



P2

B

~~2106 W. 2.1~~
DOM. PROB.
ROEHAMPTON.
~~2106~~





272

262.11
AL55

v. 2

PER CRUCEM AD LUCEM.

THE RESULT OF A LIFE.

v. 2

BY
Thomas William
T. W. ALLIES, M.A.,

AUTHOR OF

"THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND CLEARED FROM THE CHARGE OF SCHISM," "JOURNAL IN FRANCE AND ITALY," "THE FORMATION OF CHRISTENDOM," ETC.

"Domine,
Sit elevatio manuum mearum
Sacrificium vespertinum."

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.



122423

LONDON :

C. KEGAN PAUL & CO., 1, PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

1879.

LIBRARY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

(The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved.)

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
Coherence of the treatises forming this volume	1
Anglican and Catholic position	3
Ten historical proofs of Papal Infallibility	4
Infallibility the Church's glorious gift	8
Cardinal Newman on the Papal See in 1850	11

I.

TESTIMONY OF GROTIUS AND LEIBNITZ TO CATHOLIC DOCTRINES IMPUGNED IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

England's state of mind in 1850	16
Force of the testimony of Grotius and Leibnitz	19
Account by Grotius of his own mental growth	22
His witness to the Roman Primacy	24
Leibnitz: the circumstances of his time	26
His witness to the sacramental system	28
To the Roman Primacy	30
To the Infallibility of the Church	32
To the nature and number of the sacraments	33
To the Holy Eucharist as a mystery	34
To the Real Presence and Transubstantiation as identical	35
To Communion in one kind	36
To the Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament	37
To the Sacrifice of the Mass	39
To the practice of Private Masses	41
To the Sacrament of Penance	43
To Purgatory	44
On Image-worship	45
On the Invocation of Saints	47
Summary of the doctrine of Leibnitz and of Grotius	49
Temporal interests in conflict with eternal	52
Individual conversions; failure of corporate union	53

II.

ACTION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE WORK OF EDUCATING
HER MINISTRY FROM 1559 TO 1850.

	PAGE
The Mediæval Universities	57
Reform in the Universities	63
The Universities under Edward VI. and Elizabeth	64
Result of Reform	67
Why there has been no Anglican Theology	69
Universities in the eighteenth century	72
Summary of three centuries	74
The University substitute for Theology	76
Anglican Universities as Ecclesiastical Training Schools	77
The actual result of the old University training	104

III.

CHRISTIAN AND ANTICHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

Difference of First Principles in Catholic and in Protestant Education ...	113
St. Bonaventure's division of human knowledge	116
Character of nineteenth-century civilization	118
The work of Luther	123
The idea of Bacon	124
Descartes	125
The light of Grace and Modern Civilization	126
Close of the Great Exhibition of 1851 described by the <i>Times</i> ...	134
Its results foreshadowed by the <i>Times</i>	136
Christian Principles and Modern Civilization	138
Modern Civilization	146
Unbelief cannot educate Belief	147
The Church founding Universities	159
Cardinal Ximenes founds the University of Alcalá	162
Need of a Catholic University	168
Catholic Education in late times	169
Prussian Education	171
Napoleonic Education	172
The actual need of true Education	173

IV.

RELATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE ESTABLISHED IN ENGLAND BY THE REFORMATION	184
---	-----

V.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT CONCEPTION OF MISSIONARY WORK ...	213
---	-----

VI.

ST. PETER, HIS NAME AND HIS OFFICE, AS SET FORTH IN
HOLY SCRIPTURE.

CHAPTER I.—THE NAME OF PETER PROMISED, CONFERRED, AND EXPLAINED.

	PAGE
The Church the finished work of the Word Incarnate	247
Unity and visibility enter into the Church's idea, as set forth in its several types	248
Visible headship also part of this idea	250
Christ on earth in two capacities, as Founder and Ruler.—Double selection among the disciples, first of twelve, then of one	250
Statement of the question at issue in this treatise	252
First mention of Peter, the name promised	253
Meaning of the name, "stone"	254
The name conferred	256
Name explained, and promises attached	257
Classes of names given in Scripture	260
Parallel between Abraham and Peter	261
Source of pre-eminence in both, association with Christ	266
Instances of such association	269
Interpretation of St. Chrysostom	270
Summary	270

CHAPTER II.—EDUCATION AND FINAL DESIGNATION OF PETER TO BE THE
RULER WHO SHOULD CONFIRM HIS BRETHREN.

Education of Peter in the Theology and Economy	272
Preference shown to him in witnessing the Transfiguration	273
Also in the Agony; and the raising the daughter of Jairus	275
The receivers of the didrachma come to Peter	276
The answer of Christ, and what is involved in it	277
Interpretation of our Lord's action by Origen and St. Chrysostom	278
Question of the Apostles to which it leads	279
Answer of our Lord, designating Chief	280
Our Lord in two capacities:—1. as Founder; 2. as Ruler of the Church	284
She had one Ruler from the beginning.—Immense and continually growing importance of this one Ruler	285
The Church unchangeable in her form	285
The Primacy which He designated, one of real power	287
Translation of the discourse to Peter	288
Confirming used of the three Divine Persons	291
Nature of the charge, "Confirm thy brethren"	292
Meaning of the term "confirm"	292
Scope and harmony of our Lord's discourse in Luke xxii.	296
Corollaries from the charge to confirm the brethren	298

CHAPTER III.—THE INVESTITURE OF PETER.

What our Lord had done up to His resurrection	302
Further disposition of powers after His resurrection	304
Special care to prove the resurrection to Peter	304

	PAGE
Fulfilment of the Lord's promises to the Twelve, in the bestowal of their legislative, judicial, and executive powers	305
Subsequent exercise of these powers by the Twelve	307
Fulfilment of the special promises to Peter in the bestowal of the legislative, judicial, and executive powers of the Primacy	308
Force of the Lord's title, the Shepherd	309
Importance and extent of the charge conveyed by this title	311
Force of the circumstances under which it is conveyed	313
St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, Theophylact, St. Leo, and St. Basil, on the text	315
St. Cyprian adds the Primacy to the Apostolic equality	317
Force of "Follow thou Me"	318

CHAPTER IV.—CORRESPONDENCE AND EQUIVALENCE OF THE GREAT TEXTS
CONCERNING PETER.

Difference in the mode of speaking of persons indicates a difference of rank.—The phrase, a person "and they that were with him" ...	320
St. Peter first in all the Apostolic catalogues	322
Synthetical view of the whole evidence	324
Distinct spheres of St. Peter and St. John	325
Peter wrought into the whole Gospel history	326
The Primacy defined by the three great texts: first, Matt. xvi. 18 ...	329
Paraphrase of Matt. xvi. 18	329
Corollaries from it	331
Our Lord's answer to the question, Who was the greatest?	334
The text, "Confirm thy brethren"	335
Our Lord's conduct to Peter, after His resurrection, the counterpart to that before it.—Comparison of what is given to the Apostles, and what to Peter	335
The joint force, identity, and reciprocal relations of the three texts ...	337
1. They are appropriated to Peter only	337
2. Priority of time is assigned to him	338
3. Their equivalence	338
4. They indicate a sovereign and independent authority	339
5. Their definiteness	341
6. The ordinary government of the Church contained in them ...	341
7. Peter made in them the <i>continuous</i> principle of power	342
8. Peter made the type and efficient cause of visible unity	342
These conclusions borne out by Cassian in Gaul	343
By Maximus of Turin, in Italy	344
By St. Isidore in Spain, and summed up by Pope Gregory II.	345

CHAPTER V.—PETER'S PRIMACY AS EXHIBITED IN THE ACTS.

Division of the Acts into history of the Church universal, and of St. Paul in particular	346
Gospels, history of the Head; Acts, of the Body	347
Execution of Christ's promises declaratory of their enactment	347
General proof of this as to the Primacy in the Acts	349
1. Peter oftener mentioned than all the rest put together	349
2. The leading part assigned to him	350
3. Peter mentioned directly; the rest obliquely	350

	PAGE
4. Peter answers for all the Apostles	350
5. Luke records Peter's actions and speeches in full	351
6. The first part of the Acts may be called the history of Peter	352
I. Particular proof.—Election of a new Apostle	353
St. Chrysostom's comment on this	355
Peter's conduct in defending the rest on the day of Pentecost ...	355
Third and fourth speech of Peter.—Summary of the first four chapters ...	358
II. Proof from junction of authoritative teaching and miracles ...	359
Resemblance between Peter's miracles and Christ's	360
Peter the chief figure among the Apostles as Christ before ...	362
III. Peter presides over the different steps in propagating the Church ...	363
Peter's part in the conversion of Samaria	364
IV. Peter receiving the Gentiles in the person of Cornelius	366
Things to be noted in this reception concerning Peter.—Peter murmured against by some of the circumcision	369
St. Chrysostom and St. Gregory upon his conduct	371
V. St. Peter exercising supreme judicial power over Ananias ...	372
VI. St. Peter exercising supreme visitatorial power	373
VII. St. Peter's supreme legislative authority in council	374
The consent and joint action of others do not impugn the supremacy ...	376
Tertullian's testimony as to his authority here, and that of St. Jerome and Theodoret	377
VIII. Contrast between the mode in which the imprisonment of Peter, and that of James and Paul, is mentioned	378
Summary of the testimony to Peter in the Acts	379
His Primacy magisterial, judicial, and legislative.—Its institution com- pared with its exercise	380
No opposition offered to it	381
The mystical headship contrasted with the visible	382

CHAPTER VI.—TESTIMONY OF ST. PAUL TO ST. PETER'S PRIMACY.

Detailed mention of the Primacy not to be expected in St. Paul's Epistles : but an incidental one occurs often	385
Four notices of Peter in First Epistle to Corinthians	386
Paul's visit to Peter, Galatians i. 16	388
Theodoret, Chrysostom, Tertullian, Mar. Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, St. Jerome, St. Thomas Cant. on this passage	388
Paul's second visit.—Parallel between Peter with James and John on the one hand, and Paul with Barnabas and Titus on the other	391
The censure of Peter by Paul, Galatians ii.	394
St. Chrysostom's and St. Jerome's remarks	395
Misuse of this passage by ancient and modern heretics	396
Contrast of the three ancient interpretations with those of modern heretics	396
Fundamental opposition between the Fathers and the Reformers ...	400

CHAPTER VII.—THE PRIMACY OF PETER INVOLVED IN THE FOURFOLD UNITY OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM.

The person of the God-man the principle of headship in the Church ...	402
Testimony of the Fathers to this	403
Fourfold unity resulting from this headship	405

	PAGE
First unity of mystical influx	405
The second unity of charity, whose efficient principle is the Holy Spirit	406
Third unity of faith, whose efficient principle is the Holy Spirit acting through the visible hierarchy	406
Set forth by St. Paul also	408
Headship of mystical influx does not obviate the creation of an external hierarchy	411
Fourth unity of visible headship.—This the root and efficient principle of the visible hierarchy	412
The one body is complete	414
The unity of a college not sufficient to express our Lord's personal unity	414
Positive teaching corresponds to the inherent notion of the Church ...	416
The Father in the Holy Trinity what Peter's See is in the Church ...	416
Summary of this fourfold unity	417
Importance of St. Peter's office hence resulting	419

CHAPTER VIII.—SUMMARY OF THE PROOF GIVEN FOR ST. PETER'S PRIMACY.

Points in question, <i>generally</i> , inequality in the Apostolic College: <i>speciully</i> , the appointment of one over the rest; resolution of these tried by four examinations:—1. Into the words and acts of Christ, which relate to the Apostles.—2. Into those which seem to mark the institution of a singular authority.—3. Into the mode of writing used by the Evangelists.—4. Into the history of the rising Church.—A concurrence of these four points would prove the two questions	421
The analysis of what has been written shows this concurrence	422
Twelve arguments from what has been written, proving the inequality of the Apostolic College and Peter's Primacy	424
What is the force and nature of the Primacy.—Six proofs establishing this to consist in superior jurisdiction	429
Inquiry into the end and purpose of the Primacy: for the knowledge of the intention and purpose equivalent at least to a <i>negative</i> rule, ascertaining what <i>must</i> be given to it	431
Three classes of reasons, typical, analogical, and real, ascertain for us this purpose.—I. Typical. Parallel of Peter with Abraham, and its results	432
Parallel of Peter with Judah, and its results	433
II. Analogical. Analogy of body, house, kingdom, city, and fold, and its results.—And of universal, and each particular Church on one hand, and Primate and Bishops on the other	435
III. Real. Whether deduced from texts containing the institution of the Primacy, or from the inherent properties of the Church.—1. Educued from texts	437
2. Educued from properties of the Church; <i>first</i> , its <i>identity</i> ; <i>secondly</i> , its <i>unity</i> ; <i>thirdly</i> , its <i>catholicity</i> ; Scriptural setting forth of unity ...	437
Further illustration from Protestant opinions of the Church's unity.—	
A. First, that of Anglicans, of unity in particular Churches, but not in the universal Church, represented by Dodwell	439
B. Second opinion, set forth by Vitringa, of distinction between the necessity of internal and that of external unity	442
C. Third opinion, of agreement in fundamentals	448
Two causes of this being held, one theoretical, the other practical.—The former stated	449

	PAGE
2. And through the <i>real</i> criterion, or that of the subject-matter, greater in the proofs for Peter's prerogatives than in those for the real presence, or the Divinity of Christ, on account of the difficulty of grasping the object in the latter cases	478
As to the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, the proof severed from that of the Primacy sinks into nothing: considered with it, it is of the same character, but weaker	479
Accordingly, the criterion from the subject-matter is stronger for Peter's Primacy, than for the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, for the real presence, and for the Divinity of Christ.—Sum of both these criteria, verbal and real, in favour of Peter's Primacy, over these three doctrines	481
Appeal hence arising to Lutherans, Anglicans, and Calvinists.—Comparison with the inferior evidence for other received doctrines ...	481
3. The third <i>criterion</i> of analogy: force of this in favour of Peter's Primacy from three heads:—1. The divine institution of Bishops.—2. The unity of the Church.—3. The catholicity of the Church	482
4. Fourth criterion of witnesses.—Immense force of this criterion, both as stated by the Fathers, and shown by Protestants in their own conduct	484
Witnesses unanimous in favour of the Primacy	486

INTRODUCTION.

THE present volume may be said to contain a further carrying out of the principles and facts which make up the first volume. I have put together five articles written in the years 1850-52, in which the subjects treated seem to me to be on the one hand of permanent interest, and on the other to have a close logical and not less close real connection.

In the first is given the testimony borne by Grotius and by Leibnitz, two of the most powerful minds which have appeared outside the Catholic Church during the three centuries following the schism, to the truth of the most important doctrines attacked by the Reformers in the sixteenth century, and rejected in the Articles of the Church of England.

The second describes the action of the Church of England in the work of educating her ministers from 1559 to 1850: and three centuries suffice to test the nature of an institution.

The third delineates the Christian and the un-Christian scheme of education on occasion of the proposed foundation of a Catholic university.

The fourth exhibits the relation between Church and State established in England at the Reformation, and may be considered a corroboration of the argument used in the Introduction to the first volume, and of that set forth in the first treatise on the Royal Supremacy.

The fifth points at the contrast between the Catholic and the Protestant conception and realization of missionary work as exhibited in India.

Taken all together, they serve to illustrate, in the field of doctrine as well as discipline, and by the lessons of past history during three hundred years, the intense antagonism which exists between Catholic and Protestant life, wherein the primordial difference of principles shows itself in a no less divergent practice. The sacramental system is not more opposed to the Puritan, than the Jesuit missionary in his hut at Madura to the Protestant chaplain of the Establishment in India. Nor is the scheme of education which, since my essay was written in 1851, has seized definitively on the two great ancient universities, notwithstanding that they still remain practically seminaries of the Anglican ministry, and which has, moreover, passed into the marrow of the nation, more opposed to the scheme which the Council of Trent has carried out through the dioceses of the whole world, than its living product, the clergyman *paterfamilias* of the fair parsonage embedded in flowers, is opposed to the Catholic priest ministering in continence and poverty to the masses of the poor in great cities.

Lastly, the concluding work of this volume, "St. Peter, his Name and his Office," takes up the subject which had been more briefly treated in the "See of St. Peter," and draws out the prodigious fabric of scriptural proof in favour of the Primacy of St. Peter. To judge of the force of this, it ought to be contrasted with the support which Holy Scripture gives to the Royal Supremacy. Where is that to be found? Can any known method of interpretation produce one scrap from the Bible in favour of the temporal sovereign originating spiritual jurisdiction? I have waited thirty years in vain for the discovery of any such text, or the exhibition of any such method. Instead of it, Primate from above and Curate from below pursue the old trick of asserting that the Church of Rome is corrupt. The value of their assertion depends, of course, upon the credit of those who make it. But, in any case, how does an imputed corruption in one body justify an actual Royal Supremacy in another? What is the position of those who rest their salvation, not upon a divine promise made to themselves, but upon the sin of others?

This would be the Anglican position if the imputation of corruption were justified by facts, whereas I produce two of the greatest Protestants who have ever lived, to bear witness that the system of Catholic doctrine impugned at the Reformation was not a corruption, but a true development of the original religion of Christ. More specially, the last treatise in this book claims to show that the Catholic Church rests upon the most sure warrant of Holy Writ for the gift of the sacred powers of teaching and of jurisdiction exercised in the perpetual Primacy of St. Peter, sitting and ruling in his See. The only adequate answer to this would be that Anglicans should exhibit their justification for the actual system under which they live, and which is most graphically embodied in the words of each of their Prelates as he kneels before the Queen to receive his powers from her, and says "I acknowledge that I hold the said bishopric, as well the spiritualities as the temporalities thereof, only of your Majesty. So help me God."

Is such a delivery of power indeed no more than "that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scriptures by God himself, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal?" Or is the prerogative thus alleged a civil sovereignty which, legitimate in its proper exercise, becomes a monstrous usurpation when conjured into an ecclesiastical rule? Thus a reformation theoretically based upon the right of each Christian to interpret Scripture by his private judgment for himself takes shelter under the invention of a divine right of kings to rule the Church of God. And so the Puritan democracy springing from Calvin and Zwingli by a first transition develops into the passive obedience of a Jacobean clergy, while by a second transformation personal sovereignty in the time of Laud fructifies into national Erastianism in the time of Tait.

Is not this phenomenon, in all its phases, equally anti-scriptural, equally antichristian?

In the One Church doctrine and government are inseparably

woven together ; they form the Vestment of Christ, which the soldiers at His crucifixion did not rend. In false systems schism grows into heresy, and heresy invigorates schism, till the separation, which was looked upon at first as a sad necessity, becomes nature. It is nature in full growth now ; schism and heresy are its choice flowers and fruits, and May meetings the exulting exhibition of such Reformation horticulture.

The question between the Anglican and the Catholic Church resolves itself into this. The Royal Supremacy rules a community embracing every possible variety of doctrine ; and St. Peter's Primacy directs an homogeneous Church, full of growth indeed, but growing on one stem from one root. Therefore I place at the head of this volume a letter, in which I hailed with delight the forthcoming definition of Papal Infallibility, inasmuch as I may term it the compendium of the whole two volumes, as the doctrine of which it speaks is the perfect antithesis of Anglican divisions.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TABLET."

SIR,—Feeling myself an intense desire that the present Council of the Vatican may, by a clear and indubitable definition, set its seal on the words used respecting the Successor of St. Peter by the Councils of Chalcedon in 451, of Lateran in 1215, of Lyons in 1274, and of Florence in 1439, I cannot but thank you for your unceasing advocacy of such an event. And I wish to add my testimony to that of a distinguished convert, Mr. Thompson, given in your pages a few weeks ago, as to the conviction entertained by the converts as a body on the subject of the Papal Infallibility. If I have any right at all to speak on such a subject, it is that for nearly five and twenty years it has engaged my thoughts. In 1845 a page of Father Newman's Treatise on Development, setting forth the Papal prerogatives, led me to determine that I would follow out the question of the Roman Primacy to its ultimate results. I put the whole arbitrament as to the Reformation and the Anglican Church

on that issue, and the result was five years later, in 1850, a work in which, as the ground of my becoming a Catholic, I professed my full belief that the See of St. Peter was "the Rock of the Church, the Source of Jurisdiction, and the Centre of Unity." In 1852 this was followed by another work, "St. Peter, his Name and his Office," in which the whole Scripture argument to that effect was set forth. In 1866 I published to the same effect a smaller work, "Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church." I am sorry to speak about myself, but I must refer to these works for the detailed proofs, setting forth in long array the facts and testimonies which I shall endeavour to sum up, with the brevity required in a letter, under the following ten heads:—

1. The gift of inerrancy, in decisions *ex cathedrâ* upon faith and morals, is bestowed by our Lord Himself upon St. Peter in the three great texts, Matt. xvi. 18, 19, Luke xxii, 31, 32, and John xxi. 15–17. Each one of these texts conveys it by itself, and much more do they, when put together, strengthen each other and convey it by accumulation.

2. From the beginning Pope after Pope has appealed to these three texts as bestowing upon the perpetual living Peter precisely the two gifts of doctrinal inerrancy and universal jurisdiction, and Council after Council has admitted and acknowledged the appeal. No Council has treated it as a usurpation. No Council has demurred to the belief that the Apostle lives for ever in his See; that Peter speaks by Leo in 451, by Agatho in 680, by Innocent in 1215, by Pius in 1563.

3. The Decretal Letters of the Popes of the first three centuries have perished, but with Siricius, in the year 384, a regular series of them commences. They are the public acts of the Church's chief Bishop in his ordinary government, written to Bishops all over the world, and accepted as laws by those to whom they were written. A learned writer who has compiled the most ancient says of them: "Out of so many Pontiffs, singular for their learning and holiness, whom I will

not say to charge, but even to suspect, of arrogance or pride were rash in the highest degree, not one will be found who does not believe that this prerogative has been conferred on himself or on his Church, to be the head of the whole Church.”* But the gifts of headship are precisely infallible authority and universal jurisdiction. The two powers are distinguished by two entirely different words in the original charge of our Lord to Peter (John *xxi.* 15, 16); the one enjoining him to give to the lambs and the sheep the food of true doctrine, not the poison of heresy (*βόσκει τα ἀρνία μου*), the other commanding him to rule the sheep of Christ, and using for that purpose the word constantly employed in Scripture to express the power of Christ Himself (*ποιμαίνει τὰ πρόβατά μου*).

4. These two gifts are set forth specially by St. Leo the Great, in the middle of the fifth century, with a definiteness of language which can scarcely be surpassed, and the Bishops of the Great Council of Chalcedon answer his claim by calling themselves his Children, and him their Father, themselves his Members, and him their Head, “the one entrusted by the Saviour with the guardianship of the vine.” Now, this great fourth Council sums up the whole belief as to the Papal prerogatives of the four preceding centuries, and from that time to this the infallibility of the Church itself, and the infallibility of the Papal See, are interwoven in the history of fourteen centuries as warp and woof. No man can touch or wound the one without touching or wounding the other.

Accordingly we see that—

5. At every great crisis of Church history this infallibility of the Papal See is required in order to maintain the infallibility of the Church. It is so specially in all the controversy concerning the Greek schism. Bishops then were divided, a multitude on each side, but the Church was not divided, for its unity lay in the inerrancy of St. Peter’s See, and the Bishops adhering to it.

6. So again in the great schism and revolt of the sixteenth

* Coustant, *Epist. Pontif. Rom.* p. iii.

century. The unity of the Church is maintained, and the possession of the truth guaranteed, amid a tremendous defection, only by the infallible authority of St. Peter's See.

7. From the Council of Trent, in 1563, to the Council of the Vatican, in 1869, a series of dogmatic decisions is issued by the Holy See, and accepted by the Church as infallible. Here, as in all former instances, the Holy Father speaks as one whose judgment is irreformable, and decision final. In what position would the infallibility of the Church be, if, during all this period, she had received as irreformable judgments liable to error, and bowed before decisions as final which admitted of reconsideration ?

8. Thus all preceding history corroborates what the nature of things tells us, that the power of universal jurisdiction, which no one can be a Catholic without admitting to reside in the Holy See, requires for its exercise the gift likewise of infallible authority. To divide the one from the other would be like separating in the divine attributes wisdom from omnipotence. *Vis consili expers mole ruit sua*. We know from the old fable what riot Phaethon would make if he drove the chariot of the Sun. But the Divine Wisdom has constructed the constitution of the Church after the type of His own nature.

9. The Church being an indefeasible kingdom, the authority of which is never dormant or suspended, requires in her Head a permanent infallible confirmer of his brethren. She is not subject to *deliquia* of three centuries, because, by the appointment of Christ, one possesses "full power to feed and govern her."

10. Lastly, every canonized Saint, since the process of canonization has been instituted, has believed and ardently professed the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. Such were St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure; such St. Ignatius and St. Philip; such St. Francis of Sales and St. Theresa; such St. Alfonso; such all the sainted children of the seven great religious families which these represent. When was the instinct of saintliness known to fail ?

Father Newman may therefore well say, concerning such a doctrine as this, that "we are all at rest, and have no doubt, and at least practically, not to say doctrinally, hold the Holy Father to be infallible:" but surely the conclusion rightly to be drawn from all this is, that no Catholic should be allowed to deny that without admitting which it is impossible to maintain the infallibility of the Church. But for myself, I must go much further than this. We have just been reminded, in very beautiful language, how the Athanasian Creed "is not a mere collection of notions, however momentous. It is a psalm or hymn of praise, of confession, and of profound self-prostrating homage, parallel to the canticles of the elect in the Apocalypse. It appeals to the imagination quite as much as to the intellect. It is the war-song of faith, with which we warn first ourselves, then each other, and then all those who are within its hearing, and the hearing of the Truth, who our God is, and how we must worship Him, and how vast the responsibility will be if we know what to believe and yet believe not."* Now, what is here said of the Athanasian Creed I say for myself of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. I do not accept it because I cannot help it; but I exult in it as a glorious endowment bestowed upon His Church by Him who said those words to Peter, and in so saying created the Rock against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. So it appeared to St. Augustine when he said not only "*securus judicat orbis terrarum,*" but

*"Nunerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede;
Et in ordine illo patrum quis cui successit videte:
Ipsa est Petra, quam non vincunt superbæ inferorum portæ."*

If after four centuries he so appealed to it, how much more may we after eighteen? Therefore to my mind the majestic march of the Royal See of Peter through secular revolutions, changes of peoples, languages and races, a new Europe, and a new America, is the most wonderful, the most enthralling, the most convincing fact of history. Even when I was a Protestant it exercised this power over me. Even then suffering "from

* Grammar of Assent, p. 128.

the stammering lips of ambiguous formularies," and searching for a rock in a quicksand, I cried out to it, while "earthly states have had single conquerors or legislators, a Charlemagne here, a Philip Auguste there, in Rome alone the spiritual ruler has dwelt for ages, smiting the waters of the flood again and again with the mantle of Elijah, and making himself a path through them on the dry land."* A few years later, when emerging from the quicksand, I cried out to it again, "Whither then shall I turn but to thee, O Glorious Roman Church, to whom God has given, in its fulness, the double gift of ruling and of teaching? Thine alone are the keys of Peter, and the sharp sword of Paul. On thee alone, with their blood, have they poured out their whole doctrine. Too late have I found thee, who shouldst have fostered my childhood, and set thy gentle and awful seal on my youth; who shouldst have brought me up in the serene regions of truth, apart from doubt, and the long agony of uncertain years. O too long sought, and too late found, yet be it given me to pass under thy protection the short remains of this troubled life, to wander no more from the fold, but to find the Chair of the Chief Shepherd to be indeed 'the shadow of a Great Rock in a weary land.'"†

And now, after nearly twenty years, when the Eternal Hills are nearer, it is but common gratitude to God and to St. Peter's See to say that so it has been. It is to me "the war-song of faith, with which we warn first ourselves, then each other, and then all those who are within its hearing and the hearing of the Truth," to proclaim that the special Providence with which God has watched over the growth of the See of Peter, so that like and with His Church, "*crescit occulto velut arbor ævo*," is an illumination transforming all the eighteen centuries of Christian history, the golden thread which leads through its labyrinth to its inmost shrine. That "throne of the Fisherman built by the Carpenter's Son,"‡ which I hailed with delight

* Church of England cleared from Schism, 2nd edition, p. 394. 1848.

† See of St. Peter, the Rock of the Church, end. 1850.

‡ See of St. Peter, Sec. 1.

while approaching as an extern the Catholic Church, I reverence now with filial affection after two decades of years, as the masterpiece of God's hand, as the most prominent token of that "all power" given to our Lord which the world presents, until the judgment-day shall reverse all wrong and establish all right. I am indeed unable to see that the union of infallible authority with universal jurisdiction is not a certain deduction even of human reason to Catholics already. For how can "the Successor of blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and the true Vicar of Christ, the Father and Doctor of all Christians, to whom in the person of blessed Peter full power was delivered by Our Lord Jesus Christ to feed, to rule, and to govern the universal Church,"* be liable to error in the exercise of those divine functions? But the declaration that such error is impossible, if it be given by the great Council now sitting, I shall hail with that delight with which every Catholic mind dwells on the Consubstantiality of the Divine Son, declared by the Council of Nice; on His two Natures and single Personality, declared by the Council of Chalcedon; on His presence by transubstantiation, declared by the Council of Lateran; on His justifying presence in the soul, declared by the Council of Trent; and on the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother, declared by the Holy See in 1854. The declaration of one more great truth will complete the circle of these doctrines, which may indeed alarm some that are without, but to those within are the sweetest exercise of their faith, the highest delight of their reason. And such completion, demanded as I have said above, will, as I trust, be the near augury of great triumphs yet to come. It will not be a new truth any more than these were new truths, for with the Godhead of the Son the inerrancy of the Chair of teaching which He erected has ever been the mainstay of the Church; but, as the ages go on, truth shines out with more perfect radiance, and therefore attracts with fuller beauty. And so I pray that as our Blessed Lady's honour was completed by Pius IX. in 1854, the honour

* Definition of the Primacy by the Council of Florence.

of St. Peter's See may be completed while Pius IX. is its occupant in 1870. Nor can I fear the effect of this upon those within or upon those without. To the men of my own time whom I have known, the most learned, the most intellectual, the most earnest of the converts, this doctrine never was a stumbling-block. They would all have chosen to express their feelings in the burning words of one whose genius is our pride and his writings our delight. They would say, "The German Emperor has ceased to be; he persecuted the Church and he has lost his place of pre-eminence. The Gallican Church too, with its much-prized liberties, and its fostered heresy, was also swept away, and its time-honoured establishment dissolved. Jansenism is no more. The Church lives, the Apostolic See rules. That See has greater acknowledged power in the Church than ever before. and that Church has a wider liberty than she has had since the days of the Apostles. The faith is extending in the great Anglo-Saxon race, its recent enemy, the lord of the world, with a steadiness and energy which that proud people fears, yet cannot resist; out of the ashes of the ancient Church of France has sprung a new hierarchy, worthy of the name and the history of that great nation, as fervent as their St. Bernard, and as tender as their St. Francis, and as enterprising as their St. Louis, and as loyal to the Holy See as their Charlemagne. The Empire has rescinded the impious regulations of the Emperor Joseph, and has commenced the emancipation of the Church. The idea and the genius of Catholicism has triumphed within its own pale with a power and a completeness which the world has never seen before. Never was the whole body of the faithful so united to each other and to their head. Never was there a time when there was less of error, heresy, and schismatical perverseness among them. Of course the time will never be in this world when trials and persecutions shall be at an end; and doubtless such are to come, even though they be below the horizon. But we may be thankful and joyful for what is already granted us, and nothing which is to be can destroy the mercies which have been.

“So let all Thine enemies perish, O Lord ; but let them that love Thee shine, as the sun shineth in his rising !” *

What Father Newman said in 1850 he will say in 1870 ; and how should we fear for the future, since the Sacred Heart of our Lord in the Eucharist, His Virginal Mother, and His Apostle’s See are the triple magnet of all loving souls to the end of time.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

T. W. ALLIES.

Palm Sunday, 1870.

* Lectures on Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans. Lect. 10.

I.

TESTIMONY OF

GROTIUS AND OF LEIBNITZ

TO CATHOLIC DOCTRINES IMPUGNED IN THE
SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

TESTIMONY OF
GROTIUS AND OF LEIBNITZ
TO CATHOLIC DOCTRINES.

DR. RUSSELL has done good service to the cause of Catholic truth, by publishing, at the present moment, a translation of the above very curious and interesting work of Leibnitz.* There are circumstances which make it especially well-timed. Never, within the memory of living men, has there been such a stir in England concerning Catholic doctrines as within the last few months. Now, perhaps for the first time, it may be said that the Anglican Establishment has been shaken to its centre. First the Gorham controversy, and then the decision of the Privy Council, have unhinged a multitude of minds, forcing them back into themselves, and compelling them to summon their conscience to sit in unwilling judgment on the deepest and most solemn of questions. Next, a number of remarkable conversions, happening from time to time, evidently without combination of the parties—against all human interests and affections—in all cases dissolving the ties of friendship; in some taking away, besides, the means of subsistence—the result, plainly, of souls urged to a desperate struggle—to a choice between their well-being here and their eternal salvation hereafter, had worked the English mind into a state of very feverish susceptibility. These conversions, we

* A System of Philosophy, by G. W. von Leibnitz, with an Introduction and Notes by C. W. Russell, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. 1850.

say, not coming in a mass, so that those who remained might say, "Well, at last it is over—it is sad, but we have lost those we are to lose, and now we can go on afresh: a little sore it may be, but surely now we are all true men, without doubt or faltering;"—rather, on the contrary, starting up where men least expected it, and stinging them to the very soul by the strength of their testimony to the truth—forcing even upon irreligious minds the fact that there was such a thing still as the kingdom of God on earth, for which venture was to be made and pain suffered, and thrilling religious and sensitive minds with the deepest agony, at the thought that the communion in which they had been born and bred, and with which their dearest affections and most heavenly sympathies were entwined, might perchance prove to be a delusion and a sin;—those conversions had raised through the length and breadth of the country an anger, a suspicion, a fear—all the more intense, because it seemed difficult to give them reasonable expression. How were the sworn disciples of toleration, those whose cry had been for "civil and religious liberty," to hint at the desirableness of persecuting those who exhibited this liberty in a way they did not approve? How were those whose religion begins and ends with private judgment, to censure men for exercising, at great worldly loss, the dearest prerogative of conscience?

Such was the fever of the public mind, when that great and decisive act of the Holy Father, which has bestowed on his English children the blessing of a regular diocesan episcopate, gave it the long-desired vent for its indignation. It was not that the Sovereign Pontiff had exercised powers which before had slumbered: for the division of England into vicariates was as complete an act of spiritual supremacy as the appointment of dioceses; and the doubling the number of these vicariates, which took place in 1840, certainly showed growth and *aggression* as much as the present increase. But the Pope's act was the strongest and most unmistakable expression of the judgment which the Sovereign Pontiff and the

Catholic Church have ever held of the Anglican communion from the time of the schism. That frail support, which the apparent existence of the ancient sees had given to many more minds than were consciously aware of it, was henceforth swept away. A radical print observed, with much satisfaction, that the Pope had "snuffed out" the Elizabethan quasi-episcopate. It never had possessed authority to do a single spiritual act, and now this was declared, and embodied in the most unexceptionable form,—a form, we repeat, in the highest degree unexceptionable and legal, because the Act of 1829, which allowed to Catholics the free exercise of their religion, guaranteed to them the enjoyment of a regular and ordinary episcopate. This could only be granted by the Sovereign Pontiff, and his grant at once brought out the intense antagonism which must ever subsist between a merely national establishment and the Catholic Church.

Hence a rage of the public journals hardly ever before witnessed—hence a continuance of studied misrepresentations, abuse, and calumny, which make an Englishman blush for his country—hence county meetings throughout the land, at which country gentlemen, essaying to speak on matters of spiritual jurisdiction, betrayed the sad uncomfortable fact that the divine constitution of the Church of Christ was a thing simply unknown to them. They had never risen to any other notion of the Church than that it was a function of the civil government, for which the Sovereign appointed Bishops, who were Lords-Lieutenant *in spiritualibus*. No wonder the appointment of a regular Catholic episcopate was considered a Papal aggression on the Crown. Hence clerical meetings, in which so-called Anglo-Catholics were content to sit cheek by jowl with Dissenters whom they had till then persecuted as heretics and schismatics, and to join with them on the basis of a general Protestantism in furious denunciations of Popery. Hence—a deeper and darker disgrace—an assembly of the diocese of Oxford, on the very spot whence the Anglo-Catholic movement went forth—an assembly embracing, it would seem,

almost every clergyman in the diocese, and a vast number of laymen, presided over by a Bishop so kind and amiable in the ordinary intercourse of life as Dr. Wilberforce, at which only fourteen voices were raised against the word *idolatrous*, applied to Catholic rites—of which fourteen the Bishop's was *not* one.

In fact, the circumstances of the times, the decision of the Sovereign, as head of the Church, that the utter denial of sacramental grace is compatible with the tenure of Anglican preferments—the effect which conversions, for five years past more especially, have had upon minds, attracting some and violently repelling others; and finally, the grant of the Catholic hierarchy, have brought out, in an unexpected way, the deep and entire Protestantism of the Anglican Church. Those heroes of controversy, bold enough to head the most forlorn hope, who ventured to maintain that the Roman and the Anglican Church were really *one*; that the differences were but external, while the unity was essential; if they ventured to whisper such a theory at present, would be met by an overpowering burst of derision. Protestant instincts are now awake, and instincts never go wrong. Instinct, eight years ago, saw a cope in the pulpit surplice, and smelt already the eucharistic incense when Dr. Blomfield, in conciliating mood, recommended that prayers which had been said *westward*, to the people, should not indeed be said *eastward*, to the altar, but might be said *southward*, where were neither people nor altar. This shuffling between heaven and earth is now quite at a discount. A man must now be a Protestant or Catholic—he is not allowed to lurk, a doubtful friend, or a more dangerous foe, between both. The Catholic element, which still survives in Anglican services, is now sought out for proscription and ridicule. Those who venture to light candles at an Anglican Eucharist, do so with a guard of police at the door, and policemen in plain clothes among the congregation: and a hapless Bishop, in thanking the clergy of a whole county for a violent anti-Popery address, feels it necessary to remind them that there is such a thing as the apostolical succession, and that

“our pure and reformed Church” is not to be lowered to the level of an unordaining sect; and for this he is scouted as a Papist in disguise.

These, then, are the circumstances which render the translation of the “*Systema Theologicum*” of Leibnitz well timed. Anglicanism comes forth before all men, proclaimed by the almost unanimous voice of its ministers to be a mere species of Protestantism,—and Protestantism and Catholicism stand once more, in a special manner, ranged in direct contrast and battle array. It is good, we say, at such a time to be able to produce the testimony of the most learned, most able, most philosophic minds which Protestantism has ever numbered, in behalf of the truth of those very doctrines which Protestantism is now denying, misrepresenting, and calumniating. Amid all this Babel of confused cries—this mob of voices shouting without intelligence, and with blind rage, “Great is Diana of the Ephesians!”—the measured, earnest, sober judgment of the mighty dead rises in solemn distinctness. Yes, of the dead!—for they of whom we speak not only lived, but, alas! died in Protestantism. But lately an eminent writer, who some twelve years ago set forth the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration as unquestionably held by the ancient Church and the Fathers, and as an essential part of the Christian Faith, attempted to reassure his fainting followers by the declaration that he would die in the bosom of his present communion, though the denial of that doctrine has been rendered legal therein by a most solemn decision. We trust that the grace of God may yet frustrate that declaration. But those whom we shall quote, as eminent as the above-mentioned writer for learning, and knowledge of Christian antiquity, actually fulfilled that fearful pledge. They died out of that Church the truth of whose doctrines they had set forth. Alas, for their own souls! But we may cite them as the most unbiased witnesses of the truth.

The seventeenth century seems to have exhibited in France, in Germany, and to some extent in England, a spec-

tacle in many respects similar to what we see at present. Protestantism had lost its spring and force, though it had not yet subsided into that almost universal unbelief which has been the end of its course on the Continent. Its more learned and sober members were looking anxiously about to see how they could combine the portion of belief which it retained with the system of that Church which its first professors, in their violent zeal, had denounced as antichristian. In England this showed itself in the attempt of the Caroline divines to recover many Church doctrines which had been surrendered at the first establishment of the Reformation. The attempt never was popular, for it was learning and the study of antiquity which had moved scruples in the minds of these divines, and showed them the inconsistent shapelessness of the Elizabethan settlement of religion; but learning and the study of antiquity are always rare, and the popular temper, the real character of their establishment, was then, as now, vehemently Protestant, and was too strong for all their efforts. But abroad, where Protestantism was more disengaged from the Catholic element, where there was no shadow of an episcopate, no presumed priesthood, to lull tender and affectionate minds into the persuasion that they belonged yet to the Church of Christ, the result of inquiry, thoughtfulness, and prayer was, in a great number of illustrious instances, conversion to the Catholic Faith. These instances we will for the moment pass by, and rest our attention upon two men who never were converted, but who were conspicuous above all their fellows for their great ability, their love and knowledge of theology, their blameless and honourable life, and the philosophic character of their minds,—Grotius and Leibnitz.

The first of these, Hugo Grotius, was born at Delft, in Holland, in the year 1583. Of marvellous precocity from his youth, his manhood did not belie the rich and varied promise of his early years. At eleven he was sent to study at Leyden, where he soon became conspicuous above all his companions. Visiting Paris at the age of fifteen, he was distinguished by

Henri Quatre, who put a chain of gold upon his neck, and presented him to his Court, with the words, "Behold the miracle of Holland!" Not much later he was appointed historiographer of his native country. He did not confine his studies to one class of subjects, but was alike eminent for his knowledge of the Greek and Latin authors, and for his own Latin writings in prose and verse, while he was no mean proficient in mathematics and astronomy; he opened a new era in the science of national jurisprudence, and his theological works fill four folio volumes. Yet his was a busy life among courts and statesmen; and it is a wonder how he found time for so prodigious an accumulation of mental treasures. By birth and education a Dutch Calvinist, it could only have been by the force of his own character and his private studies that he drew near to the Catholic Faith. Yet he has left us the following sentiments on those two cardinal doctrines, the affirmation or denial of which must decide the controversy between Catholic and Protestant—we mean, the being and constitution of the Church Catholic, and the Primacy of St. Peter. In his "*votum pro pace Ecclesiastica*" (opera, tom. iv. p. 653) he thus sums up the result of all that he had read and thought respecting the Holy Catholic Church:—

"Nurtured from my youth in sacred literature, and taught by masters not holding the same opinions on divine things, it was easy for me to see the will of Christ, that all who desired to bear His name, and through Him to attain blessedness, should be one among themselves, as He is one with the Father (John xvii). And that, not one in spirit merely, but likewise in a communion which can be seen, and is specially seen in the bond of government and the participation of sacraments. For the Church is, or ought to be, a certain Body (Rom. xii.; Ephes. i. 4, 5; Colos. i.); which Body, Christ, the Head given to it by God, has willed to be jointed together by the ligaments of various offices (Ephes. iv. 11); and individuals to be baptized in it, that they may become one Body (1 Cor. xii.). And they are to feed on one consecrated Bread, that they may grow

more and more unto each other, and show themselves to be one Body (1 Cor. x. 17). I was strangely captivated by the beauty of that ancient Church, on whose Catholicity there is no controversy, when all Christians, save fragments torn off, and therefore easy to be recognized, were knit together by the intercourse of ecclesiastical letters from the Rhine to Africa and Egypt, from the British Ocean to the Euphrates, or beyond. I saw that it was for this very reason that schisms and separations in that conspicuous Body were severally interdicted (Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. i. 10, 11, iii. 3, xi. 18, xii. 25; Gal. v. 20); and that this was the special subject in the letters of Paul and Clement of Rome, to the Corinthians, and in many writings of Optatus of Milevis and of Augustine against the Donatists. Moreover, I began to reflect that not only my own ancestors, but those of many others, had been pious men, hating superstition and wickedness; men who brought up their family well in the worship of God and the love of their neighbour, whom I had ever deemed to have departed from this life in a state of salvation; nor had Francis Junius taught me otherwise, a man of such fair and mild opinions, that the more heated Protestants disliked and abused him. I was also aware, from the report of my elders, and the histories I had read, that men afterwards arose who were altogether for deserting the Church in which our ancestors had been; and who not only themselves deserted it, some even before they were excommunicated, but made new assemblies too, which they were for calling Churches, made new presbyteries in them, taught, and administered sacraments, and that in many places against the edicts of Kings and Bishops, and alleged, in defence of this, that they must obey God rather than man, just as if they had had such a charge from heaven as the Apostles had. Nor had they halted in their daring at this point; but traducing Kings as idolaters and slaves of the Pope, had stirred up the mob to armed meetings, seditions against the magistrate, breaking of the images of saints, of holy tables and shrines, and finally to civil war and open rebellion. I saw

that much Christian blood had thus been everywhere shed; that morals, looking generally, especially where they had prospered, had so far from improved, that long wars had made men savage, and the contact of foreign vices infected them. My sorrow at these things increasing with my years, I began to reflect myself and consider with others on the causes of calamities so great. *The seceders, to cover their own deed, stoutly maintained that the doctrine of the Church united with the Chief See had been corrupted by many heresies, and by idolatry.* This was the occasion of my inquiring into the dogmas of that Church, of reading the books written on both sides, reading also what has been written of the present state and doctrine of the Church in Greece, and of those joined to it in Asia and Egypt.

“I found that the East held the same dogmas which had been defined in the West by universal councils; and that their judgments agreed on the government of the Church (save the controversies with the Pope), and on the rites of the sacraments unbrokenly handed down. I went further, and chose to read the chief writers of ancient times, as well Greek as Latin, among whom are Gauls and Africans: and those of the three next centuries I read both all and often; but the later ones, as much as my occupations and circumstances allowed, especially Chrysostom and Jerome, because I saw that they were considered happier than the rest in the exposition of Holy Scripture. Applying to these writings the rules of Vincentius of Lerins, which I saw to be approved by the most learned, I deduced what were the points which had been everywhere, always, and perseveringly handed down, by the testimony of the ancients, and by the traces of them remaining to the present day. *I saw that these remained in that Church which is bound to the Roman.*”

What is wanting to the force of this testimony? Here is a man of the highest mental powers, who was born and bred, who lived and who died a Protestant, and who declares that the result of long studies in the Holy Scriptures and the

Fathers, and in writers on the Catholic and the Protestant side, undertaken for the very purpose of forming an accurate judgment, was, that the doctrines of the Roman Church agree with those held always, everywhere, and by all in Christian antiquity.

Let us see what he says further on the capital point of the Primacy. We shall see that he unites the testimony of history with the necessity of things—fact with principle. “Paul has taught us (Ephes. iv. 11) that there should be various degrees of rulers in the Church, and that by means of these degrees the Church forms one compact structure. Now order, whether in its parts or in the whole, is maintained by a certain headship, or the unity of the chief. And this is what Christ has taught us in the person of Peter. This Cyprian learnt from Christ; and Jerome says against Jovinian the same thing as Cyprian: ‘The Church is founded upon Peter, although this very thing, in another place, takes effect upon all the Apostles, and all receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the strength of the Church is established equally upon them all. Nevertheless one out of the twelve is chosen for the very purpose that by the appointment of a head the occasion of schism may be removed.’ Such a head among Presbyters is the Bishop, among Bishops the Metropolitan, or some one elected in another manner to preside over the rest. *Such, among all, is the Roman Bishop. This order ought always to remain in the Church, because the cause always remains, that is, the danger of schism.* Diotrephes in evil mode claimed that for himself which belonged to others, as afterwards did Novatus and Novatian. It is true that each Bishop enjoys a part of one single episcopate, that a portion of the flock is assigned to each pastor, that the care even of the Universal Church is, in a certain sense, entrusted to all; for the Church is ruled by the Common Counsel of the Bishops. But the agglomeration both of many parts to each other, and of the whole Body, requires one chief. Thus subsist both a purity of power, and a certain power of higher range, as Jerome says, among those otherwise equal; for they are equal

in that they are colleagues, not in that there is a headship over them."*

Again (tom. iv. 641): "As an army or a ship cannot be ruled save by officers of different grade, which grades are to terminate in one, so neither can the Church. Even if all who are in the Church were endued with the highest charity, yet would there be need of such an order. God is not wont to be always doing miracles; but for the best result He likewise points out the best means, as a certain order is to the Unity of the Church. And what this order should be, Christ has pointed out in the person of Peter: for to him He gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven, for the whole college, as the head of the college. Now the headship in every college consists in directing the consultations and executing the decrees. A passage of Cyprian plainly expresses what we mean: 'The Lord says to Peter, etc. The Primacy is given to Peter, that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one, and the episcopal chair one.' Here you see the Primacy, which name in every college carries with it a certain power. That most beautiful union which holds the Church together, emanated not from the Roman Empire, but was indicated by Christ and followed out by the Apostles. Thus the Apostles set up Presidents in the Churches, whom the Apocalypse, after the manner of Malachy, calls angels, as being chief priests in their own assembly. Such was Polycarp at Smyrna.—So Titus was Metropolitan in Crete.—And long before the name of Patriarch came into use, the Bishops of Rome, of Antioch, and of Alexandria, ruled the body of the Church by common counsel. But amongst these three most eminent Churches, the headship of the Roman Church was the more powerful, with which it was necessary that every Church should agree, because the tradition of the Apostles has been ever preserved in that Roman Church by those on all sides of it, as Irenæus teaches us (iii. 3), who indeed himself, in admonishing Victor as to the right exercise of this power, admits by that very fact his inspection even over the Churches

* Opera, tom. iv. 658.

of Asia. The Bishop of Rome is the head of the Christian aristocracy. That Primacy can be exercised under Christ, and without the terror which a tyranny inflicts, and so as to preserve to the Bishops their right over the Churches committed to their charge. No one who has given any attention to ecclesiastical history can deny that the most serious schisms which arose of old in Greece and Asia were healed by the authority of the Roman See. If any schisms have arisen from the Roman See itself, these have been from contested elections. In such a case, the Emperor and Kings should provide for the meeting of a General Council, and allow it either to decide the election, or appoint a new one. But why is it that those who differ in their opinions among Catholics remain in the same body without breaking communion; while Protestants who differ cannot do the same, however much they talk about brotherly love? Whoever gives its due weight to this reflection will discover the great force of the Primacy, the right use of which, such as Melancthon would not have disapproved, he who lists may find, without further trouble, in the letters of Gregory the Great."

From Grotius let us pass to one still more eminent, perhaps the most distinguished person, for his vast and varied learning, and his philosophic acuteness, whom Protestantism in the course of three centuries has produced.

In the year 1819, Germany was startled by the apparition of a new work bearing the honoured name of Leibnitz, and that no less a work than a *System of Theology*. Although Leibnitz was known to have had many Catholic tendencies, and although his correspondence with Bossuet on the mode of restoring unity between the two communions was notorious, yet the newly discovered *System of Theology* was so markedly Catholic, that the first resource of German Protestants was to deny its authenticity. When this was proved beyond possibility of doubt, the next thing was to maintain that it was "written in the assumed character of a Catholic, and with a view of explaining the Catholic belief to Protestants in the most favour-

able sense of which it is susceptible, and of thus promoting the project of Church union."* But this hypothesis seems likewise set at rest by a letter from the author himself to an unknown correspondent, believed by the German editor Guhrauer, to be the reigning Duke of Hanover, Ernest Augustus, but by Dr. Russell, to be the Landgrave Ernest of Hesse-Rheinfels.

These, it would appear, were the circumstances which led to this remarkable treatise being written. During the latter half of the seventeenth century there were continual projects entertained by certain German Princes for the reunion of the Protestants with the Catholic Church. Among these Princes figure some illustrious ancestors of her Majesty, John Frederic, Duke of Hanover, who himself became a Catholic, and his brother, Ernest Augustus, 1679-98, father of George I. It was in reference to one of these projects that Leibnitz, then librarian at the Court of Hanover, wrote in the year 1684 in "reply to a communication from this unknown correspondent, the chief object of which would appear to have been to urge on the negotiations, and especially to cut short the discussion of theological details, on the ground that the only really essential subject of discussion was the fundamental question of authority, and that this point being once determined, all the rest followed as a necessary consequence." † Leibnitz, in answer, gives the purpose for which he composed the treatise translated by Dr. Russell. There is no reason to doubt that he executed himself what in this letter he proposed to his correspondent.

"Hence I think that, in order to proceed securely in these matters (the project of uniting the Protestants to the Church), it would be necessary to adopt the following plan. It would be necessary that a man of meditative mind, and one whose views are not far removed from the reunion, should draw up an Exposition of Faith, a little more detailed than that of Monseigneur the Bishop of Condom (Bossuet), in which he should endeavour to explain himself *with the utmost exactness and*

* Dr. Russell's Introduction, p. xvi.

† Ibid. p. xcii.

sincerity on the disputed articles, avoiding all equivocal phrases, and all the terms of scholastic chicanery, and employing only natural forms of expression. This exposition he should submit to the judgment of some learned Bishops (of the Roman Church) distinguished for moderation: dissembling, however, his own name and party. And, in order to enable them to judge more favourably, the question proposed should be, not whether they themselves agree with the writer in his opinions, but simply whether they hold his opinions to be tolerable in their Church" (p. xc).

The Exposition of Faith thus described is found among the manuscripts of Leibnitz, in an unfinished state, the first rough draft of the author, and ending with a comma. For some yet unexplained reason it never seems to have been submitted, as he here proposes, to any Catholic Bishops. After his death in 1716, it remained unpublished, but not wholly unknown, in the Royal Library of Hanover, until it was taken thence during the French occupation, and was finally published in 1819, one hundred and thirty-five years after the probable date of its composition in 1684.

The above-cited letter supplies a guarantee for the author's perfect sincerity. Moreover, the treatise itself commences thus: "After a long and mature examination of the controversies on the subject of religion, in which I have invoked the divine assistance, and divested myself, as far, perhaps, as is possible for man, of party feeling, as though I came from a new world, a neophyte unattached to any party, I have at length fixed in my own mind, and, after full consideration, resolved to adopt the following principles, which, to an unprejudiced mind, will appear to carry with them the recommendation of Sacred Scripture, of pious antiquity, and even of right reason, and the authority of history."

We will now proceed to quote the judgment of Leibnitz on the chief points disputed between Catholics and Protestants.

I. On the unity of the one body the Church, and, as

involved therein, the sacrament of Orders, the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and the Authority of the Supreme Pontiff, he thus speaks: "The sacrament of Orders, or of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, is that by which the ecclesiastical or spiritual office or power, distinguished into its several grades, is conferred on certain individuals, whose ministry God uses for the purpose of dispensing the grace of His sacraments, and of instructing, ruling, and retaining others in the unity of the faith, and the obedience of charity, superadding thereto a certain power of jurisdiction, which is comprehended chiefly in the use of the keys. To the Hierarchy of Pastors of the Church belong not only Priesthood and its preparatory grades, but also Episcopacy, and even the Primacy of the Sovereign Pontiff; *all of which we must believe, to be of divine right.* As Priests are ordained by a Bishop, the Bishop, *and especially that Bishop to whom the care of the entire Church is committed,* has power to moderate and limit the office of the Priest, so that in certain cases he is restrained from exercising the power of the keys, not only lawfully, but even validly. Moreover the Bishop, *and especially the Bishop who is called Œcumenical, and who represents the entire Church,* has the power of excommunicating and depriving of the grace of the sacraments, of binding and retaining sins, and of loosing and restoring again. For it is not merely that voluntary jurisdiction which belongs to a Priest in the confessional, that is contained under the power of the keys; but the Church, moreover, has power to proceed against even the unwilling; and he 'who does not hear the Church,' and does not, so far as is consistent with the salvation of his soul, keep her commandments, 'should be held as the heathen and the publican;' and as the sentence on earth is regularly confirmed by that of heaven, such a man draws on himself, at the peril of his own soul, the weight of ecclesiastical authority, to which God himself lends that which is last and highest in all jurisdiction—execution.

"In order, however, that the power of the Hierarchy may

be better understood, we must recollect that every state and commonwealth, and therefore the commonwealth of the Church, should be considered as a civil body, or one moral person. For there is this difference between an assembly of many and one body, that an assembly, of itself, does not form a single person out of many individuals; whereas a body constitutes a person, to which person may belong various properties and rights, distinct from the rights of the individuals; whence it is that the right of a body, or College, is vested in one individual, while that of an assembly is necessarily in the hands of many. Now it is of the nature of a person, whether natural or moral, to have a will, in order that his wishes may be known. Hence, if the form of government is a monarchy, the will of the monarch is the will of the State; but if it be a polycracy, we regard as the will of the State the will of some College or Council,—whether this consist of a certain number of the citizens, or of them all,—ascertained either by the number of votes, or by certain other conditions.

“Since, therefore, our merciful and sovereign God has established His Church on earth, as a sacred ‘city placed upon a mountain’—His immaculate spouse, and the interpreter of His will—and has so earnestly commended the universal maintenance of her unity in the bond of love, and has commanded that she should be heard by all who would not be esteemed ‘as the heathens and the publicans;’ it follows that He must have appointed some mode by which the will of the Church, the interpreter of the divine will, could be known. What this mode is was pointed out by the Apostles, who, in the beginning, represented the body of the Church. For at the council which was held in Jerusalem, in explaining their opinion, they use the words, ‘It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.’ Nor did this privilege of the assistance of the Holy Ghost cease in the Church with the death of the Apostles; it is to endure ‘to the consummation of the world,’ and has been propagated throughout the whole body of the Church by the Bishops, as successors of the Apostles.

“Now as, from the impossibility of the Bishops frequently leaving the people over whom they are placed, it is not possible to hold a council continually, or even frequently, while at the same time the person of the Church must always live and subsist, in order that its will may be ascertained, it was a necessary consequence, by the divine law itself, insinuated in Christ’s most memorable words to Peter, when He committed to him specially the keys of the kingdom of heaven, as well as when He thrice emphatically commanded him to ‘feed His sheep,’ and uniformly believed in the Church, that one among the Apostles, and the successor of this one among the Bishops, was invested with pre-eminent power; in order that by him, as the visible centre of unity, the body of the Church might be bound together; the common necessities be provided for; a council, if necessary, be convoked, and when convoked, directed; and that in the interval between councils, provision might be made lest the commonwealth of the faithful sustain any injury. And as the ancients unanimously attest that the Apostle Peter governed the Church, suffered martyrdom, and appointed his successor, in the city of Rome, the capital of the world, and as no other Bishop has ever been recognized under this relation, we justly acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to be chief of all the rest. This, at least, therefore, must be held as certain, that in all things which do not admit the delay necessary for the convocation of a general council, or which are not important enough to deserve a general council, the power of the chief of the Bishops, or Sovereign Pontiff, is, during the interval, the same as that of the whole Church; that he can excommunicate any individual, or restore him to communion; and that all the faithful owe him true obedience; and this obedience extends so far that, in the same way as an oath is to be kept in all things in which it can be done consistently with the salvation of the soul, so also we are to obey the Sovereign Pontiff as the only visible Vicar of God upon earth, in all things which, after due self-examination, we think can be done without sin, and with

a safe conscience; insomuch that, in doubt, when all the other circumstances are the same, we must regard obedience as the more safe course; and this we are bound to do for the love of the unity of the Church, and with the intention of obeying God in the person of those whom He has sent. For we should submit to suffer anything whatsoever, even with grievous personal sacrifice, rather than be separated from the communion of the Church, and give occasion to schism" (pp. 140-145).

Elsewhere, in his works, Leibnitz says concerning the Sovereign Pontiff: "In every republic, and therefore in the Church, it is provided by the law itself, that there should be a supreme magistracy, whether it be in the hands of one, or of more persons. And, nevertheless, if the College consist of more than one, it is necessary that the right of director, or supreme magistrate (restrained, however, by its own limits), should be in the hands of one individual."*

And again: "As God is a God of order, and as it is of *divine right* that the body of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church should be bound together by one government and one universal hierarchy, it follows that, *by the same right*, there should be within it a supreme spiritual office, confined within due limits (these words I now add), armed with a directorial authority, and provided with power of doing all that is necessary for the fulfilment of this office for the safety of the Church; though it may have been through human motives that Rome, the metropolis of the Christian world, has been chosen as the place and seat of this power."†

II. Infallibility of the Church.

In a letter to the Landgrave of Hesse-Rheinfels, Jan. 1, 1684, quoted by Dr. Russell, p. 141, he says: "But in order that your Highness may see more clearly that I am not far removed from your views, as to that not the wanting of the sacrament, but the despising of it, condemns, I hold that any one who wishes to be a member of the Church through this interior

* Opera, tom. v. pp. 229, 230.

† Ibid. 228, 229.

communion, must make every possible exertion to be also in the external communion of the visible Catholic Church, which is discoverable by the continual succession of her hierarchy; and this Church, which is called the Roman Church, appears to me to be such. I say, furthermore, that the hierarchy which is seen in that Church, *i.e.* the distinction of the Sovereign Pontiff, *appertains to the general divine law*, inasmuch as there must necessarily be a director of the Bishops and the Priests. I will further add, that the visible Catholic Church, through the special and promised assistance of the Holy Ghost, is infallible in all articles of faith which are necessary to salvation." *

III. The nature and number of the Sacraments.

"Though it is idle to dispute much about names, yet, as the appellation 'Sacrament' has been received in the Church, its meaning should be estimated not from private caprice, but from public usage. By the name of Sacrament, therefore, is nowadays understood in the Church a rite to which a special promise of grace is annexed by God. Some require, in addition, that the rite should be expressly contained and sufficiently described in Sacred Scripture; but it is certain that what is wanted in the written, can and should be supplied by the traditionary word of God. Some require, also, that there should be a corporeal and visible element, but this also equally seems to be unnecessary. And some restrict the grace which is conferred to justification and the remission of sins; however, this condition also is arbitrary.

"The sacred rites, such as we here define, are seven in number: Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, Matrimony. In Baptism the rite is ablution with water 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;' the grace is the purification of the soul, the bestowing of faith and penance, and consequently the remission of sins and renovation. In Confirmation the rite is unction; the effect of the grace conferred is indicated by the word

* Biographie, i. 344, 345.

Confirmation itself. In the Eucharist the rite is the ministering of the symbols, according to the prescribed form; the grace is the nourishment of the soul, or the increase of charity. In Penance the rite is confession and absolution; the grace the remission of sins. In the Unction of the Sick the rite is indicated by the name; the grace is the support of the vital powers in sickness, chiefly in order that, while life is in peril, the soul may be strengthened against temptations. In Orders the rite is imposition of hands, and whatever else appertains thereto; the grace is the spiritual power conferred on the ordained, which consists in celebrating the perpetual Sacrifice, and in remitting and retaining sins. Lastly, in Matrimony the rite is the legitimate declaration of consent; the grace is the divine benediction, to which, as a kind of spiritual effect, is annexed the bond of Matrimony.

“No rite has hitherto been discovered, which could even with any show of reason, be added to these seven except the ‘Washing of Feet,’ which has been by some referred to the number. But, although the words of Scripture seem to favour it somewhat, this rite has not received the testimony of the Church; for if this condition had been added, it also should have been admitted as a Sacrament” (pp. 90, 91).

IV. The Holy Eucharist. And here we will distinguish several different points:

1. That it is a mystery.

“I come now to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, upon which the greater weight of the controversy has turned. For there are some persons who, reasoning too freely in judgments of the divine mysteries, and perverting certain words of Chrysostom, Augustine, and others among the ancients, maintain that the Body and Blood of Christ are not really present in the Lord’s Supper, but are only represented or signified; because they are as far removed from us as heaven is from earth, and a thing which possesses the true nature of a body cannot be in more than one place simultaneously. Some, with greater liberality, appear to admit (though not without ambiguity) that we

really receive the Body of Christ, but receive it through the medium of the mind, which is raised up to heaven by faith, and that, consequently, as faith alone is the instrument of receiving, the Sacrament is not received by the unworthy,—*a doctrine which seems entirely opposed to the words of the Apostle.* However, this opinion, when its supporters are driven to an explanation, seems, in the end, simply to amount to this, that the mind flies up to heaven, to receive the Body of Christ, only in the same way as we are said to be, in thought, at Rome or Constantinople; for, if they adopt any other explanation, they will be compelled to ascribe to our mind a power which they deny to Christ's Body, viz. that of being in heaven and on earth at the same time. We shall be more secure, however, in adhering closely to the words of our Saviour, who, 'when He had taken bread and wine, said, THIS IS MY BODY.' Pious antiquity always recognized in this Sacrament a great mystery which was beyond the comprehension of the human mind; now, if it be a sign that is given instead of the reality, there is no mystery in it whatsoever. And indeed that every existing Church in the whole world, with the exception of the Reformed Churches, and those which have sunk lower than the Reformers in innovation, admit the Real Presence of Christ's Body, certain recent writers of eminence, (the authors of the *Perpétuité de la Foi*,) have demonstrated with so overwhelming evidence, that we must either admit this to be proved, or abandon all hope that anything shall ever be proved regarding the opinions of distant nations" (pp. 98, 99).

2. That the Real Presence and Transubstantiation are true, and are identical.

"There are some who, while they admit the Real Presence, maintain, so to speak, a sort of impanation. They say that the Body of Christ is given in, with, and under the bread. Hence, when Christ said, 'This is my Body,' they understand it in the same sense as if a person were to exhibit a purse, and to say, 'This is money.' The records of pious antiquity, however, plainly enough demonstrate that the bread is changed into the

Body, and the wine into the Blood of Christ : the ancients, too, universally acknowledged therein a change of substance (*μετασχηματισμόν, μετουσιασμόν*), which the Latins have aptly rendered ‘Transubstantiation ;’ and it has been defined that the whole substance of the bread and wine is changed into the whole substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. And therefore here, as elsewhere, the Scripture is to be explained from the tradition, which the Church, its keeper, has transmitted to us” (p. 100).

In another part of his works, quoted by Dr. Russell, he asserts, what any one who accurately follows out the whole subject will perceive for himself, the identity of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation.

“This, too, shall be demonstrated (what no one has ever imagined), that Transubstantiation and the Real Presence in many places simultaneously do not differ from each other in their ultimate analysis ; and that it is impossible to conceive a body present in several separate places at the same time, in any other way than by conceiving its substance to exist under different species. For the substance alone is not subject to its extension, and therefore (as will be distinctly shown when the nature of the substance of a body, as far as regards this point, shall be explained) neither is it subject to the conditions of place. Hence Transubstantiation, as it is called in well-considered phrase by the Council of Trent, and as I have illustrated it from St. Thomas, is not opposed to the Confession of Augsburg, but, on the contrary, follows from it.” *

3. The Communion in one kind.

“Nor, indeed, can it be denied that by virtue of concomitance, as divines say, Christ is received entire under either kind, since His Body is not separated from His Blood. The only question is whether we may, without sin, depart from the form which appears to be prescribed in Sacred Scripture. And I confess that if this had been done by private individuals, it would be impossible to acquit them of the charge of grievous

* Briefwechsel zwischen Leibnitz, etc. pp. 145, 146.

temerity; but the usage of the Church, continued for so many ages, proves that, even from the earliest times, it was believed to be allowable to dispense with the use of the chalice, for approved reasons. And there are some Protestants who admit that, if a person have a natural abhorrence of wine, he may be content with the communion of the bread alone. Now I ask, what more pressing cause can there be than the desire of avoiding schism, and of preserving the unity of the Church and public charity? I hold it to be certain, therefore, that the withdrawal of the chalice cannot supply any one with a just cause of seceding from the Church" (p. 121). And he adds, "Now I have no doubt that those who are in authority have power to make laws in such matters as these; and that the faithful are bound rather to obey them, than to give rise to a schism, which St. Augustine shows to be almost the greatest of all evils. Indeed, the Church's power of defining is very extensive, even (though this is only in a certain way) in things which belong to positive divine law; as appears from the transfer of the Sabbath to the Lord's Day, the permission of 'blood and things strangled,' the canon of the sacred books, the abrogation of immersion in Baptism, and the impediments of matrimony; some of which Protestants themselves securely follow, solely on the authority of the Church, which they despise in other things" (p. 124).

4. The adoration of the Blessed Sacrament.

"The practice of adoring the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, though it was not equally in use in every age, has with laudable piety been established in the Church. In everything appertaining to the external display of worship the early Christians observed the utmost simplicity; nor indeed is it possible to censure them in this, for they burned within with true piety of soul. But by degrees, as they began to grow cool, it became necessary to employ external signs, and to institute solemn rites, which might serve to remind men of their duty and to revive the ardour of devotion, especially where there was any great reason or occasion. Now, it is difficult to supply

to a Christian a greater occasion than is presented in this divine Sacrament, wherein God Himself renders present to us the Body which He has assumed. For although He is equally present at all times, and in all places, as well by His substance as by His aid, yet, as it is impossible for us, at all times, and in all places, to direct our mind expressly to Him, and to render to Him perpetual signs of honour, prudence will point out the propriety, in ordering the details of divine worship, of marking off certain times, places, causes, and occasions. And God Himself, in assuming a human body into the unity of His Person, has given us a peculiar and most signal occasion of adoring Him; for no one will doubt the justice and congruity of adoring God while He appears in the visible form of Christ; and the same must be admitted wherever it is certain that Christ is corporally present (for the Divinity is present in all places and times), even though it be after an invisible manner; *now it is perfectly certain that this condition is fulfilled in the most holy Sacrament.* Hence, if there be any case in which the practice of adoring may congruously be introduced, it is the case of this Sacrament. And thus it has been justly ordained that the highest solemnity of external Christian worship should be devoted to the Sacrament of the Eucharist; because the object proposed by our Saviour in its institution was to enkindle the love of God, which is the highest act of external Christian worship, and to testify and nourish charity. For when our Lord, at the Last Supper, delivered the supreme commands of His last will, He wished that we should remember Him (like all who love and are beloved in turn), and that we should love one another as members of His one Body, whereof He has made us all partakers. And hence the Church has always employed the Eucharist as the test of unity, and has been careful not to admit to its mysteries, which may be regarded as the inmost recesses of Christianity, any except the proven and purified. To no others, indeed, was it permitted even to be present at the mysteries. It is certain, moreover, that the ancients also adored the Eucharist; and indeed Ambrose and Augustine expressly

apply to the adoration of Christ's Body in the mysteries the words of the Psalm, 'Adore ye His footstool.'

"And in the end, since the necessity has ceased for deferring to Pagan prejudices, either by concealing the mysteries, or by abstaining from certain external signs, which might offend the weak, or wear the semblance of Paganism, it has gradually come to pass, that the most exquisite rites of our external worship have been devoted to this venerable Sacrament; especially in the West, where there has not been any necessity to consult for the prejudices of the Saracens. Hence it has been ordained, not only that the people prostrate themselves at the elevation of the Sacrament after consecration; but also, that when borne to the sick, or otherwise carried in procession, it shall be attended with every demonstration of honour; that from time to time, whether on occasions of a public necessity, or from some other cause, it shall be exposed for adoration; and that, as the pledge of God's presence upon earth, it shall be celebrated yearly by a special festival, with the utmost joy, and, as it were, triumph of the Church. And, indeed, the wisdom of these usages is so manifest, that even the Lutherans adore in the moment of receiving the Eucharist, although they go no further, not believing the Body of Christ to be present sacramentally, except in the actual eating thereof; but this we have already shown to be a novel and incongruous invention" (pp. 124-127).

5. The sacrifice of the Mass.

"It remains for us to explain the sacrifice of the Mass, which the Church has always taught to be contained in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. In every sacrifice there may be distinguished the person offering, the thing offered, and the cause of offering. In this Sacrament of the Altar the person offering is the Priest. The Chief Priest is Christ Himself, who not only offered Himself once on the cross, when He suffered thereon for us, but also perpetually exercises His priestly office, even to the consummation of time, and even now offers Himself for us to God the Father, through the ministry of the Priest or

Presbyter. Hence it is that He is called in Scripture, 'a Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec;' for nothing appears to be clearer than that in him, when, according to the prophetic allegory of the Scripture, he is said to have offered bread and wine, the Eucharistic Sacrifice is prefigured. The thing offered, or the Victim or Host, is Christ Himself, whose Body and Blood undergo immolation and oblation, under the appearance of the symbols. Nor do I see what there is wanting here to the true character of a sacrifice. For what is there to prevent that which is present under the symbols from being offered to God, seeing that the species of bread and wine are fit matter for oblation; that the oblation of Melchisedec consisted therein; and that what is contained under them in the Eucharist is the most precious of all things, and the most worthy offering which can be presented to God? Coming to the aid of our poverty, therefore, by this admirable service of mercy, the divine goodness has enabled us to present to God an offering which He cannot despise. And as He is infinite in Himself, and as nothing else can emanate from us which would bear any proportion to His infinite perfection, no offering could be found capable of appeasing God but one which should itself be of infinite perfection. And in this wondrous manner it comes to pass, that Christ, ever giving Himself back to us anew in this Sacrament, as often as the consecration is repeated, can always be offered anew to God, and thus represent and confirm the perpetual efficacy of His first oblation on the cross. Not that by this propitiatory sacrifice, repeated for the remission of sins, any new efficacy is superadded to the efficacy of the passion; its value consists in the representation and application of that first bloody Sacrifice, which 'perfected all things once;' and its fruit is the divine grace which accrues to those who assist at this tremendous sacrifice, and who worthily celebrate the oblation in unison with the Priest. And thence, as besides the remission of eternal punishment, and the gift of Christ's merit unto the hope of eternal life, there are many other saving gifts which

we may ask of God, both for ourselves and for others, whether they be living or dead—especially the mitigation of that paternal chastisement which remains due to every sin, even though the penitent has been received back into favour—it evidently follows that, in the entire range of our worship, there is nothing more precious or more efficacious in obtaining what we ask, than the Sacrifice of this divine sacrament, in which the Body of the Lord itself is present. For, provided we come with clean heart to this altar, there is nothing which we can immolate more grateful to God, or of sweeter odour in His sight. And St. Bernard well says: ‘All that I can give is this wretched body; and if that is too little, I add His own Body also.’”

Having thus wonderfully set forth the doctrine itself, he alludes to the scriptural and patristic authority for it:

“Now, the Sacred Scripture itself, as we have already observed, clearly alludes to this sacrifice in the comparison of Christ with Melchisedec in the 110th Psalm, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews; not to speak of the ‘perpetual Sacrifice,’ mentioned in Daniel (viii. 11, 13, xi. 31, xii. 11) and other places. And indeed it was meet that the Christian religion should not be without a sacrifice; and that as our oblation, which was only prefigured by the sacrifices of the Old Testament, is the most perfect and most worthy of all sacrifices, it should also be permanent and perpetual, as it is insinuated in the Psalm cited above, that the priestly office of our High Priest is perpetual. Indeed, this is the common interpretation of the ancients; and even the early Fathers, Justin Martyr and Irenæus, to say nothing of Augustine and the later ones, applied to the Eucharist the ‘clean oblation’ of which Malachy speaks. Lastly, there are numberless passages of the holy Fathers in which it is declared, that Christ is daily immolated in the Sacrament for the people” (pp. 129–132).

6. The practice of private Masses.

“Moreover, as the dignity and utility of the perpetual Sacrifice are so great, the usage of offering it very frequently

to God for the necessities of the faithful, even though it was not always accompanied by public communion, at last became universal. Of old, indeed, it was the usage that all who were present at the Sacrifice should also partake of the communion; but, by degrees, the number of communicants was reduced to a few, when the fervour of early piety declined, and well-grounded fears began to be entertained that too frequent communion, and a promiscuous admission of communicants, might lead to a diminution of reverence, and be an occasion of sin to many. For if the faithful in our own days were all to approach the table of the Lord after the celebration of the mysteries, who can doubt that numbers of them would eat unworthily? On the contrary, by allowing intervals between the occasions of communion, time is given to those who come to the feast to prepare, so that they may not be found without the nuptial garment. It would have been wrong, nevertheless, that, because communicants were not always found, the divine honour should therefore suffer any diminution. Hence, when the laudable and pious practice of daily celebrating the most holy Sacrifice in every church was established, it followed, as a consequence, that the communion of the Priest who offered was regarded as sufficient. This is the origin of what they call private masses; and it is not right that the Church should be deprived of their fruit, which undoubtedly is very great, and that the honour of God should be curtailed by their suppression. For it is not a sufficient reason for requiring the abolition (which would cause the greatest offence to the faithful) of institutions, which in themselves are excellent, to allege that the Church existed for a long time without them; neither are we to return entirely to the ancient simplicity in externals; save perhaps those among us who may prudently trust that they are able to offer within their hearts the pious fervour which distinguished the first Christians. And would that there were many who could entertain this confidence!" (pp. 133, 134).

V. The Sacrament of Penance.

“Assuredly it is a great mercy, on the part of God, that He has given to His Church that power of remitting and retaining sins, which she exercises through her Priests, whose ministry cannot be despised without grievous sin. In this manner God at once confirms and strengthens the jurisdiction of the Church, and arms it against the refractory, by promising to give effect to her judgments; and hence, unhappily for schismatics, while they despise the authority of the Church, they are compelled also to forfeit her advantages.

“Both kinds of remission, that which takes place in Baptism, and that which is received in Confession, are equally gratuitous, equally rest on faith in Christ, equally require penance in adults; but there is this difference between them;—that in the former nothing is specially prescribed by God beyond the rite of ablution; but in the latter it is commanded that he who would be cleansed shall show himself to the Priest, confess his sins, and afterwards, at the judgment of the Priest, undergo a certain chastisement, which may serve as an admonition for the future. And as God has appointed Priests to be the physicians of souls, He has ordained that the ills of the patient shall be exposed, and his conscience laid bare before them:—whence the wise declaration which the penitent Theodosius is recorded to have made to Ambrose: ‘Tis thine to prescribe and compound the medicines, mine to receive them.’ Now the ‘medicines’ are the laws which the Priest imposes on the penitent, as well to render him sensible to past sin, as to make him avoid it for the future; and they are called by the name of satisfaction, because, on the part of the penitent, this obedience and self-chastisement are grateful to God, and mitigate or remove the temporal punishment, which should otherwise be expected at His hands. Nor can it be denied that this is an ordinance in every respect worthy of the divine wisdom; and if there be in the Christian religion anything admirable and deserving of praise, assuredly it is this institution, which won the admiration even of the people of China and Japan; for, by the necessity of confessing, many, especially those who

are not yet hardened, are deterred from sin, and to those who have actually fallen it affords great consolation; insomuch, that I regard a pious, grave, and prudent confessor as a great instrument of God for the salvation of souls; for his counsel assists us in governing our passions, in discovering our vices, in avoiding occasions of sin, in making restitution, in repairing injuries, in dissipating doubts, in overcoming despondency, and, in fine, in removing or mitigating all the ills of the soul. And if in the ordinary concerns of life there is scarce anything more precious than a faithful friend, what must it be to have a friend, who is bound even by the inviolable obligation of a divine sacrament, to hold faith with us, and assist us in our need?"

VI. Purgatory.

"Let us dismiss these inquiries, however, and come to the much-agitated question of Purgatory, or temporal punishment after this life. Protestants hold that the souls of the departed are consigned at once either to eternal happiness or eternal misery. Hence they reject the prayers for the dead as superfluous, or reduce them to the condition of idle wishes, such as, rather through human custom than any idea of their utility, we conceive regarding things already past and decided. On the contrary, it is a most ancient belief of the Church, that prayers are to be offered for the dead; that the dead are assisted thereby; and that, although those who have departed from this life may, through the merits of Christ, have been received into favour by God, and by the remission of the eternal punishment have been made heirs of eternal life, they continue, notwithstanding, to suffer a certain paternal chastisement, or purgation, especially if they have not sufficiently washed out the stain during life. And to this purgatorial punishment, some have applied Christ's words about 'paying the last farthing,' and that 'all flesh shall be salted with fire;' others, the passage of Paul's regarding those who have built upon the foundation 'wood, hay, stubble,' and 'shall be saved, yet so as by fire;' others, the passage on 'baptism for the dead.' It is true that the holy

Fathers differ as to the mode of purgation. For some were of opinion that the souls are detained for a determinate time (which some extended to the day of judgment, and some even further) in a certain place where they undergo a temporary purification. Some held that the mode of chastisement consisted in corporeal fire; some in the fire of tribulation,—an opinion to which St. Augustine at one time leaned, and which some Greeks hold even at this day. Some thought the purifying fire was the same as, others that it was distinct from, the fire of hell. And there were even some who restricted purgatory peculiarly to the time of the resurrection, wherein all, even the saints, shall have to pass through fire; but those only shall be burnt, or shall suffer loss, whose work is so ill-executed as to be liable to injury by fire. However this may be, almost all agreed to the existence—whatever might be its nature—of a paternal chastisement or purgation after this life, to which the soul, enlightened at its parting from the body, and touched with extreme sorrow for the imperfection of its past life, and for the hideousness of sin, of which it then for the first time becomes fully sensible, voluntarily subjects itself, insomuch that it would not desire to attain to supreme happiness on any other condition" (pp. 165–168).

VII. On Image-worship he observes:—

“The use of images in worship appears clearly to be founded on principles of utility and reason. What object have we in reading or listening to histories, but in order that the images which they represent may be painted on our memory? Now, as these images are of themselves very fleeting, and are not always sufficiently distinct and clear, we should gratefully acknowledge, as a great gift of God, the arts of painting and sculpture, through whose aid we obtain enduring images, representing the objects with the utmost accuracy, vividness, and beauty; by the sight of which (in the impossibility of referring to the originals) the external images may be renewed, and, like the impression of a seal on wax, more deeply imprinted upon the mind. And as the use of images possesses such

advantages, in what circumstances, I ask, can it be more fitly introduced, than in those in which it is of the greatest moment that the images impressed upon our memory should be especially lasting and vivid, that is, in the concerns of piety and of the divine honour? And this is especially true, because, as I have observed above, the worship of God is pre-eminently the most fitting field for the display of all the arts and sciences, and therefore also of painting.

“To one who considers these things, it must be clear, beyond all doubt, that if the law of God and certain holy men chose to prohibit, at certain times and in certain places, a thing which in itself is harmless, and indeed which, if religiously practised, is eminently useful, it was solely because it might give occasion to grievous abuses, against which it was difficult to guard in those times. We must see, then, in what these abuses chiefly consist.”

After pointing out the very different state of the world before the establishment of Christianity, and the overthrow of the ancient polytheism, he continues, “Hence, when all the reasons are carefully balanced, we must come to the conclusion, that the law of God, if any such law existed against the use of images, and even against such a worship of them as does not trench in any way on the divine honour, was merely a ceremonial precept; that it was but temporary in its nature, and perhaps was retained for a while by the first Christians on account of grave reasons; in the same way as the law of the Sabbath day, and that concerning the use of ‘blood and things strangled,’ which, though enforced by a much more express passage of the New Testament, nevertheless fell into disuse among the majority of Christians, as soon as the season for observing them was at an end.”

Further on he has an acute remark: “It is not a whit more censurable to adore before an external image than it is to adore in presence of the internal image which is painted on our imagination; for the only use of the external image is to render the internal one more vivid.” And he sums up the

whole subject thus: "All things considered, therefore, seeing that in the practice of venerating images, as it is approved by the Fathers of Trent, there is nothing opposed to the divine honour; that there does not appear to be, in these times, when all are sufficiently aware that the Omnipotent Deity alone is worshipped with divine honour, any fear of idolatry which might pervert the honour due to God; that, moreover, there exists in the Church a usage of so many centuries, which cannot be abolished without the greatest revolutions; that, in fine, if the abuses be removed, it is productive of signal advantage to piety; I conclude that the retention of the practice of venerating the original in the presence of the image (in which alone image-worship consists), is a judicious and pious measure, provided it is confined strictly within its own limits, and the utmost caution is observed in its use" (pp. 53, 57, 64, 68.)

VIII. The Invocation of Saints he thus defends:—

"It is certain that angel-guardians are assigned to us by God. Now, the Scripture compares the saints to angels, and calls them 'equal to angels' (*ἰσαγγέλους*). That the saints have some concern in human affairs appears to be conveyed by the 'talking of Moses and Elias with Christ;' and that even particular events come to the knowledge of the saints and angels (whether it be in the mirror of the divine vision, or by the natural clearness and wide-ranging powers of vision possessed by the glorified mind), is insinuated in Christ's declaration, that there is 'joy in heaven upon one sinner that doth penance.' Further, that God, in consideration of the saints, even after their death, grants favours to men (although it is only through Christ that the saints, whether of the Old or of the New Testament, possess their dignity), is indicated by the prayers found in the Scripture: 'Remember, O Lord, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Thy servants;' a form not very different from that which the Church commonly employs: 'Grant, O Lord, that we may be assisted by the merits and intercession of Thy saints;' that is, 'Regard their labours,

which by Thy gift they have borne for Thy name ; hear their prayers, to which Thine only-begotten Son hath given efficacy and value ! ”

And he concludes a dissertation on this point thus : “ Seeing, therefore, that the blessed souls, in their present state, are much more intimately present in all our affairs, and see all things much more nearly than while they lived on earth (for men are acquainted only with the few things which occur in their sight, or are reported to them by others) ; seeing that their charity, or desire of aiding us, is far more ardent ; seeing, in fine, that their prayers are far more efficacious than those which they offered formerly in this life, that it is certain that God has granted many favours even to the intercessions of the living, and that we look for great advantages from the union of the prayers of our brethren with our own ; I do not perceive how it can be made a crime to invoke a blessed soul, or a holy angel, and to beg his intercession or his assistance, according as the life and history of the martyr, or other circumstances, appear to suggest ; especially if this worship is considered but as a slender accessory of that supreme worship which is immediately directed to God alone ; and if, whatever may be its character, it is offered for the sake of testifying our reverence and humility towards God and our affection for God’s servants, and springs from that pious solicitude which prompts us in proportion to the lowly sense we entertain of our own unworthiness to desire to unite the prayers of other pious persons, and, above all, those of the Blessed, with our own. And thus when it is analyzed, this very accessory of worship terminates in God Himself ; to whose gift alone the saints are indebted for all that they are or can do, and to whom is due a sovereign honour and love incomparably transcending all other love. For if the veneration and invocation of saints be circumscribed within these limits, it is, though not of necessity, not only tolerable, but praiseworthy. At all events, it cannot be regarded as idolatrous or damnable, unless we be willing to affirm, at the imminent hazard of the faith, that the promises of Christ have been frustrated, and

that the true Church fell from her very origin into a horrible apostasy" (pp. 71-87).

When we add to the above that on the grand doctrinal point of Justification, Leibnitz sets forth the Catholic view, though at too great length to be here quoted, we shall have gone over the whole range of doctrine attacked by the Reformers of the sixteenth century. What we see, then, is this: A man of great powers of mind, renowned for his intellectual subtlety, and for his vast knowledge, one who shows an intimate acquaintance with the writings of the Fathers, and of the schoolmen, born and bred a Protestant, and dying one, draws up, for the purpose of favouring a project of union between Catholics and Protestants, a "System of Theology," in which, after solemnly attesting his perfect sincerity, he states his belief in one Church, the Body of Christ, governed by a divinely constituted hierarchy, at the head of which, both by the express institution of Christ, and by the nature of things, is one chief Bishop: that this Bishop is the Roman Bishop, to whom obedience is due from all Christians: that this Church, of which the Roman Bishop is the organ and representative, is infallible in decisions of faith, and by the express promise of Christ can never fail: that it possesses a perpetual sacrifice, the most divine and exalted, the only one which man could possibly offer to God not unworthy of His infinity, viz. the sacrifice of that Body which God has assumed into the unity of His Person: that for offering this sacrifice a priesthood is appointed by a sacrament which confers on them grace for this end, and for bestowing remission of sins, on certain conditions, upon those who approach the sacrifice: that the practice of sacramental confession and absolution is "an ordinance in every respect worthy of the divine wisdom; and, if there be in the Christian religion anything admirable and deserving of praise, assuredly it is this institution, which won the admiration even of the people of China and Japan" (p. 136): that souls, dying in a state of grace, have in the next world that purgation completed which was left imperfect in this: that

“venerating the original in the presence of the image (in which alone image-worship consists) is a judicious and pious measure, provided it is confined strictly within its own limits, and the utmost caution is observed in its use”(p. 68); and that the prayers of the Blessed are of great advantage, and to be asked for with humility: and, once more, that “as the evidence of reason and of Scripture assures us that true and perfect charity is not only prescribed by God, but is moreover the highest service which man can render to his God, and that without it ‘faith is dead,’ therefore it has been justly and congruously ordained that *through it our justification, reconciliation, and renovation are completed*; although the actual grace of charity is obtained for us, and granted to us, solely through Christ, while we are still separated from God; and although its power of effacing sin springs solely from Christ’s merit, imputed to us through a lively faith” (p. 31).

It is evident that in making these statements Leibnitz sweeps away every particle of justification which the Reformers claimed for their acts, since he lays down that those very doctrines are in the highest degree Christian, which they assaulted as antichristian, and that the antiquity to which they appealed is wholly against them; and in doing this he removed, likewise, all excuse for remaining in a state of separation from that Church which he here recognizes as divine and infallible, and that supreme Pontiff, to whom, as he says, all Christians owe obedience.

In the present moment of excitement, then, we can turn with confidence to the testimony of these two great Protestants. Let us try to discover, among the Anglican clergy, among the declaimers at public meetings, among the Episcopate itself, who are the equals of Grotius and Leibnitz in learning and knowledge of antiquity. Leibnitz saw “the only sacrifice not unworthy of God’s infinity,” where they see “idolatry.” Grotius saw “the points which had everywhere, always, and perseveringly been handed down, remaining in that Church which is bound to the Roman;” to them these same points are

“corruptions.” Both Grotius and Leibnitz saw in the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, the necessary bond of unity; the Anglican episcopate, clergy, and laity, see in him the rival of Queen Victoria, and one who has committed an act of aggression on her crown by appointing a diocesan episcopate.

But it may fairly be asked, how is it that men who so plainly give up the only ground on which Protestantism can stand, after all, however near they might come, never became Catholics—never gave that complete testimony to the truth, which thorough self-sacrifice and submission, if need be, alone can render? With regard to Leibnitz, we think Dr. Russell has suggested the true answer in a theory which that eminent man maintained, “a distinction between the internal and external communion of the Church.” In one of the preliminary communications to Madame de Brinon, by which, several years afterwards, the way was opened to the celebrated correspondence with Bossuet, he maintains not only that he is a “Catholic in heart,” as Madame de Brinon had ventured to affirm, but that he may be said to be such “even outwardly;” inasmuch as, according to his view, nothing but obstinacy (of which, he says, his conscience acquits him) can constitute a heretic; and “the essence of Catholicity does not consist in external communion with Rome (else those who are unjustly excommunicated would cease to be Catholics), but in charity.” Hence he infers that “the real schismatics are those who throw obstacles in the way of unity; and the true Catholics are they who do all in their power to enjoy even external communion.”*

Are there not many others now who suffer such an unsound sentiment to keep them back from firm and high action, from grasping the reality of that unity, on the dream of which they are wasting life, and perilling eternity?

Before concluding, we must notice a curious coincidence in point of time. When the English nation was frightened out of its propriety by Titus Oates’ Plot, and was near shedding the purest blood of its nobles like water, when it was imposing, by

* *Introd.*, pp. lxii., lxiii.

Act of Parliament, an oath, to be taken by all members, and, as such, by the Bishops of the Established Church, which declared the most holy Sacrifice of the Eucharist to be idolatrous, the then head of her Majesty's family, John Frederic, Duke of Hanover, had become a Catholic from conviction. And a few years later, when the furious rage of party was endeavouring to exclude the brother of the King from succession to the crown as a Catholic, her Majesty's lineal ancestor, the father of our George I., then Duke of Hanover, was encouraging his librarian, Leibnitz, to entertain projects of union between Catholics and Protestants. A few years later, in 1700, the Duke of Gloucester dies, and the succession to the British crown, on the condition of Protestantism, is settled upon the son of this same Ernest Augustus of Hanover. Then we behold Leibnitz no longer the advocate of peace and reconciliation, but intimating to his friend Fabricius, who had to recant for having sanctioned the marriage of a Brunswick Princess with a King of Spain, and her consequent change of religion, "the necessity of embodying in his proposed disavowal an expression of *abhorrence of Popery*;" the man who writes above that all Christians owe obedience to the Pope, declares formally, that as "the sole ground of the succession of the Hanoverian family is England's detestation and exclusion of the Roman religion;" the declaration which poor Fabricius was compelled to make must, at all events, "avoid everything which savours of lukewarmness on the subject of Popery."*

Of course no more was heard of the zeal of the Court of Hanover to effect a union between Catholics and Protestants. And the interests of this world rendered abortive many similar plans. The unity of Christ's Body is not to be built upon compromise of that truth which is in very deed its secret bond. Statesmen decry the inefficacy of the Church's counsels, but when did any plan of theirs, which has had truth for its subject-matter, succeed or cohere? For eighteen hundred years they have repeated Pilate's question, or his sneer, What

* *Introd.*, p. cxxxii.

is truth? But the truth lives on—it is crucified, and it rises again, and in the end it reigns for ever.

Let us conclude with some remarks of Dr. Russell's, which are not without their present application (Introd., p. cxxxiii.): "Such was the end of the numberless plans of Church Union set on foot by the sovereigns of Germany during the course of the seventeenth century. For the immediate object for which they were designed by their originators, they proved utterly ineffective. Their general result, it is true, was favourable to the cause of the Catholic religion, and the movement occasioned many most important defections from the ranks of Protestantism. To the spirit of enlightened inquiry which it invoked, the Church was indebted for some of the most brilliant triumphs which she had enjoyed in Germany since the Réformation; for the accession of many royal and illustrious converts, like Christina of Sweden, Frederic Augustus of Poland, Wolfgang William of the Palatinate, Christian William of Brandenburg, Ernest Augustus of Hesse-Rheinfels, John Frederic of Hanover, and his nephew Maximilian; Antony Ulric of Brunswick, Christian Augustus and Maurice Adolphus of Saxe-Weitz; of distinguished statesmen, like Boineburg and Ranzov; of divines, like Nigrinus, Blum, Prætorius, Bertius, Fromm, and Nihusius; of jurists, like Besold, Hunnius, and the two Nessels; of men of science, like Steno and Hellwig; and of eminent scholars, like Lambeck, Pfeiffer, and Lucas Holstein. But beyond individual conversions, such as these, history does not point to any single memorable result of all these ostentatious preparations; not one of the magnificent hopes so confidently cherished was realized; no union, even of a preliminary or provisional character, was effected; not a single community, however unimportant, was re-attached to the Church; not a single controversy was adjusted; not a division was healed; nor, except in the case of a few eminent disputants, was the asperity of general controversy in the smallest degree diminished. Since the signal failure of the once promising union actually consummated at Florence, the

history of the Church furnishes no lesson so significant of the hopelessness of all such general movements, and of the folly of an individual member of any Church, when once convinced of the necessity of communion with the great Catholic body, perilling his private and personal happiness on the more than problematical expectation of an approximation of the Churches themselves, and bartering his own yearning desire of peace and rest within the bosom of the common mother, for the brilliant but illusive prospect of enjoying that happiness in the restoration of his Church to the privileges of Catholic Unity."

II.

ACTION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

IN THE

WORK OF EDUCATING HER MINISTRY

FROM 1559 TO 1850.

ACTION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

IN THE

WORK OF EDUCATING HER MINISTRY,

ALMOST three centuries have passed away since the Convocation of the English Church, the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the English Bishops in their individual capacity, united in protesting against a measure urged through Parliament by the power of the Crown, at that time enormous, and the servility of nobles and gentry gorged with the plunder of religious houses. This united protest of the spiritual power against the aggression of the civil was fruitless: the act of Parliament passed; in virtue of it every member, save one, of the existing English episcopate was deposed and expelled from his see, a new episcopate was set up by the civil power, consecrated according to an ordinal composed by a parliamentary committee whose president disbelieved the Apostolical Succession, and deriving its jurisdiction from the Crown.

The civil law, by virtue of which the ancient English Episcopate descending from St. Augustine was thus extinguished, transferred to the Sovereign of these realms that spiritual supremacy, which from St. Augustine downwards had been exercised by the Pope. Fourteen heads of Colleges at Oxford, and near ninety fellows, and eleven heads of Colleges at Cambridge, besides several fellows, were expelled for refusing subscription to this same law. But the Convocation, in its protest, had expressed its belief not only in the Supre-

macy of the Pope, but in the Real Presence, and the Sacrifice of the Mass; doctrines which it conceived to be overthrown by the new law. The resolution, thus carried by the force of the civil power, involved, therefore, not only a change in the *person* from whom spiritual power descended, and to whom spiritual obedience was due, but a change in those objective *doctrines* on which the spiritual kingdom itself is built, and for which its officers have their functions. Up to that time Bishops had been instituted in virtue of a warrant from the Chief Bishop of Christendom; from that time they were instituted in virtue of a warrant from the Queen of England. Up to that time Priests had offered in mystical sacrifice the Body and Blood of Christ on the altar; from that time ministers distributed the Lord's Supper to their brethren. Up to that time both Bishops and Priests had been consecrated by a ritual descending from remote antiquity, and conveying in the most absolute terms high spiritual powers: from that time these two orders were, aptly enough it must be confessed, set apart for their modified functions by a maimed and dislocated ritual, not ten years old, and drawn up by the command of the sovereign.

That fair and beautiful structure of worship, which sprung up beneath St. Peter's moulding hand, and had been hallowed through fifteen centuries by Greek and Roman, by Northman and by Saxon, was torn down by the sacrilege of the State, and its chiselled and polished stones, mixed with earth and rubble, served for the erection of a meaner and mongrel building, where the beauty of isolated parts did but set off the want of unity and harmony in the whole; as Roman architrave and Greek capital, encased amid the rubbish of the Turk, only make us indignant at the work of the spoiler, while we sigh over the glories of the past. A new episcopate and a hybrid ministry corresponded well to a fragmentary ordinal and an amphibious liturgy.

Thus the year 1559 inaugurated a complete change in the spiritual government and the worship of England. We pro-

pose to consider the effect of this change on the course of studies pursued at the universities, and on their character as ecclesiastical schools.

But what had been their previous history? It seems almost necessary to glance at this for a due understanding of the effects wrought by the above-mentioned change.

The universities, as they existed in the middle of the sixteenth century, carry us back to one of the most interesting periods of history. They sprung from that mighty movement of the human mind which arose in Europe about A.D. 1100, and continued to about 1300. It was the fresh intellect of young nations moulded by the Church into a unity of spirit, civilization, learning, and religious feeling, which now threw itself with passion and enthusiasm on the deepest and most intricate problems of human life. And this intellect was necessarily collected in certain great centres, because, as yet, before printing was discovered, the process of teaching was by the "*living word*," and not by the "*dead letter*." Perhaps the whole difference between ancient and modern times, and the whole difficulty which has made the actual world so ungovernable, is summed up in this distinction. So then this intellectual life collected and energised at certain places, such as Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge. Then it was that thirty thousand students are reported to have been at Oxford. In the universities the flower and youth of Europe met: here, in consequence, sprung up a system of religious and metaphysical philosophy, not belonging to any one nation, but common to Christendom, and under the inspection and guardianship of that Church which was the soul of Christendom. The object of this philosophy in religion was to arrange and systematize and work out to its ultimate results that vast fabric of doctrine which had come down to the Church from the Fathers. It was on this field that Peter Lombard and Albert the Great, that the Angelic and Seraphic Doctors, and their inferior but still mighty fellow-labourers, worked, and aimed at mental victories, as much more grand than

Alexander's lust of conquest, or Cæsar's passion for rule, as mind is superior to matter. But a nobler impulse than ambition moved them. It was to bring all arts and all philosophy under the sway of that kingdom, which the true Sovereign of their hearts, at once Son of God and of Mary, had set up in the world. Thus unity and universality, completeness and harmony, were the marks of that mental fabric which they reared. It overlooked and absorbed national differences as naturally as that kingdom which was designed to make all nations one. And the great seats and workshop of this philosophy were at Paris and at Oxford; where, accordingly, the studies were not national but European. Thus we read that "the University of Paris had far more of a European than of a French character, as to the elementary bodies which composed it. It comprised four *nations*, viz., French, English, Normans, and Picards; the French containing, as *provinces* or subdivisions, Frenchmen, Provençals, Gascons, Italians, and Greeks. Under the English nation were ranked the British and Irish, Germans and Scandinavians. The third nation had no subdivision. The fourth comprised Picardy, Brabant, and Flanders." * It is true that the insular position of Oxford, and its remoteness, prevented such an affluence of many nations, as at Paris. And so we find that "although foreigners often came to the English universities for the advantage of study, they were never reckoned as integrant parts of the scholastic organization. Its two nations were wholly native, except that the Southernmen generally included the Irish and Welsh, while under the Northernmen were comprehended the Scotch." Yet the studies at Oxford and Cambridge and at Paris were mainly the same. The Latin, as it was the language of the Church, so it became the language of these philosophic schools, which aimed at being co-extensive with the Church. Grammar, logic and rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music, formed a groundwork of arts. The study of the Church's canon law, and the Roman civil law, made a faculty

* Huber on the English Universities, translated by Newman, vol. i. p. 80.

of jurisprudence. That of medicine was a third. While all these were viewed as the handmaids of theology, the crown of all human knowledge, as uniting man with God, and as itself wholly reared on that union of the Two Natures in One Person, which alone has made such unity possible. Thus it was that the mediæval universities were pre-eminently Catholic. They tended to efface nationalism in the greater whole of Christendom. St. Thomas, an Italian by birth, and a near kinsman of the German Emperor, became the common doctor of French and English, of Spaniard and Scandinavian. A glorious result, surely, of that day, when "Parthian and Mede and Elamite, strangers of Rome, Jews and Proselytes, Cretes and Arabians," heard the Apostles speaking in their own tongue "the wonderful works of God." And in proportion were these great seats of learning and religious philosophy favoured by the Church, which gradually emancipated them from the superintendence of the local bishop, gave to their supreme officer spiritual jurisdiction over their members, and subjected them to the Pope alone. "No person," says Huber, "thought of denying that the Papal See was the last and supreme authority concerning the studies, belief, discipline, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the universities. The only question was, whether and how far those nearer steps in the hierarchy, the authorities of the national Church, might be passed over, and the Chair of St. Peter reached at once." * "Nor did the kings scruple to intercede with the Popes in behalf of the universities, as often as they desired to obtain for them new Papal privileges, or the Papal confirmation of the old and new, Papal and Royal, privileges." "For instance, Edward II. requested of the Pope (v. Wood, A.D. 1317) that the English universities, as the University of Paris, might have the privilege of 'lecturing (*legendi*) in every part of the world,' that is to say, as in the case of so many other privileges, he asked him to confirm what already existed." "From the king to the peasant every one

* Vol. ii. pp. 210, 207, 215.

upon certain occasions addressed himself to Rome, when unable to obtain at home his real or supposed rights : and every one at such times looked upon Rome as a refuge and protection."

The spring of intellectual activity in the English universities seems to have risen to its flood between 1200 and 1350 : in which period we read of two hundred authors in England, one hundred and forty belonging to Oxford, and thirty to Cambridge. A period of declension both in numbers and spirit succeeds, which continues all through the fifteenth century. There is during this period the rise of the colleges and a gradual improvement in wealth and stability ; but the schools are no longer thronged with students. Whether it was the force of external causes, such as the Wars of the Roses, little enough favourable, we should imagine, to intellectual cultivation, or whether there was some deeper internal cause, we find that "in the year 1450, of two hundred schools only twenty were in use, and not a thousand students." * But during all these centuries, from the rise of the universities to the change of religion, amid vast fluctuations in numbers, and with cycles of advance or decay in spirit, we find a *system* of study inseparably linked with the unity of Christendom, Whether or no the universities were in favour with the laity as places of general education, they were throughout the nurseries of the Church. They were "grounded in arts" which subserved the Church's authority ; they had a faculty of jurisprudence which illustrated and classified the Church's canon law ; and the theology which they taught was a system in the arrangement of which the keenest intellects and the most sanctified hearts had laboured under obedience to the Church, and ruled by the spirit which presided over her, for five hundred years. *One* life pervaded Christendom, and the universities were the high schools and laboratories of Christendom, in which, though this life might at different periods be more or less vigorous and expansive, yet through-

* Wood, quoted by Huber, vol. p. i. 162.

out it was ever one, and homogeneous. In those days at least "the trumpet gave no uncertain sound for battle," and this is the single point which it has been the scope of the above remarks to set forth.

But other times are coming. The eighth Henry has seen the light of the Gospel shine in Boleyn's eyes, and when the common Father of Christendom refused to pander to his lust, he has torn himself free from all authority, constituted himself the lord of his people's consciences, and attached to his earthly throne the supreme authority in Christ's kingdom. The universities are commanded to reject that spiritual Head, by whom during so many centuries their privileges had been increased and defended. In religious, as in worldly matters, there is no longer any limit to the despotism of the Crown. The king may, if he please, confiscate their property and extinguish them. As it was, he kept their privileges for ten years suspended in his hands. In the year 1535, he ordered a visitation of Oxford and Cambridge, in which the scholastic philosophy and theology, and the canon law, were expelled as inseparably connected with the Papal Supremacy. But what was put in their place? Let us hear the notices of Professor Huber in this matter, to whom we are indebted for the most learned and accurate account of the universities. He is a German Protestant, and a friend of the Reformation pure and simple, and therefore far removed from any tendency to favour Catholic views. Describing this visitation as "one of the first acts of the Crown as inheritor of the mitre," he says, "arbitrary indeed enough was the state of things when the Papal authority was annulled, and Church dogma was yet to be maintained with the greatest strictness."* Notwithstanding, "the true doctrines of the Catholic Church were as earnestly recommended as the study of the classic languages and authors." Finally, "in Oxford in the year 1540, and in Cambridge in the year 1540, five Professorships—of Theology, Greek, Hebrew, Civil Law, and Medicine—were established and

* Huber, vol. i. p. 251.

endowed with a yearly emolument of forty pounds. For Canon Law there was no place after the rupture with Rome. As far as regards philosophy, it would seem that in Oxford the whole subject was to be included in the sentence passed on the Scholastics : a matter in which Reformers and Classicists were agreed." * "As the schism worked on and on, it of necessity exercised great influence upon the resources and position of the universities. Not only were their revenues plundered or clipt, but the caprice of the supreme power left it for a time in doubt whether they should exist at all, as far as their estates and property were concerned. The abolition of the monasteries, and the transfer of an immense mass of ecclesiastical property to the Crown, to private persons, or secular corporations, must have acted directly upon the universities, first, to diminish their numbers to a minimum ; next, to give over to the greatest misery many of those who remained." † Passing on to the reign of Edward, he says, "Whether the *omnipotence of the State* be or be not a Christian or a Protestant principle, this is at any rate the form which Protestantism then assumed most distinctly in England. Political and worldly interest soon gained an entire preponderance over all questions of religion and of truth ; with whatever sincerity the latter may have been pleaded at the beginning of the movement." ‡ "A royal commission was issued in 1549, with full power, for a thorough reform of the universities, but the result was unsatisfactory to all parties. The *destructive* powers of this commission seem to have been enormous. Documents of the vanquished Church, Missals, Legends, writings strictly theological, Relics, Pictures or Images of Saints, Monuments, were burnt, broken, or degraded to the vilest uses. In the common ruin was inevitably involved all the literature of the middle ages, including both the poetry and the scholastic philosophy : for the limits between the latter and theology could not be defined, and the poetry was so impregnated with Popery, as to seem to carry the 'mark of the beast' on its face." § Its

* Huber, vol. i. p. 255. † Ibid. p. 258. ‡ Ibid. p. 269. § Ibid. p. 273.

constructive powers were limited to enjoining with still greater earnestness the *classical* studies which the former visitation had encouraged. Yet all this while, "a decided majority of the academicians was in favour of the old religion, and this majority included the most learned men, and the best classic scholars."* Passing over the short restoration of Mary, which replaced in the university "Scholastic Philosophy, Theology, and Canon Law," and whose "visitation in many respects honourably distinguished itself from the preceding visitation of the Reformers," † let us go on to the state of things finally established by Elizabeth. Of course a fourth commission, issued at the beginning of her reign, proceeded to purify the universities from everything incompatible with the new creed. Once again the old philosophy and the old theology and the study of the canon law were expelled. On the other hand, the Thirty-nine Articles were introduced, and became the standard of public teaching. The result is thus summed up by Huber:—"At Oxford, it is certain that of the Academic studies, some were in complete decay, others were pursued in a shallow, spiritless manner, as a mere form; or at best in a popular way such as might suit *dilettanti*. The morals and sentiments of the Academic youth are described at the same time as having been in the highest degree wild, selfish, loose, devoid of all earnestness, honour, or piety. More serious still, however, are the notices before us concerning the older and more influential Academicians, in whom every hateful passion took the deeper root, and pervaded their whole life the more thoroughly, the less it was able to find vent in open violent expression. Compelled to preserve a certain outward dignity in seeking either personal ends or party objects in Church or State, they had to maintain a close secrecy, or at least to adhere to measures which were ostensibly legal." ‡ Wood himself says of his beloved Oxford in the year 1582, "Of the university itself I must report, that although it had

* Huber, vol. i. 278.

† Ibid. p. 288.

‡ Ibid. p. 324.

lately made laws most salutary alike to religion and to learning, yet all its hopes were disappointed, as all these laws were almost by all parties violated and neglected. There were few, indeed, to preach the word of God, or attend on preaching, although in these times a great multitude of clergy left the parishes of which they were pastors, and came to Oxford, with more appetite for indolence and sloth than for propagating the faith. To this was added the inactivity of the Academic tutors, etc. To return to the gowmsmen. They were so given to luxury as to outdo in dress the London Inns of Court, and even the Queen's levee; and were so swollen in mind, that scarcely the lowest of the low would yield precedence to graduates, or to persons on any ground superior to him. Shall I add that the public lectures in the Greek and Hebrew languages, as well as in Medicine, Law, and Theology, were very rarely held? In fine, if you look at the stage of logic and philosophy, you will confess that the men of our time have degenerated from the teaching of their forefathers. All these things being duly weighed, it may be said that in Oxford itself you have to search after the Oxford University, so greatly has everything changed for the worse.* The picture is completed thus by Huber: "We cannot expect that other branches of the academic studies should flourish more than theology and arts, especially in such an age. Ecclesiastical law, properly speaking, existed no longer; for the Papal law was most severely forbidden, and the Protestant Church law, promised by Edward and Elizabeth, was, for very intelligible grounds, never brought forward. Civil or Roman law, which had been much neglected before the Reformation, now pined just in proportion as Common or Statute Law throve. Common Law, however, was not scientifically cultivated at Cambridge or Oxford, and indeed had its headquarters at the supreme courts of justice in London." And, again: "Of all the branches of learning, mental philosophy was perhaps the least favoured by the opinions of the times,

* Quoted by Huber, vol. i. p. 325.

in or out of the universities. The reaction against the scholastic philosophy still prevailed in full vigour; and the giving up to oblivion as utterly worthless all the exertions and acquisitions of half a millennium could not but be disadvantageous to philosophic culture." *

Contrasting, then, the state of the universities after the changes introduced by Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, with their state up to the year 1534, we find not merely a period of confusion, and individual distress, and temporary disorganization, which usually accompany great changes, but a radical and fundamental subversion of the highest faculty, theology; the expulsion or grievous maiming of the second faculty of law; and the reduction of the primary faculty of arts to the study of the Greek and Latin classics in Oxford, and to the mathematical sciences in Cambridge. For when the theology of the Fathers, drawn out, arranged, and illustrated by the great scholastic writers, and exhibited in the practice of the Church during so many hundred years, was summarily rejected and anathematised, and when the spiritual ruler, who had built up and maintained the unity of Christendom, was in England ignominiously dethroned, what religious system of teaching succeeded to the former? or who became the bond of religious union, instead of the latter? We do not know what answer can be made to this question, save that the *Summa Theologica* was deserted for the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Triple Crown melted into a Queen's Diadem. The grand result of Tudor reform was a spiritual society capped with a temporal head: and a theology the beginning, middle, and end of which was *compromise*, the fusion of antagonist principles, the latitude of contradictory ideas; a hierarchy retained, with its jurisdiction bestowed by the sovereign; authority claimed for the Church, with the express declaration that it had erred and might err again; and yet, at the same time, the Holy Scriptures declared to be the sole standard of faith, but the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures left to the

* Huber, vol. i. pp. 343, 347.

individual mind. What heart or head was ever satisfied with this heap of contradictions? But to deny it was hanging, drawing, and quartering. No wonder that from this time forward theology ceased to exist as a science. In the Elizabethan Prayer-book the Catholic element was at least largely retained: no one doubts now, or ever has doubted, the thorough Protestantism of the Articles; while in the junction and imposition of the two lay hid from the first a latitudinarian element, destined to be by far the strongest, and to neutralise both one and the other, sapping honesty, and deadening conscience, and tending from the first to the utter denial of dogmatic truth. We have seen the ultimate result of this in a religious profligacy, of which Christianity in eighteen hundred years had presented no example: the supreme tribunal of a communion deciding concerning a great doctrine, not that it must be held, nor that it must be denied, but that it may be either held or denied, the holders maintaining it to be an article of the faith, the deniers, a "soul-destroying heresy," and both continuing ministers in the same Church. And how well that supreme tribunal has estimated the spirit which animates the communion over which it presides is shown by the fact that but very few have refused, by their acts, to submit to such a decision.

There was then from the beginning this inherent impossibility that a theology could exist after the Elizabethan university reform, because theology requires thinking, and "no member of the Establishment can believe in a *system* of theology of any kind, without doing violence to the formularies. Those only go easily along them and the Prayer-book who do not think;" for assuredly "there is no lying, or standing, or sitting, or kneeling, or stooping there, in any possible attitude, but, as if in the tyrant's cage, when you would rest your head, your legs are forced out between the Articles, and when you would relieve your back, your head strikes against the Prayer-book." *

* Newman on Difficulties of Anglicanism, pp. 25, 137.

Nor is this a mere theoretical statement of what ought to have been, from the heterogeneous and piebald constitution of a religious system in which the original basis was Catholic, the superinduced distinctive tenets Protestant, and the spirit which joined both together secular and latitudinarian. Not only *ought* there to have been no science of theology known in the Anglican Establishment, and in the universities which are its high schools, from the year 1559 to the present, but there *has been none*. Professor Huber has, with the most exemplary diligence, followed every generation up to the year 1840, and whether in the Calvinism which was dominant during the reign of Elizabeth, or in the *sai-disant* patristic school of Laud and Andrews, or in the period following the Restoration, when the Prayer-book seemed to be in the ascendant, or in the long decline inaugurated by the Revolution, which some have termed the definitive triumph of Protestantism, a consistent and coherent theology is equally wanting. So continuous a result under external circumstances so varying points to an inherent cause in the nature of things. The State, disgusted with a religion which it could not shape and manage at its pleasure, and which kept repeating to it, "the things of Cæsar to Cæsar, but the things of God to God," had put together, under its own headship, something which was to serve for a moral police. Now policemen are to *act*, not to *think*. Their superior requires of them *obedience* not *learning*; at the best, administrative energy is the highest virtue of instruments. The *divine right of kings* was that which held the fabric together—what had they to do with the *Holy Ghost dwelling in the Church*? His inspiration was, indeed, claimed for that first Prayer-book, which lasted a year and a half; perhaps its fleeting duration advised them to be more cautious in future; or at least, to limit His assistance to the royal counsels, which, however much they might *change*, were sure to *prevail*. Thus of the *morale* of Elizabeth's reign Huber writes: "The principal energies of the government were exerted in clearing between the extremes of each party,

a large neutral space, in which the majority could conveniently move about. But in effecting this object, every moral principle was set at nought, and every crooked path of State expediency was trodden.' "In the appointment to Church benefices more especially the pecuniary interest of the secular patrons and their families prevailed to such a degree, that this alone might have sufficed to bring about that lamentable condition, moral, religious, and intellectual, of the mass of the ministers of the State Church, of which we have only too credible testimony. In fact, precisely the best and worthiest members of the Catholic Church had been compelled to quit the ministry, and sacrifice their worldly interest to their convictions; while, among the Protestant ministers, those whose inward calling was the strongest, were forced by the secularization of the ruling Church into a sectarian position, which excluded them from her service, and sometimes altogether from academic life. This being the condition of the *Church*, it is not wonderful that we find the great mass of those connected with *school* instruction, in the highest degree neglected and corrupted, morally and intellectually."* Treating of the "moral and spiritual characteristics of the Episcopal Church in the seventeenth century," Huber says: "In entering on this subject, we are first struck by the little attention paid to intellectual interests, in comparison to those of religious party."† The principal object of the day was to harmonize the universities according to the principles then ruling in the Church and State; and yet more to fit them to diffuse an education which should engender and support those principles. But most to Laud, of all men, is due the extinction of scientific theology. Huber describes the imperative necessity which his situation laid upon him of acting against what must have been his own turn of mind. "Theology might have been expected, in the midst of the ecclesiastical storms of the day, to have grown up a vigorous, though a one-sided plant. Within the limits of formal orthodoxy, as theoretically recognized by the Anglican Church,

* Huber, vol. i. p. 340.

† Ibid. p. 29.

there was both room and material for constructing a stately building of learning : but we can find none such at the universities. Not that the isolated and literary efforts of divines were either uninfluential, or without merit ; but there was no systematic and scientific exposition of the doctrines of the Anglican Church, nay, nor any rudiments of such a thing, under the recognition of either Oxford or Cambridge. This deficiency is the more striking, the higher were the pretensions of those in power, to the glory of restoring the Church, and the greater their activity or success in its outward and moral reform. *Certainly the authorities of this period must bear the heavy responsibility of having excluded theological studies from the universities for many generations.* After Leicester's profligate government (he was Chancellor of Oxford from 1565 to 1587), a decisive crisis at length came on under the era of Laud, when the course of divinity was of necessity to be either excluded or reformed, and it is impossible now to deny that destruction, not reconstruction, took place. Nor is this hard to explain. Eagerness for external conformity often gives a premium to hypocrisy ; and Laud, with the prelates and the whole party, while substantially Arminian, had to pay deference to the substantially Calvinistic system of the Thirty-nine Articles. They might honourably have determined on one of three things : either to profess Arminianism, and openly eject Calvinism ; or profess Calvinism, and openly eject Arminianism ; or openly embrace both into the Church, declaring the controversy to be a matter, not for dogmatic decision, but for free learned inquiry. But they did none of the three. They chose to retain the letter of the Church formulas in its integrity ; and so far from avowing Arminianism, treated as offensive its avowal by others. How, then, could they propound any learned and systematic course of theology at the universities ? How would they have been able to evade, within the schools themselves, a shock of battle which they must have sincerely judged to be most pernicious ? Not that men are definitely conscious of such thoughts ; nor

make up clear reasons in themselves for what they do or leave undone : the inherent necessities of their position urge them, as if by instinct, along the track. And if the stormy times are pleaded in excuse for these failures, the fact must still not be forgotten, that Laud and his adherents are the men who effected that complete abolition of *scientific theology*, which is to this day so deeply marked a feature in the English universities." "The Royal ordinances of January 16, 1629, seem wilfully to have aimed at stopping all theological discussion, even arguments on the side of orthodoxy, for fear of stimulating thought and feeling on the subject." "Theology, then, even in the most limited Anglican sense, could no more flourish as an academic study, than jurisprudence or medicine. It is a sign of the times that the three higher faculties are not mentioned as faculties in the new (*i.e.* the Laudian) statutes, although they are presupposed as branches of study. At an earlier period traces are to be found of an effort after corporate organization of the faculties ; but henceforth it vanished." *

Let us pass to the totally different outward state of things in the eighteenth century. Here we find "an entire neglect of the studies connected with the higher faculties," and that while Jurists and Medical students went to the capital or elsewhere, "the aspirants in divinity were left altogether to their own impulse, and to private study. Academic life offered no stimulus whatever in this direction. An individual might aim as high as he pleased, but the university took no cognisance of his exertions : according to its standard they were supererogatory." † Then, after observing that the religious state of the universities during the last century appears much more unfavourable than the moral, of which, however, he has drawn any but a pleasing picture, he continues, "Nor was there any counter influence to be derived from the vigorous effort of religious instruction of a scientific character, for the theological studies were completely null." ‡ "The English universities scarcely

* Huber, vol. ii. pp. 65, 70.

† Ibid. p. 302.

‡ Ibid. p. 317.

possessed or offered the very scantiest means for the studies in Law, Medicine, and Divinity, or for the foundations of the science of State economy. The philological and mathematical branches appear to be the only exception, inasmuch as the universities offer every means for rendering those who devote themselves to these two branches real and most learned school-masters."* And the result as to theology was, that after acquiring the character of a "gentleman" by a liberal, *i.e.* a university education, "sound common sense, a knowledge of the world and of mankind, respectability and dignity of manner, with an understanding of the rules and ordinances of the Church, are looked upon as the best *pastoral* theology. The literature *necessary* for the dignified clergyman was only the New Testament in the original tongue, the Old Testament in a translation, with a commentary, some exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, a few popular theological works, and some few collections of sermons." †

Lastly, of the present state of studies in the Faculties, that is up to the year 1840, Huber says, "From all this is clear that it is as little possible now, as it was in the last century, to think of forming one's self as Theologian, Jurist, Economist, or Physician, by help of the public instruction at Oxford or Cambridge. And, in fact, all that can be said with respect to these departments in England is, that whatever is known in them is gathered otherwise than in the course of the *university* studies—by practice in life, by private study, private instruction, or even by teaching." ‡

What is the judgment which a foreigner, a philosophical bystander, strange to our religious parties, and moreover a Protestant, passes as to the *prima mali labes*, which tainted the very spring of theological science *in England*? "The chief source," he says, "of these defilements of the Anglican Church appears to be *its connection with the State*; or else with Royalty, that is to say, *with the King and Court*. This connection arose

* Huber, vol. ii. p. 319.

† Ibid. p. 341.

‡ Ibid. p. 377.

out of the course taken by the Reformation in England; which established on principle that the highest powers of the Church must be decisively vested in the Crown. If the evils which afterwards occurred did not *inevitably* proceed from this heterogeneous union, they were at least very much promoted by the manifold abuses and mistakes connected with it.”*

Thus the actual history of the Anglican universities in the last three centuries entirely corroborates the view which the Elizabethan religious settlement of itself suggests. In that wonderful product of state-craft the doctrines of the old religion and the new—the principles of authority and of private judgment—the sacramental system and justification by faith only—a visible Church, and Calvinism—respect for antiquity and a brand-new constitution—were violently squeezed together by the whole weight of the civil power. Take that weight away, and the entire building would fall to pieces. But grievous as the tyranny was which then lay upon the conscience of England, it could not prevent a most violent war of parties, opposed to each other as light and darkness, which has been perpetuated to the present day. Puritan and Episcopalian struggled for mastery in the days of Elizabeth, and the issue of that contest in the time of Charles wrecked the vessel of the State itself. Non-juror and Establishmentarian continued the fight after the Revolution, and High Church and Low Church, succeeding them, after casting out Wesley, and forming a new schism in the middle of the last century, in our own days have developed into the Oxford movement on the one hand, the most defined expression of the Catholic element which Anglicanism has borne, and into Evangelicalism on the other, the proper end of Puritanism, the denial of a formal creed, and of a visible Church, of altar and of sacrament; while that deadly principle which lurked in the violent pairing together of these two opposite beliefs at the beginning, has at length shewn itself with no common power and energy in the party which bears the name of Dr.

* Huber, vol. ii. p. 30.

Arnold: a party which the State, with the natural love of a parent for its offspring, welcomes and fosters. All these have subsisted and do subsist together—of all these the disciples and representatives—with a hundred shades of variation—are to be found at the universities: of all these the universities are the common instructresses. How could a Theology spring out of so deadly an antagonism of first principles?

And one thing more must be added. Theology cannot grow up save where a true, living, consistent authority exists: one which claims and receives the willing obedience of heart and mind and conscience. Now, true though it be that the legal subjection of the Anglican Church to the State is complete, that the chains have been riveted too firmly to be torn asunder without entire destruction, yet not a single member of that Church can be found, whatever his private belief, who yields obedience in heart, or mind, or conscience, to *such* an authority. Nobody can believe, nobody affects to believe, in a lay Papacy, lodged in a royal privy council. The communion which lives under it—the clergy which hold livings, canonries, deaneries, and bishoprics, in virtue of obedience to it—respect its sentence as little as they respect that of the chief mufti of Constantinople. Moreover, one such authority alone exists in the world by the institution of Christ, His last and best and crowning gift, which should turn His very departure into a blessing, and it is lodged in the *whole* Church, in the *living*, not in the *dead historical* Church; it dwells not in each member, but in the body. So that were a branch Church ever so normally constituted, as to the succession and as to the faith, this supreme and final authority it never could possess. And accordingly it could as little possess a theology, which is the code of belief sanctioned by such an authority. Under that authority the Catholic Church does possess a vast and varied structure of dogmatic and moral theology, consistent in all its parts, worked out by the labours and prayers of saints and doctors, in so many centuries, through the inspiration of that One Spirit who is pleased to dwell in the

Church. Without that authority, and subject to a mock lay Papacy, the Anglican Church, at the end of the third centenary of her existence, has advanced so far in theology as to have no doctrine on the very first act of the Christian life, Holy Baptism. "From him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he seemeth to have."

But what has then been the staple of instruction given at the universities since that great religious revolution by which the Scholastic Philosophy and the Catholic Theology were expelled? It was necessary to find some neutral ground on which the studies might be conducted, and the new passion which arose at the beginning of the sixteenth century for the learned languages and classic literature suggested at Oxford that they might fill the gap, while at Cambridge an original predilection for the mathematical sciences, carried in after times to the highest pitch by the great genius who arose there, caused these to be selected as the main instrument of education. Three centuries ago the choice was much more restricted than at present. The Baconian philosophy had not yet arisen: the inductive sciences were not even in their infancy. In our own days a crowd of competitors are knocking for admission, urging their claim, and pointing to England's wonderful development of power and glory as due to the vigour with which they have been prosecuted by private research and energy, unendowed by university patronage, unassisted by the magnificent foundations of our ancestors. Geography, geology, mineralogy, botany, and every branch of natural philosophy; jurisprudence and political economy; trade, manufactures, and statistics; this fertile progeny of the novum organon, not to mention a host of modern languages, burst upon our bewildered youth, and threaten to exhaust, or to dissipate on variety of objects, the energies of a life, under the claim to train an education. But the choice was much more restricted when the present bent of our universities was taken, and from that time to this, while the higher faculties of Theology, Law, and Medicine became a mere name, the

real education given consisted in a limited course of the Faculty of Arts, comprising in Oxford the Greek and Latin languages, and the Aristotelian philosophy in some small degree; and in Cambridge the mathematical sciences.

But where, in the mean time, were the ecclesiastical training schools of the Anglican Church? Till a very late period it had none other than Oxford and Cambridge: and at this moment the great mass of its clergy have no other qualification for their sacred office than the course of about three years which they pass at these universities, and a few lectures subsequently, so trifling in number, and affecting the pupil's tone of mind and character so little, as hardly to enter into computation. The future clergyman's mind for good or for evil may be said to be formed at Oxford and Cambridge: there at the most important period of life his habits are moulded: there he passes from the constraint of school to almost the freedom of manhood: there the bias is received which will probably only be confirmed in future years: and thence he passes, always with a very brief interval, and sometimes with none at all, to the performance of his sacred functions. What the episcopal seminaries are in Catholic countries to the students for the priesthood, that Oxford and Cambridge are to the Anglican *ordinandi*. They are emphatically the 'forma cleri Anglicani,' and they act upon the youthful mind probably with a force far greater than that of any seminary, because, instead of a small number collected within the walls of one building, they contain the very flower and bloom of a great nation, of unexampled energy and industry, now in the spring-tide of wordly renown and material power. In such a society the tone and character which prevail—the impulses which with electrical agency charge the air—have a far greater force, a far more living effect, than any dry, material rules: the free-will, which often exerts itself against the latter, expands and exults in the former, and grows into them with all the energy of its being. All those who have passed through Oxford or Cambridge will know how they tell upon the mind.

Those few years' sojourn leave an ineffaceable something on the gayest and most thoughtless, and the effects on the character of the intercourse which there takes place are often more valued by parents than any amount of information which the most industrious could attain.

These, then, are the ecclesiastical training schools for the great mass of the Anglican clergy, for there are none other: and therefore it is fair to compare them in this particular point of view with Catholic training schools, which otherwise it would not be fair to do, for the course of Arts in a university does not naturally comprehend special instruction in Theology, dogmatic, moral, or pastoral, and as little formation of ecclesiastical character. But these are either given here, or they are not given at all, to Anglicans. Moreover, the faculty of Theology which nominally exists, is, and has been for three hundred years, as we have shown, a nonentity.

The efficiency of ecclesiastical schools would seem to consist partly in forming those inward habits, partly in conveying that special knowledge, which are needed for the clerical life and mission. It is of the utmost importance to the Church that her ministers in both these respects should be long and carefully adapted for the extraordinary and unworldly duties which they have to perform. Secular education is no more like clerical education, than the world is like the Church. Let us see how in these respects the chief and prime university of England, the more especial nursery of the Anglican Church, the citadel of her strength, and the chosen seat of her spirit, discharges its high office.

Behold the choicest of her youth from the richest country in the world, in the noonday of her prosperity, out of the princely palaces of her nobility, out of the stately homes of her gentry, from her myriad of smiling parsonages, such as no other realm can boast, from mansions which commerce has reared and enriched with the costliest productions of sea and land, are met together in that ancient city of study. Eton and Winchester, Harrow and Rugby, the Charterhouse and

Westminster, and hundreds of other schools have furnished their quota to swell this tide of life and energy. With dispositions as dissimilar as their aims and objects in life—as wealth or comparative want, early habits of luxury or of keen exertion, create—some for the senate, some for the bar, some for other learned professions, for arms, or for trade, some for enjoyment of country life, but a large majority for the ministry of the Church, they are drawn within the same walls, to submit for a time to a common discipline, to pursue common studies, to join in common sports. Gaze on them, and you will recognize the imperial Anglo-Saxon race, whose very merchants “hold the gorgeous East in fee, and are the safeguards of the West;” there is stuff of firm texture, out of which the world may be planted with self-governing colonies, the sea subdued, and the earth made one vast emporium of buying and selling; or, if need be, a Trafalgar or a Waterloo be won. They are of those born *parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos*. Independence, self-confidence, individuality of mind, shows itself in all their demeanour. It is true the college chapel and the college lecture receive all alike; though some more frequently than others: and all sleep—unless college porters and scouts are corruptible—within the same walls. And the great poets, historians, and orators of Greece and Rome, and above all, he, whom mediæval times called with affectionate reverence the Master, are appointed for their most grateful occupation; and during their sojourn here they are to live in the thoughts of the great spirits of antiquity, expressed in their own incomparable languages. Something, no doubt, of Latin majesty, something of Greek harmony and genius, some voices from Salamis, some echoes of the Forum, will reach every spirit which is not quite *ἀμουσος*. But some are here for none of these things. Already of high rank and ample fortune, they live at least only in the tone and society of the place, even if they are not sent specially for these. They are devoted to the morning lounge, the afternoon ride, and the evening supper. Others are more or less widely

affected by their example. Many are tempted to imitate a profusion which in their case has no excuse, nothing to redeem it from the most miserable folly. Again, many have a bent of mind so turned away from the above-mentioned studies, that they never enter into them with spirit, and relinquish the prospect of distinction in them. But the great point of all this is, that here the world has entered with a spring tide; not, indeed, a world with engrained habits of evil and hard-heartedness, but a world with all its powers of dissipation, spreading its thousand subtle influences around youth, and teaching them its own standard of things. A few years pass, and the majority of those who are now, if most industrious, studying Aristotle, Thucydides, and Tacitus, with an occasional boat-match or cricket-match, a grave after-dinner party or a more lively supper, who are urged to the utmost by the desire of renown, and whose motive principle is *ἄνεν ἀριστέειν καὶ υπείροχον ἕμμεναι ἄλλων*, will be scattered far and wide over the country, preaching to corrupted towns and semi-heathen villages the cross of Him "Who was despised and rejected of men, the very scorn of men, and the outcast of the people." What we would ask is, how and when, in the whole of that academical course—which as a system of secular instruction, if it has many defects, we yet most gratefully acknowledge has many excellencies—how and when is that all-important question of *vocation* brought before those, who, this course ended, are to take upon themselves the awful burden of the Christian ministry? It is a fair question, for this academic course they go through as the chief qualification for orders. Now at what time in it—by what studies in it—by what persons—is this *vocation* brought before each individual? The course of studies in its main range is secular, even heathen. All the positive instruction in divinity given is lectures on the Articles: but we are not now so much speaking of instruction, as of bringing home to the conscience with all possible effect the peculiar duties, the peculiar qualifications, of those who are to "bind up the broken-hearted," and bear

the standard of the cross in the world. Here are a mixed mass of young men, those who are to continue laymen, those who are to become ecclesiastics, pursuing a common course of studies in the dead languages, and in the heathen authors; and the bond between Tutors and Pupils is not ecclesiastical but academical. Lectures are given, not consciences directed. No doubt open immorality is discountenanced: non-attendance at chapel is punished. But the inward being of the pupil, the real man, remains during all these three years a complete mystery to the tutor, into which he does not even attempt to enter. As for an effort to ascertain that there is any real bent to the ecclesiastical state, any real endeavour to lead a pure and holy life, to avoid sins of thought, to mortify worldliness, it is never made. It would be out of character to make it: an ungentlemanly inroad on privacy. The tutor's relation to his pupil is both far too external, and far too secular, nor has this a direct bearing on the schools for which the pupil is immediately studying, all important as its bearing is on that future life for which honours in the schools are sought. We should say that the subject of *vocation* as distinct from a decent moral life, is one which probably never occurs to the student from the beginning to the end of his academical life. We do not mean that he does not consider the subject of a *profession*, quite the contrary; as the young military man looks forward to a commission, and the lawyer to being called to the bar, so the future ecclesiastic contemplates taking orders. Thus he weighs the matter, and sometimes already has an eye to the future partner of his possible parsonage. But a man may be qualified to become a good lawyer, a good officer, a good merchant, and the rest, and moreover a good Christian in all these, who, becoming with such dispositions a clergyman, would not only be a very bad minister, but probably a very bad Christian.

And next in importance to *vocation* is the *formation of tone and character*, and the inner spiritual life. This cannot be omitted, like *vocation*, for good or bad it must be, and of

perpetual growth. And in this, as we have hinted above, our universities have great force, and a most living energy, on account of the extent and the various classes from which they gather their pupils. They tell, because they are so worldlike and so worldwide. But *how* do they tell? In what way will that busy swarm of active youth—that medley of the richest and noblest, the dissipated and worldly, with the keen anxious student—they to whom learning is valueless, and they to whom learning is all and all—those who look to professions and those who look to the Church—be moulded? One thing is plain, they will be moulded according to this world, and not according to that which is to come. Here the studies are secular: the bond between tutor and pupil is secular: the society is secular: what is highest and what is lowest, the idleness and the study, the ambition and the sloth, are secular. The end of the *first class* is honour, distinction, and advantage: the end of the boat-race, the revel, and the chase, is pleasure: the end of the mass between, who neither gain classes nor commit dissipation, is gentlemanliness. Now honour, pleasure, and gentlemanliness are equally secular. Youth is seduced and seducing: rank and fashion are attractive: study is engrossing, and honour absorbing: and here all these have not a college but an university for their field: not the gleanings of a class, but the pick of a nation, for their food and range. Alas for the young ecclesiastic! the world, the world, the world is upon him before he is aware: by his warmest sympathies, by his most natural tastes, by the force of example, by the challenge of renown, it enthrals him. What is left for Christ? What are the forces here at work? Among those who do not study, pride of wealth and birth, fashion and custom, expensive habits fostered by a system of almost unlimited credit: among those who do study, emulation, the more intense, since as Greece looked upon her Olympian games and rewarded the winners, so England looks on those who win at her universities, and welcomes them to the more real trials of life. Nor probably does any applause

of listening senates so thrill through the speaker's frame as the moment which places the young academician high in the class list: nor is there any struggle of after-life so sustained and urgent as that which gains for him those first well-won laurels of Alma Mater. Can it then be vainglory, which has cost so much, which is gained so hardly, which has seemed to be so encouraged by partial voices at home, by superiors here so eager for the honour of their college, that conquest almost seemed virtue, and failure quite a crime? And so that pleasing poison of praise has run into and infected the whole being. How will it brook hereafter the obscurity of a country village, the reforming of clownish minds, the stirring up of consciences sunk in the pettifogging of daily trade, the converse of those "whose talk is of oxen?" Is not a certain love of ease and refinement, a taste for well-furnished rooms and comfortable sofas, a keen voluptuous enjoyment of literature, and, most markedly, an indisposition to suffering, and a calculation of virtue by worldly success, generated in the higher class of minds by such an education? Should we expect such to be ready to inhale fevers over sick beds, or teach the first articles of the Creed to the children of ignorance?

But daily habits are the best indication of the inner spiritual life, which they so deeply affect. And what are the daily habits of Oxford, especially in regard to devotion? How much and how often is the unseen world of the Christian's hopes and fears brought before the youthful mind? Attendance at the daily morning prayers, usually at eight o'clock, is enjoined: in many colleges this is imperative, being used as a security against sleeping out, as exit is not allowed before morning service. In others attendance in the evening is allowed instead. But what are those morning prayers? Surely a more formal service was never devised, nor one in which there is less worship of body and soul. But to know and feel to what degree that which is of itself stiff and formal can be made lifeless and perfunctory, as the voice of a parish beadle or the crier of a court, that service must be heard day after day with

its stereotyped exhortation, its unbending monotony through fast day and festival, from the mouth of chaplain or tutor, with its lessons gabbled by the scholar, who seems to fear that he shall utter the words of Scripture with too much decency, or too little unintelligibility. When this half-hour is over breakfast succeeds, and then two, or, it may be, three lectures with the tutor on some Greek or Latin writer. The later afternoon passes in recreation. Dinner about five reunites the students in their several halls; after which they "wine" with each other. Tea follows, before which there is chapel, which all may, and some do, attend a second time; and then the more studious prepare for the morrow. It will be seen how large a disposal of his own time is left to each: how very much for good or ill he is independent of all control. But is any examination of the spiritual state daily, weekly, or monthly, inculcated? No such thing is thought of. It is matter for the private conscience. Of course if the natural piety of the individual lead him to it, if parent or master have previously drawn him to practice it, he may continue it; but the college never enters into any such matter, and far less the university. True it is that once in the Term each is called upon to attend the Holy Communion; but in what state he comes to it is left wholly to himself. He has been brought up to think that over the internal world of his thoughts no one ought to have the slightest control. How should any one? He was never brought to confession even before his first communion: he was never told there was any such duty. And to whom should he confess? Where is the place for it, or the time, or the person? He does not hear that his college tutors, if they are priests, are in the habit of receiving confessions, or, indeed, have been instructed how to do so. When he entered the college its superior never told him it was a duty: in fact he does not see any of his comrades practising it, at least openly. Most probably the notion never occurs to him at all. In the mean time the Sunday on which Holy Communion is administered is approaching. He wishes it was not, but he

does not know how to escape. He feels so perfectly well that he can't feign indisposition. He has a sort of unreasoned conviction that he is not at all fit to go: he is quite sure he would rather not go. Then a few evenings since he drank rather too much at supper: and the songs sung strike him, as he thinks of it, to have been a little too free. Well, if there be not more than thoughts of evil recklessness indulged, more than a throng of idle words and careless actions. What a bore it is that these tutors will have this every Term, and look for every one to attend. But, however, he cannot post himself to the college as an immoral person, and to his own knowledge half his friends are as ill prepared as himself. So he goes. In another year such an one may be, and has full often been, in Deacon's orders, with the partial care of a parish: and as he went to first communion, and to every communion since, without submitting his spiritual state to any guide, so he has entered into holy orders without inquiry made into his vocation, the Bishop supposing that the solemn appeal addressed to him by the Prayer-book, "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration?" is sufficient guarantee that the conscience has been examined and the vocation ascertained by each for himself. What else can we expect when confession has been made what is called "voluntary," that is entirely disused by men and women, young and old, ninety-nine out of a hundred: when the hundredth practises it under the rose, and with the stigma of being popishly inclined? In such a state of things it would be an insult to suppose that the student at college, or the candidate for orders, needed any inquiry into his spiritual state. At least no one is competent to make it, for he is clear of all open immorality, and, approaching either Holy Communion or orders, who has a right to suggest what would be a sort of token of suspicion? But what sort of supervision of the inward life of his people will a minister so educated and prepared be competent to take? His own heart from his childhood up has been left a wilder-

ness, in which first self-will, and then the passions, ranged at pleasure : no fatherly voice has warned him of the commencements of sin : no skilful physician probed the depth of corruption, arrested the disease, and applied the remedy. How can he do for others what has never been done for himself? In what will consist his "*Cure of souls*"?

And here we must remark in passing, that among the daily habits of university life there is no note whatever of mortification or the ascetic principle, as good for the Christian in general, or in any respect necessary to the minister. We are all familiar with that excellent tutor immortalized in "*Loss and Gain*," who astonished his college servant by ordering no sweet sauce to his plain joint of mutton on a fast day. This, however, is below the mark, and we are sure that many a "*Head*" would consider the absence of the sauce a most suspicious circumstance on any day which the calendar marked as fast or vigil; and the present Bishop of Hereford proved at least his orthodoxy, if he did not add to his existing claims on a mitre, by having a sort of ball on an ember day. Not that the contrary tone of mind does not exist, but then it is individual, and in spite, not in consequence, of the habits of the place.

Now compare in these three points, the formation of daily habits, the cultivation of the inner spiritual life, and the ascertaining of vocation, what is done for Catholic students at a seminary. Let us take them in the inverted order. Here is the course of a day's study and devotion at S. Sulpice.

"5 a.m. They rise; recite the '*Angelus*' (*Angelic Salutation*).

5 to 5½. Dress, come downstairs; the most pious go for two or three minutes before the Holy Sacrament.

5½ to 6½. Vocal prayer for ten minutes, and then prayer for the rest of the hour, each by himself, kneeling without support.

The Professor says his prayer aloud, in order to teach the pupils, on his knees, in the hall.

6½ to 7. Mass. Those who have communicated attend another Mass for returning thanks, which may last to 7¾; the rest mount to their rooms.

7. Reading of Holy Scripture in private.

8 to 8¼. Breakfast: dry bread, wine and water; nothing else allowed, save that, in case of necessity, milk or soup is sometimes given. Each reads in private.

8¼ to 9½. Preparation of theological lesson in their rooms.

9½ to 10½. Lesson in theology. Morale.

10½ to 10¾. Visit to the Holy Sacrament.

10¾ to 11¾. Deacons have a lesson in theology; the rest a singing lesson for half an hour, and then go up to their rooms.

11¾ to 12. Private examination of conscience. During seven minutes meditation, kneeling, on some fact of the New Testament; and for the next seven Tronson read.

12 to 12½. Dinner. For three minutes a chapter of the Old Testament read aloud, then the life of a saint, or ecclesiastical history. They end with the Roman Martyrology for the morrow. Then a visit to the Holy Sacrament for a minute: recitation of the 'Angelus.'

Dinner consists of a little soup; one dish of meat, potatoes, or *legumes*. For dessert, an apple, or such like. Drink, wine and water.

12½ to 1¾. Recreation. At 12¾ talking is allowed for the first time in the day. Letters are delivered. The Professors are bound by their rule to take their recreations with their pupils; they make a great point of this.

1¾. Recitation of the 'Chaplet;' sixty-three Paters and Aves.

2 to 3½. Private study in their rooms. From 2 to 3½, class of ecclesiastical singing four times a week. From 2 to 5¼, adoration of the Holy Sacrament by each person for half an hour.

3½ to 4½. Theological class. Dogma.

4½ to 4¾. Visit to the Holy Sacrament.

5½ to 5½. According to the season, bell for all in holy orders to say their breviary. Time for conferences.

6½ to 7. 'Glose,'—spiritual reading by the Superior.

7 to 7½. Supper. One dish of meat, *legumes*, salad, wine and water. Reading at all meals. Talking never allowed but at the Archbishop's visit once a year. A chapter of the New Testament read; a verse of the Imitation of Jesus Christ.

7½. They go before the Holy Sacrament; recite the 'Angelus.'

7½ to 8½. Recreation.

8½ to 8¾. Evening prayers; litanies, vocal, with private examination of conscience. Mount straight to their rooms, or go first before the Holy Sacrament. The Superior remains in his place; each, in passing beside him, accuses himself of any outward faults committed during the day against the rules.

9 to 9¼. Bed-time; at 9¼ to be in bed. Each has a room to himself; a table, a bed, a candlestick, and fireplace. A priest sleeps in each corridor.*

Such a course of daily occupation speaks a volume by itself. We note in it three hours and a half given to devotion: eight and three quarters to study: four to meals and recreation. But what a cultivation of reverence to our Lord's Eucharistic Presence! What a perpetual realizing of the Incarnation through that most loving and awful mystery! The whole day seems brooded over by it, as though they were walking beside the lake of Galilee, listening to our Lord's parables, and gazing up into His face.

Secondly, what are the means taken to cultivate and foster that inner spiritual life, the most precious of all qualifications for the Priesthood?

"They confess themselves every week, ordinarily in the morning during the meditation. They choose their own confessor among the masters, who are at present twelve, but the number is not fixed. As to communicating, they are free, but are exhorted to do it *often*. Often is all the Sundays and festivals. Some communicate, besides, two, three, four, five times a week, especially as the time of their ordination draws

* *Allies' Journal in France*, pp. 30, 31.

near. The priests every day. After the communion, twenty minutes' *action de grâces*. On entering the seminary a general confession of the whole past life is made. At the commencement of each year, after the vacation, in October, a confession of the year is made. At the beginning of each month there is a retreat for one day, ordinarily the first Sunday. *Direction* is twice a month. It is intercourse between each young man and his director for the purpose of making known his inward state. There is a general retreat after the vacation for eight days; in this no visits are allowed, no letters received, no going out into the city. There are recreations, but the rest of the day is consecrated to prayer, to confession, and to sermons. Each has his own rule (*règlement particulier*), which he draws up in concert with his confessor.

"The day, the hour, and the mode of using the following exercises, to be determined on with the director. Private examination of one's self. Confession. Holy Communion. *Direction*. The monthly retreat. *La monition* (which consists in making known to him who has charged us with that office of charity his imperfections and external defects contrary to Christian and ecclesiastical virtues). Any special reading. Accessory studies.

"What has been determined on by the director, relatively to the preceding exercises, is to be written in the *règlement particulier* of each.

"The main resolution necessary to ensure the fruits of the seminary is fidelity to the *règlement*, and especially to silence at the prescribed times, and to the holy employment of one's time.

"The virtues to be studied are collectedness, the thought of the presence of God, modesty and good example, charity and humility, religion, and fervour in the exercises of piety.

"The order of exercises for a day in the annual retreat is as follows :—

"5 a.m. Rise; preparation for prayer; short visit to the Most Holy Sacrament.

5½. Prayer.

6½. *Messe de communauté.*

7. Preparation for general confession, or for that of the annual review, and especially for that of the time spent in the vacation.

8. Breakfast.

8¼. *Petites heures.*

8¾. Reading or direction.

9¼. Visit to the Holy Sacrament.

9½. *Entretien.*

10½. *Délassement*, during which there may be either reading or direction.

11. Writing of one's resolutions, and then reading the prescribed chapters of Holy Scripture.

11¾. Private examination.

12. Dinner, followed by the Angelus and recreation.

1¾. Vespers and Compline; recollecting of one's self, to examine how one has done the morning's exercises.

2¼. Reading, with meditation of the chapters of the Imitation.

3¼. Visit to the Holy Sacrament.

3½. *Entretien.*

4½. Matins and Lauds; writing of resolutions. Then *délassement*, as in the morning at 10½.

6. Recitation of *chapelet*, meditated.

6½. A spiritual lecture.

7. Supper, followed by the Angelus and recreation.

8½. Prayer; examination of conscience.

9. Bed; making preparation for (the morning's) prayer."*

In the "picture" which is given to each student as a general summary of the objects to be aimed at, he is told that "the object of the monthly retreat is—1. More deeply to examine the conscience; 2. To make firmer resolutions for the correction of faults; 3. To choose the most effective means to advance in virtue, and specially to be confirmed in the life

* Journal, pp. 32-35.

of faith, and in contempt of the world, by a serious preparation for death.

“In order to profit by this exercise, the seminarist sets before him the following considerations :

“1. To learn his ruling and oftenest recurring fault ; for instance, love of the world, and its pleasures ; sloth, and want of application to his duties ; fear of humiliations ; inclination to slander, and unfavourable judgment of his neighbours ; liking for his own will, and opposition to obedience.

“2. To search into the causes of lukewarmness and slackness ; habitual heedlessness ; little preparation for prayer and attendance on sacraments ; frivolous reading and conversation ; indisposition for and want of openness in direction ; irresolution in complete surrender to God, in avoiding slight faults, and in seeking the society of the most earnest.

“3. To examine the most necessary virtue, and pursue the practices fitted to acquire it ; to meditate seriously on the necessity of obedience, humility, self-denial, charity, good example, in the holy ministry.

“4. To write down his feelings and resolutions, communicate them to his director, and read them over frequently.” *

Thirdly, as to vocation, besides that it is a subject perpetually recurring in this system of inward discipline, on which no one can enter, and in which, still less, can any one persevere, without a severe trial of it, there is yet a last and crowning test.

“There are, moreover, retreats for eight days before each ordination. Exposition of the pontifical is given. Before the ordination of any individual is decided on, there are two ‘appeals’ to be gone through. 1st. That of outward conduct ; 2nd. That of inward conduct. If these are passed, there is a third examination of himself and his fitness for the ministry to be gone through by the pupil in private. Fourthly, if he is thoroughly persuaded of his vocation, his confessor finally decides whether he shall be accepted for the ministry or rejected.” †

* Journal, p. 379.

† Ibid. p. 36.

It is plain that in tone and spirit, and in the standard set before the student, no two lives can be more opposed than that of a candidate for the Anglican ministry at Oxford, and for the Catholic priesthood at S. Sulpice; and the force of the latter is thrown exactly on the point which in the former is entirely neglected,—the interior qualification of heart and temper.

But another point of primary importance, to which we referred above, remains to be considered,—the imparting that special knowledge which is needed for the clerical life and mission. The subject-matter of this knowledge is, again, threefold—dogmatic and moral theology, and the practical application of these in ritual and discipline.

Now, doubtless, in a course of Arts, and especially for the baccalaureate, we should not expect such knowledge as this to be imparted at all. But then, this course of three or four years, terminated by the Bachelor's degree, is the only course of systematic study by which the Anglican minister is qualified for his functions; and after its termination, generally not more than a year, and sometimes less, remains, before he enters into Deacon's orders. We must, therefore, inquire what space theology occupies in the studies which all those who attend the universities go through.

Now, the acquisition of the Greek and Latin languages themselves occupies the far larger portion of the *ordinary* student's time in those three or four years; while the history, the chronology, the antiquities, which are necessary to illustrate the prose writers, and the exquisite graces of idiom which mark the poets, supply an ample field besides, for the student *in honours*; not to say that the main stress of the battle will be with him in philosophy, that is to say, in mastering the ethics, rhetoric, and poetics of Aristotle. A certain amount of logic is also necessary. But as for divinity, every student knows, indeed, that something is so imperatively required, that the want of it will not be compensated by any degree of knowledge in other things. This something is, the

being acquainted with the four Gospels and the Acts, in Greek, a general knowledge of sacred history, the subjects of the books of the Old and New Testament, the evidences of Christianity, and the being able to quote the text and understand the meaning of the Thirty-nine Articles. To which the student in honours may add one or more of the Epistles, and Ecclesiastical History. With this amount of divinity every one's examination begins, and not to reach the minimum in this is fatal to any further trial. But at the same time, every one knows, that nothing more is wanted than to do *respectably* this amount of divinity. The class will not turn on any further proficiency in it. And it needs but a glance at this list of subjects, to see that the only portion of it which can be termed dogmatic is the Thirty-nine Articles; on these, accordingly, as the distinctive code of the Anglican Church, lectures are given in the various colleges, and in such lectures must be contained the only appearance of systematic instruction given to the student on the Church of Christ, as a great living system, on its belief and on its sacraments. These Articles, save the first six, being negative rather than positive, and consisting in certain one-sided protests against supposed errors of the Church of Rome, the natural view for a student to take, to whom they are presented as the code of faith, and the text-book for comment, will be, that the main function and high prerogative of a Christian in this world, is to keep himself clean from the corruptions of Popery. We doubt if he will leave the university half so well convinced of the Two Natures of our Lord, and the Hypostatic Union, as that the Papacy is an enormous system of fraud; or that he will feel there to be "one holy Catholic Church" half so keenly as he enters into the fact that "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome has erred, in matters of faith." Then again, as to our Lord's dwelling with His people in the Sacrament of His love, he will have a very timid, guarded, and hesitating apprehension, but he will be bold as a lion to declare that "Tran-

substantiation cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions ;” while his knowledge of counsels of perfection, and of the duty of the clergy, to whom he is about to belong, to spend and be spent for their people, will be conveyed under the negative form that “bishops, priests, and deacons, are *not* commanded by God’s law either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage.” Besides, he is told that “general councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes ;” by which he may infer the independence of our Lord’s kingdom,—and that “when they be gathered together, being an assembly of men, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God,”—whence he may form a notion as to its infallibility : and that “it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word written ; neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another ;” which may, perhaps, suggest a thought about the Church’s fidelity to her office, as if Church and Scripture stood in a sort of normal opposition to each other.

But we have seen Professor Huber again and again declaring, that as for any positive and systematic exposition of what even Anglican orthodoxy admits, it has never been found at the universities. Now, what the university neither has, nor ever has had, in the three hundred years since the Reformation, of course, it cannot impart to its students. But to give the true cause for so long continued an effect, a science of Anglican theology does not exist, because Prayer-book, Homilies, and Articles are fragments of three contradictory systems, which refuse to coalesce, the forces of which negative each other, and the inconsistency of which is not felt only by those who do not consider the bearing of one doctrine on another. The one real and living idea of the Reformation, which is reproduced again and again in the three centuries of its existence, was to substitute the text of the Bible, inter-

preted by each according to his fancy, for theology. Here was an appearance of venerating God's Word on the one hand, and an unlimited range for private judgment on the other. For the authority of the one Church to interpret and set forth the true meaning of Scripture being rejected, every individual became free to maintain his own interpretation. Now, to this one principle all Protestants are true, whatever their individual bias. Accordingly, they do not contemplate the Christian faith as a whole, nor the relation of one doctrine to another; that is, they have no theology, and they feel no need of it. They have no sense of inconsistency and contrariety, not being in possession of any definite faith by which to test what is brought before them. Thus the Church's dogma appears to them a human invention, and they oppose it to the Word of God, not perceiving that the real opposition lies between the mind of the individual as to what *is* God's Word, and the mind of the Church, and that while the former may, and naturally will, run into all manner of error, the latter is protected from this, not only by every human safeguard, but by an express divine promise.

Quite true to this is the university in her examination of students. She puts them on the *text* of the Gospels and Acts, on sacred history, on the subjects of the Old and New Testament, on evidences, on the *text* of the Epistles again, or on early ecclesiastical history. The only apparent exception is the Thirty-nine Articles, as a system of belief. Yet these too are mainly a protest against another system of belief, and so negative rather than positive. Thus he who gains a first-class, and he who takes the common degree, will alike go forth from the schools at Oxford ignorant that there is one, coherent, uniform system of belief necessary to salvation: it needs not to say that he will be uninstructed what it is. Chance, so to call it, may have thrown him in the way of Puseyite, or again of Evangelical, or of Latitudinarian influences. According to circumstances will his bias be: an Arnoldite, if he fall upon an amiable and accomplished tutor of that persuasion, who is

not content with giving college lectures, but seeks to gather round him a school by the charm of his conversation, the absence of donnishness, and an affectionate interest in his friends: Evangelical, or Puseyite, if such be the prevailing temper of his college or his circle. There is nothing to prevent young men going forth from the same public schools, with the same honours, out of the same discipline, with principles of belief absolutely opposed, some believing in Sacraments, in the Priesthood, in the Eucharistic Presence and Sacrifice, and the existence of a Church; some in that "spiritual" religion which denies all these; and some in that comprehensive and convenient persuasion, that it is great folly to squabble about such things at all. And these will carry their respective opinions into the Anglican ministry, and subscribe the Prayer-book, with its baptismal, confirmation, and ordination services on the one hand, and the Thirty-nine Articles on the other: all alike professing that "whosoever will be saved, it is before all things necessary that he hold the Catholic faith, which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly."

It must not be forgotten, however, that in the last few years a voluntary theological examination has been established at Oxford and Cambridge for those who have gone through the schools. Many bishops already require candidates before ordination to have attended this, and probably all will in the end. Does this then supply that utter want of dogmatic teaching which we have been noting? Nay, it offers a remarkable proof that the evil is inherent and ineradicable in Protestantism. This examination has arisen from a sense of the utter inefficiency of the theological instruction given to the future clergy in the course of Arts. It is the latest remedy devised for an acknowledged fault. Let us see how far it reaches. The subjects appointed for the examination at Cambridge in October, 1851, are these—the Greek Testament: the first Apology of Justin Martyr: Ecclesiastical History: the Thirty-nine Articles: the liturgy of the Church. At

Oxford the student must attend four courses of lectures, each comprising at least sixteen from the divinity professors, one course of which, however, may be from the professor of Hebrew: and he will be examined on the subject of these lectures: that is, probably, on the Thirty-nine Articles, on Ecclesiastical History, on some part of pastoral theology, as preaching, and on some part of the Hebrew Bible. What can be more vague and uncertain, more neutral and devoid of dogma, or every ruling principle, than this? Puseyite, Arnoldite, and Evangelical will go through it, and come out just as they entered.

But suppose the candidate for the clerical state to have passed through both schools and voluntary examination, and to present himself before the bishop a few months preceding his next ordination. He will probably be asked a few questions on the Articles, set to construe a passage in the New Testament, and recommended to study Pearson on the Creed, and Burnet on the Articles, with one or two more, in the intervening period. A friend of ours, indeed, who applied to the bishop most distinguished for his attempt to assert the dogmatic character of the Anglican Establishment, was not so fortunate; he failed to elicit any text-book so positive as Pearson on the Creed, or the essay of the trigamist ecclesiastic, who was Bishop of Salisbury, friend of Dutch William, and hero of England's brilliant Whig historian. Having taken his degree early, and wishing to employ a considerable time in study for orders, he begged to be put upon a regular course: the Bishop replied that he should expect from him "a competent knowledge of the Old and New Testament." Chillingworth, it seems, was right after all: he took the common-sense view, and discerned the only adequate safeguard against Popery: "The Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants."

Such is the amount, such the definiteness, and such the authority of the instruction given to the Anglican candidates for Orders on those mighty and soul-thrilling subjects for the Christian's contemplation—the Being of God; the Divine

Persons ; the Incarnation, and its manifold consequences ; the angels ; the creation ; the mysteries of Christ ; the Blessed Virgin ; the doctrine of Grace and Justification. How many of them even know that a wonderful fabric of dogma on all these has been elaborated under the inspiration of that Spirit who dwells in the Church ?

But if such be the case concerning dogmatic theology, what concerning moral ? That the very distinction is unknown, that few Anglican ministers, or even bishops, are aware what it means, or that it exists, is a certain fact. For the Anglican Establishment not being a government of souls at all, but a State department for religion, how can it authorize instruction in a science which from beginning to end it considers to be an invasion of the rights of the individual conscience ? Moral theology is, in fact, an utter blank in Anglican literature, from the year 1559 downwards : there is no school on it existing : no tradition known. Should an Anglican minister advise himself, being in charge of a parish or otherwise, to attempt the functions of a Catholic Priest, he will, after conferring faculties on himself to hear confessions in general, and the reserved cases in particular, have to construct, out of his private reading of Catholic books, his whole method and rules of action. We know what we should think of a learned amateur, who, after studying in private the best works on surgery, illustrated with the most accurate engravings, set himself, having never attended an hospital, nor bound up a limb, to operate for the stone. It would be a marvel indeed if the patient escaped with his life, or the operator without meeting St. John Long's punishment for charlatanism. The individual might have in germ the talents of a Cooper or a Brodie, but we should not judge the less severely of his presumption. Exactly parallel is the case of a spiritual doctor, who, uninstructed by Church, unauthorized by Bishop, assumes the authority of a grand penitentiary, constructs a confessional after his own eclecticism, and ventures to deal with the most difficult cases of conscience on a system of rules framed by

himself. If constitutions escape under such dealing, it must be that there was a natural process of healing going on, which anticipated the operator. Now, the Anglican minister, urged by the wants of his people to enter on a duty for which no previous education has fitted him, in which he has no landmarks save those furnished by a communion against which his own protests, such a one will painfully feel what it is to have heard pronounced over him the words "whose sins thou dost remit they are remitted, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained," without one single instruction before or after concerning so awful a gift, and the way in which it was to be used.*

This is but an instance of the non-existence of moral theology on one particular point: but when we come to the whole doctrine of the sacraments themselves being unsettled, a series of "open questions" comes into view which quite takes away the breath. Parties which number their adherents in the ministry by thousands dispute whether grace is given through the sacraments, or by faith alone: the former denounce the latter as heretical: the latter represent the former to be Judaic and unspiritual. The State holds both parties together in its cold embrace, and says, "Why will you not join together and educate my people? Leave disputing about forms."

One point of instruction remains, as to the administration of the practical ritual and discipline. But where the doctrine of sacraments is unsettled, it is hardly to be imagined that the mode of celebrating them will be less so. What Anglican minister is taught, at the university, or elsewhere, how to

* Since these words were written the Ritualistic School in the Anglican Establishment has largely illustrated them by its practices. What was almost an ideal sketch in 1850, is become a simple picture of existing facts in 1879. One must profoundly pity the souls subjected to these self-taught operators, who—drawing both the ideal which they follow from the Catholic Church, while it is denounced by their own, and the information which they possess from Catholic books privately studied, or chance intercourse with Catholics—have found it necessary, in many cases, to prohibit reading Catholic books, or conversing with Catholics, to their so-called "Penitents." It seems that what the teachers have fed upon would be poison to those whom they are teaching, unless it be distilled in an Anglican alembic.

baptize a child, or how to celebrate Holy Communion? Or wherein the *forma* of the one, or of the other, consists? He probably takes his own custom in these from the minister with whom he happens to be at his first curacy. As little is there any special instruction in the mode of catechizing children, of visiting the sick, or the many other details of ministerial life. What an amount of neglect has arisen from the utter disregard of ritual regularity, it would be impossible to express in words. All these things have in truth been dead forms to the mass of the clergy: that they were living and moving in a divine system which their Lord was administering by their hand or voice, was never, till quite of late, impressed on their minds. They administered Baptism with far less care than the registrar of births takes in inscribing a name. And as for the one other sacrament out of the seven which the Articles allow them to keep, if the Anglican clergy do indeed possess that most awful supernatural gift which the Puseyite portion of them at least claim most earnestly, the amount of profanation respecting the Holy Eucharist which in the course of three hundred years has taken place, is something quite inconceivable. The mind revolts at the thought, and is happy to take refuge in absolute unbelief of the gift from so literal a trampling under foot of the Blood of the Covenant.

To the triple subject of moral, dogmatic, and pastoral theology, thus neglected in the Anglican Universities, we find that three years of study are devoted in the college of S. Sulpice. They are thus disposed.

“FIRST YEAR.

Morale.	Le traité de actibus humanis.
„	de legibus.
„	de peccatis.
„	de decalogo.
Dogme.	de vera religione.
„	de vera ecclesia.
„	de locis theologicis.

SECOND YEAR.

Morale.	Le traité de jure et justitia.
	„ de contractibus.
Dogme.	„ de Trinitate.
	„ de Incarnatione.
	„ de gratia.

THIRD YEAR.

Morale.	Le traité de sacramento pœnitentiæ. (Under this head would fall the whole direction for the guidance of souls.)
	„ de matrimonio.
	„ de censuris et irregularitatibus.
Dogme.	„ de sacramentis in genere.
	„ de baptismo.
	„ de confirmatione.
	„ de eucharistia.
	„ de ordine. (There is also a special course on this.)
	„ de extrema unctione.

“A course of Holy Scripture twice a week, exclusive of private study of it.

“Authors used—Bailly, 8 vols.; Bouvier, *institutiones theologicæ*; Carrière, *de jure et justitia*, etc.; Tronson, *Forma cleri*. These three years of theology are sometimes expanded to four. From Easter to the vacation they are instructed in the duties of a pastor in great detail. At three o'clock on Sundays, at S. Sulpice, the young men exercise themselves in catechizing, except from Easter to the vacation.”*

And the general result of this remarkable contrast between Anglican and Catholic education for the ministry has been thus summed up:

“The work of educating the French clergy is largely in the hands of the congregation of S. Sulpice, a celibate body, of course, and whose members are not paid, but merely

* *Allies' Journal in France*, pp. 53, 32.

clothed and boarded. They necessarily teach one uniform dogma, that is, within that sufficiently wide range of doctrine on which the Church has set her immutable seal. More than this, they impress one uniform sacerdotal mould and type, and exercise one discipline on all committed to them. It results, of course, that all who go forth from them, passing through their various public and private scrutinies, are trained and practised combatants to the extent to which their teaching goes. More yet than this; a severe ascetic and self-denying character is from the beginning attached to the sacerdotal life; they take the Apostle literally, 'no man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life;' parents who consent to their children entering into the priesthood think and speak of it as 'a sacrifice;' those who look forward to it have it so set before them, and can count the cost before they take the first step. Few situations to which they can afterwards be called require the exercise of greater self-denial than has been expected from them from the first. Does not this point out to us the quarter from which a reform among ourselves must proceed? Surely before the laity can become sound Churchmen, the priesthood must be *uniformly taught*; 'the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth.' But High Church and Low Church, not to mention the interminable shades of distinction in individual minds between and beyond them, are utterly incompatible with each other. After the dogma of the Trinity they part company. Until, then, the Anglican Church teaches her priests a uniform dogma, and moulds them in a severe and uniform discipline, she cannot hope for any other fate than that her bosom should be rent with interminable heresies and divisions. The existence of the Seminaries, and the order of S. Sulpice, is a reform in the Roman Church. Are we never to *reform*? Not by introducing novelties, but by recurring to ancient practices. The continual encroachment of the world upon the Church rendered it necessary to promote Seminaries as places of spiritual retreat for candi-

dates for holy orders; and when, as a consequence of the revolution, the course of study in the university became quite secularized, it became also necessary to detach the candidates altogether from that course, and to provide all that was requisite for instruction, as well as for inward discipline, within the walls of the Séminaire. This, as to instruction, is not completely done yet. But it is in course of doing. Now does not that necessity, which sprung up in the French Church, exist just as much among ourselves? Are our universities at present a fit school for preparing men for a life of the utmost patience, self-denial, and humiliation? Is the sacerdotal type impressed there at all? Is anything like a uniform dogma known? Is it not precisely there that moral control is relaxed, and habits of indulgence are commonly introduced? Is there any attempt made to form the inward life, and discern a man's vocation? Oh, is it not the severest censure of our universities even to mention such things? And without any special training, without any knowledge of his inward state, the young man who has been accustomed to unrestricted company, to studies almost exclusively classical or mathematical, to every kind of worldly amusement and sport, or to travel at the time of life most perilous to innocence, is taken and made a priest of, and sent to the 'cure of souls' in a parish. Can any state of deeper practical corruption than this be well imagined? Or any system more thoroughly opposed to that pursued in the Church, which is proverbially mentioned among us as 'corrupt'?"*

Thus, powerless, then, have been the teaching and the discipline of the universities, as well in producing the ecclesiastical tone and character, as in maintaining and impressing a uniform dogmatic system on the minds of those subjected to their influence. But let us consider the matter a little more widely. For three hundred years they have possessed unexampled material resources for the prosecution of all learning, human and divine, and during all that time, the very flower

* Journal, pp. 350-353.

of the English nobility, gentry, and commonalty, has been from generation to generation nurtured in their halls. What has been their effect on society, on manners, on the nation, which in that period has passed from infancy to full manhood, and now exults in her political position and material power as the head and crown of the world's civilization?

"The English universities," says Professor Huber, "content themselves with producing the first and most distinctive flower of the national life,—a well-educated gentleman." It is not the special knowledge requisite for lawyer, physician, or clergyman which they undertake to convey, but their glory is to lay a prior formation of character, which shall develop afterwards according to individual tendencies. Their main intellectual instrument in doing this has been at Oxford the study of the Greek and Latin languages, and the Aristotelian moral philosophy; at Cambridge, the mathematical sciences. But their chief moral force has lain in the old influences of Church and State acting upon the youth drawn together into them from the higher ranks in all parts of the empire. It is unquestionable, that a very peculiar moral, political, and religious character has been formed and widely diffused in our nation from this their teaching; a character marked by delicate and correct taste, the proprieties and amenities of life, whose standard is honour and respectability, whose sympathies are more with Horace and Augustus than with John the Baptist and Athanasius. The heathen virtues have thus been seen to spring out of the Christian creed, and the devotion which banished St. Antony to the desert, and stretched St. Lawrence on the gridiron, has been cooled down for the occasions of ordinary life in the possessors of comfortable parsonages, and the fathers of large families. And no less in its political than in its domestic aspect this character has been valuable to the State: the enthusiasm which was unbecoming in religion it has shown for the prizes of the world, and the children of Oxford and Cambridge have distinguished themselves in arts and arms in every climate of the globe, and have watered a thousand battle-fields with their blood.

With another remark of Professor Huber we agree—that the universities have possessed, and have not been slow to use their extraordinary facilities “for forming accomplished schoolmasters.” To which must be added a special praise of Cambridge, that she is the mother of able lawyers. The intellect, which has been so keenly engaged in the study of mathematical sciences, naturally gains distinction at the bar, and energizes with precision amid the intricacies of English law.

Moreover, a very great merit has seemed to belong, at least hitherto, to the system of the universities, which belongs also to some public schools, that they call out voluntary energies, and, not overburdening the mind with too great a variety of subjects, leave the individual character to exert its sway, and to produce, perhaps, in after life, richer fruits than if it had from the beginning been subject to a severer and more cramping course of training. This, indeed, is a merit which belongs to the whole of English, as compared with continental, life, and touches on an original difference of blood; for hitherto, the Anglo-Saxon race seems to be the only self-governing one, and to thrive on an independence which would waste itself in mere wildness of blood in other nations.

But the making gentlemen, schoolmasters, and lawyers, and the encouraging individual tendencies, was rather a falling in with the natural bias of the age, and race, and nation, than a correcting and subliming of it. For what is a citadel of religious intellect set up in a country, if not to discharge a nobler office?—to raise and bear to victory a standard which otherwise had not been seen, and a cause which otherwise had been lost. England, since the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign, has become the great commercial power of the world. “Tyre of the West,” she has been called by friend and foe. She has thriven on the inductive sciences, according to the course mapped out by her own great philosopher; all her recent glory and greatness are built on her discoveries in the realm of matter, her applying, combining, and perfecting those discoveries of her own and others. Earth, air, fire, and water do

her bidding, and submit to her rule. A boundless capitalized wealth moves those myriad arms by which she subjects these elements to the progress of human civilization. Doubtless, it is a great destiny. It is an endless task of curiosity and interest to read those secrets which the Almighty Creator has hidden in the bowels of the earth, to collect and arrange for the advantage of man powers which He has dispersed, to improve the well-being of society by impartial laws, and to open fresh sources of prosperity in a boundless trade. England will have the first glory of embracing the whole world's productions under one roof. But in such a scene of turmoil, such a struggle for worldly pre-eminence, such an exhibition of material power, more need was there for a continual memento that man is not merely "an exchanging animal," but a "living soul." The earthly empire tended to obscure the heavenly citizenship. Have the universities maintained this latter as a real and living idea in the minds of men? A spiritual creed, demanding faith,—a spiritual kingdom, involving citizenship,—a spiritual authority, claiming obedience,—these were the correctives to the overbearing tyranny of worldly wealth and power. Three centuries ago these were living in the heart of the nation: they were throned in immemorial possession. The Englishman had not only a national inheritance of language, land, and law, but he spoke likewise a Catholic tongue, was heir of a spiritual realm, and subject to a Divine code. And these it is which the universities were created to maintain and set forth,—these, too, are what they have suffered to perish out of the minds of men. Our legislators, while their debates are borne on the wings of steam to the ends of the world, and read by all civilized men, have no sense of the Church's independent spiritual existence, feel no need of a system of belief, one, complete, and coherent, and yield it no obedience. That is, with greater power than the Cæsars, and a civilization "reminding one of Rome in the time of Heliogabalus,"* they have sunk in religion back to the

* Dr. von Döllinger.

state of savages, and have come to consider the individual's independence the perfection of spiritual manhood. They have wandered back, each in his self-will, into that confusion of tongues out of which Abraham was taken.

And so it is that when the Catholic Church spreads out her arms to receive men, and would mould them into her divine unity, they recoil, and cry out, "We are wiser than you. We can read for ourselves, and think for ourselves, and be a law to ourselves. What can you give us which we have not? The press has made your book ours too. You may burn incense before it, and chant it in an unknown language, but it lies upon our tables all the time." They have forgotten that what subdued the world of old was not a book, but the tongues of fire descending on twelve men assembled in an upper chamber. And the fire once kindled on the earth is there still, and goes through the nations yet to quicken or destroy.

Now, it is to this most sacred trust that the universities have been unfaithful: yet it could not be otherwise: they could not raise the nation with a power which had its centre and abiding place in the nation, and therefore was subject to it. When for ten years their rights and privileges lay in the hands of a despot drunk with blood, it was an image of their future helplessness; of their doom not to guide and teach society, but to be its cupbearers and lacqueys. When an Act of Parliament violated the wills of all founders, and transferred to the new religion what had been left to maintain the old, it cast away all pretext for resisting any future confiscation which the utilitarian spirit may demand. You have already entered into possession of other men's goods; when the nation cries, you have held them too long, and done little service with them, what can you reply? A robber cannot plead the rights of private property, and colleges built to say masses, wherein mass is never said, cannot complain, should reform be for turning chapels into museums, and lecture upon the structure of beasts and reptiles in preference to the Thirty-nine Articles.

And it would seem that at length some such destiny is approaching. The age is angry with the universities for quite a different fault from that with which we reproach them. Not because they have taught no theology, and sent forth no apostolic ministry, but because, besides Latin and Greek and Mathematics, they have not taught modern languages and modern sciences, because Aristotle is old-fashioned, and Toryism out of date, they are threatened with a remodelling by a power with which they have no sympathy. We cannot exult at such a prospect. If these noble foundations have been kept so long, through changes so marvellous, and with effects so apparently inadequate, we could have hoped that it was for some better end at last than to be sacrificed to the shortsighted educational empiricism of the day. Creedless men will not build up what the eighth Henry demolished, nor the spirit of the counting-house restore life to halls built by a Wykeham or a Waynflete.

For indeed amid this wonderful growth of the arts and commodities of life, this rise and continual development and working out of the inductive sciences, spiritual principles have been in a continual ebb, doubt has won ground upon faith, and first axioms in theology, from which our ancestors started, have been shaken. To such a degree have tricky and compromising formularies sapped all honesty of perception, that a doctrinal decision, making the virtue of baptism an open question, and so equivalent to a denial of Christianity itself, in the mind of one who has a creed, is already acquiesced in by a vast majority of the Establishment. We indeed as Catholics only see in this the necessary result of certain principles which were at the bottom of Henry's and Elizabeth's reform. The evils which we have briefly traced as clinging so pertinaciously to university ecclesiastical education through three centuries are not temporary and accidental, but spring from the logical basis of the Reformation. Want of dogma could not but follow from the principle of private judgment on which alone the whole revolt was based; want of moral

theology, disregard of vocation, neglect of the spiritual life from the overthrow of the sacerdotal relation between pastor and people, and the non-interference, on principle, with the individual conscience. The necessary secularization of a married clergy carried with it the want of spiritual life, and bore the full flood of the world into the sanctuary. It is not corruption in practice, nor the fertile springing up of abuses, which we note, but the radical perversion of the idea; the State taking the place of the Church; and so the dissolution of spiritual authority, and the melting of truth into opinion. And the process is now complete: from the primary mystery of Baptism, to the crowning one of the Eucharistic Presence, all is brought into doubt: the learner, having the choice of schools quite contradictory in their most essential tenets, is put in a position of superiority to his teachers: he is critic rather than disciple. He can render no submission of the heart or intellect, for there is no authority to receive it. Unity is so utterly broken up, that men defend themselves from retracing their steps by asserting that our Lord did not mean His disciples to be one.

A strange contrast it is which assails the thoughtful mind in Oxford, which must have struck with peculiar force foreign Catholics hastening in the freshness of their enthusiasm to a spot more telling of the past than any other in our island, and still bound up with so many sacred recollections. The world, which has swept away almost all other marks of mediæval life, has left the structures of Wykeham and Waynflete, of Walter de Merton, and so many others, intact. You may enter still—alas! you cannot worship in—a chapel* where St. Thomas himself may have offered the Holy Sacrifice, which, in the perfect proportions of its sculptured beauty, is like his own Summa, cut in stone, so serene, so complete, so stately, and so reverential; the roof of which the pious genius of a living son, in a spirit like his own, has decorated with the portraits of Saints and Martyrs; the very likeness of the Doctor Sub-

* Merton College Chapel.

tilis yet hangs within that college, of which he was a student. These are societies whose corporate life held on through the overthrow of all sacred things at the Reformation, whose actual statutes, no less than their buildings, speak of fixity, system, formed character, and definite aims, and pay homage to Theology as the end of all arts and sciences : while, for ten generations, those who have thronged these halls have been the prey of every conflicting religious opinion, fanatical at one time, apathetic at another, but ever, in the diversity of their judgments, their waywardness, and ambiguity, shewing the fatal effect of that compromise which State policy struck between ancient truth and modern error, when it produced a hybrid whose members live on in perpetual conflict with each other, wasting, in intestine opposition, the vital energy of a being which, by the fault of its birth, has been cursed with sterility.

February, 1850.

III.

CHRISTIAN AND ANTICHRISTIAN
EDUCATION.



CHRISTIAN AND ANTICHRISTIAN EDUCATION.*

A DOCUMENT, the production of an individual who has been wittily described by one of his friends as "equally ready at half an hour's notice to build a St. Paul's, to take the command of the Channel fleet, or to superintend an operation for the stone"—a famous document, written on a celebrated occasion, has proclaimed to the world that the Catholic religion tends "to confine the intellect and enslave the soul." Even from the Prime Minister of a great empire, of accomplishments so universal, and assurance so complete, the accusation strikes one as bold against the religion of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, of Galileo, Malebranches, and Vico, of Bossuet and Benedict XIV., of Suarez, Bellarmine, and De Lugo. Such as it is, however, this accusation is daily repeated in one form or other, implicitly or explicitly, suggested in an innuendo, or presupposed throughout an argument, treated as self-evident, and acknowledged as a fact shameful, indeed, and damning, but too clear for the knight-errantry of any Catholic to dispute, by almost the whole daily press of England. Lord John Russell has but catered to the popular feeling, and summed up in half a dozen words the sentiment of modern English journalism, of the floating mind of the nineteenth century, which oscillates between profound contempt and

* The occasion of this paper was the address of the Irish Bishops on the Catholic University. Dublin, 1851.

bitter hatred of the Catholic faith. We propose to consider the meaning and the causes of this accusation, and with the light thence thrown on the subject, to proceed to the necessity and vast importance of the promised Catholic University.

Now this accusation of loving ignorance brought against the enlightener of the nations, and of fostering slavery brought against the bestower of true freedom of heart and mind and will restored to heavenly harmony, runs up, if we mistake not, into a difference of *First Principles* between Catholic and Protestant. These First Principles, the very bases of our opinions and judgments, the first springs of our actions, and so the key of our moral character, are assumed and acted upon by all without proof, by an intuition of the mind, and by most men unconsciously, even to the end of their lives. Now what is knowledge, and what ignorance, what freedom, and what slavery, of the intellect and moral powers, will depend to each individual judging on a higher question; how, that is, he arranges the various divisions of human intelligence, and the relations which they bear to each other; what, again, he considers, to be the *end* of civil and religious politics, and of human life altogether. The lawyer has one standard, and the merchant another; the artist a third, and the philosopher a fourth; the theologian one higher than all these. Nations, again, have a various moral and intellectual gauge. Millions of French peasants feel an idolatry for the memory of Napoleon, who decimated their fathers; Englishmen pay a perhaps unconscious worship to manufactories and railways, and feel a far deeper interest in the composition of the steam-engine than in the nature of the soul; Spaniards, on the other hand, measure distances by the rosary, and salute by an expression of faith in a blessed mystery; and Italians illuminate in honour not only of the earthly sovereign, but the heavenly queen. Even in the same country and race, a different spirit prevails at different times. Saxon sovereigns laid aside their crowns at St. Peter's shrine, and the proudest of the Plantagenets paid homage, as

Christians, to his successor; Norman nobles left land, and wife, and children, to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the infidel. Modern England resents the exercise of St. Peter's spiritual jurisdiction as an aggression on temporal sovereignty, and exerts the whole force of her mighty power to maintain the Holy Sepulchre in the hands of the infidel. Thus race and nation, the habits and occupations of the mind, modify the standard of all human things, and so, of course, that by which comparative knowledge or ignorance, freedom or slavery of the mind, are estimated.

If, then, we would fairly meet the question, we must classify the various subjects of human knowledge, we must arrange and group the arts and sciences of civilized life, and specially we must consider the *end* for which all these exist and are cultivated, and the relation which they severally bear to that end, and to each other. And as Catholics and Protestants here judge and act upon different First Principles, we shall take a division made long before the West was separated into these two conflicting parties. We shall go back to a great Catholic philosopher, theologian, and saint, almost three centuries anterior to the rise of Protestantism. Certainly he cannot have had the latter state of opinion in view; he set forth the train of thought which universally prevailed in his own day throughout the great Christian people, moulded into expression by a very profound and exquisitely holy mind. The division of human knowledge into its various branches, which we are about to quote, is from St. Bonaventure, and it has a unity, a simplicity, and a completeness, combined with the deepest philosophical truth, which we have not seen equalled in any other arrangement. It occurs in his small work called "The Reduction of the Arts to Theology," and is as follows.

From God, the Fontal Light, all illumination descends to man. The divine light from which, as from its source, all human science emanates, is of four kinds; the *inferior* light, the *exterior* light, the *interior* light, and the *superior* light.

The *inferior* light, that of sensitive knowledge, illuminates in respect of the natural forms of corporeal objects, which are manifested to us by the five senses. Its range does not extend beyond the knowledge of sensible things. The second, or *exterior* light of mechanical art, illuminates in respect of artificial forms. It embraces the whole circle of those arts which aim at protecting man from the weather, clothing, feeding, healing him when sick, and the theatrical arts directed to his recreation. Thus it includes all productions of the needle and the loom, all works in iron, and other metals, stone, and wood; all production and all preparation of food; all navigation and commerce, which superintend the transit and the exchange of these; medicine in its widest sense; and music, with the arts belonging to it. Manifold as are the objects of this light, it is all concerned with artificial productions; it touches only one side of human nature; it deals with man almost exclusively as an animal; it is directed to supply his bodily needs, and console his bodily infirmities. The third, or *interior* light, is that of philosophical knowledge: its object is intelligible truth. It is threefold, for we may distinguish three sorts of verities—truth of language, truth of things, and truth of morals. I. Truth of language, or rational truth, either makes known the conception of the mind, which is the function of grammar, or, further, moves to belief, which is that of logic; or moves to love or hatred, which is that of rhetoric; that is, it is either apprehensive reason, which aims at congruity, or judicative reason, which teaches, or motive reason, which uses ornament. II. Truth of things, or natural truth, which deals with things as to their *formal* (*i.e.* in mediæval language, their *essential*) relations, in regard to matter is physical, in regard to the soul is mathematical, in regard to the divine wisdom is metaphysical, and has the province of *ideas*. The physical treatment of things has to do with their generation and corruption, according to their natural powers and seminal principles: the mathematical, with their abstract forms, as our intellect conceives them:

the metaphysical treats of the knowledge of all *entia*, which it reduces to one First Principle, End, and Exemplar, God, from whom they came forth; *i.e.* it deals with things as to their *ideal* principles. III. Truth of morals, has for its object either the individual, that is, the whole range of personal duties, which is termed *monastic*, or of family duties, which is termed *economic*; or of duties to the state, which is termed *political*. Lastly, the fourth, or *superior* light, is that of Grace and of the Holy Scripture, which illuminates in respect of saving truth. It leads to higher objects by manifesting those things which are above reason; it descends by inspiration, and not by discovery, from the Father of lights. The doctrine of Holy Scripture, though *one* in the literal sense, is *triple* in the spiritual and mystical sense: *allegoric*, in which it teaches what is to be believed, and relates to the generation and incarnation of the Word, and this is the study of doctors; *moral*, in which it teaches the rule of life, and this is the subject matter of preachers; and *anagogic*, which embraces the union of the soul with God, and is treated by the contemplative.

Thus the fourfold light descending from above has yet six differences, which set forth so many classes of human knowledge and science. There is the light of sensitive knowledge, the light of the mechanical arts, the light of rational philosophy, the light of natural philosophy, the light of moral philosophy, and the light of Grace and Holy Scripture. "And so," adds the saint, "there are six illuminations in this life of ours, and they have a setting, because all this knowledge shall be destroyed. And therefore there succeedeth to them the seventh day of rest, which hath no setting, and that is, the illumination of glory. And as all these derived their origin from one light, so all these sorts of knowledge are directed to the knowledge of the Holy Scripture, are shut up in it, and completed in it, and by means of it are ordered to the illumination of eternity."

We are persuaded by experience, that the more this

arrangement of human arts and sciences is considered, the more it will be valued. Perhaps all the philosophical errors of the last three hundred years have been by anticipation exposed in it. Take, for instance, the multitudinous errors connected with the question of the origin of our ideas. One school makes them proceed from the first light alone, and derives them from the senses. Another from a combination of the first and third light, or the internal sense. They have, by common consent, put out of view the fourth light, which has for its object the supernatural and the super-intelligible, and which presupposes another capacity of receiving knowledge on man's part, which these schools disregard. Above all, what strikes us in this arrangement of St. Bonaventure is, that throughout it he considers the circle of human knowledge, and the objects of which it treats, to be what God created them—a universe, a whole, which can only be understood in Him who is its Beginning and End, the dread Alpha and Omega of Being, I Am that I Am. And therefore we shall make use of it as a standard whereby to appreciate the accusation which Protestantism may be understood as daily bringing by the ten thousand mouths of its *bellua multorum capitum*, the press, against Catholicism, viz. : that as a system it tends “to confine the intellect and enslave the soul.” And perhaps in the hasty glance we are about to take, we may have opportunity to remark what this very loud-tongued accuser itself has done for the real advancement of knowledge in the human race, since its champion Luther appeared on the scene.

Now, that in which the Europe of the nineteenth century mainly differs from the Europe of the sixteenth is the prodigious cultivation of the mechanical arts, and the successful application to these of certain physical sciences, such as chemistry, which depend on the principle of induction, and are wrought out by a series of experiments. Wonderful is the advance in these which has been made not merely in the past hundred years, but in our own generation, since the peace. The

mind of the world seems turned upon these with an energy which has scarcely before been witnessed, and the mechanical arts have so manifold inter-relations, that it is hard to foresee how far an improvement in one may affect others. Who, for instance, can yet tell what will be the effect either on the political or the religious state of Europe, produced by railway trains traversing its bosom daily at express speed, or by the electric telegraph actually annihilating distance between the great centres of human thought and action. Isolation of any particular people, and the evils which follow from it, seem no longer possible. Again, as we have seen in the late Exhibition, industry is become no longer national, but cosmopolitan. Every invention is exposed to a universal rivalry. What has been conducted successfully to a certain point by the discovery or improvement of one mind, is presently caught up by another's, and worked out into higher results. We should be very ungrateful, certainly, not to feel what has been done, and is daily doing, to promote the *comfort* of all classes, and not least of the poor. Still the very word suggests wherein this vast and ever increasing civilization lies. It concerns mainly the food, the clothing, and the covering of man; his locomotion; his healing, when sick; his taste and recreation in gazing on pleasant and beautiful forms, or hearing melodious sounds; in short, his bodily wants. It deals with him mainly as an animal, a buying and selling, travelling and voyaging, earth-cutting, iron-working, steam-producing, gold-seeking animal; where it uses his reason and high intellectual powers, as in the mathematical and physical sciences, it is yet chiefly with a utilitarian view, for application to the mechanical arts. We are not underrating the *quantity* of light thus diffused; we are but remarking on its *quality*, that it is mainly the *inferior* and the *outward* light, with so much of the *interior*, as embraces the physical and mathematical, but not the higher speculative and metaphysical sciences. In other words, this busy, restless, ever-advancing, all-engrossing modern world of thought and action hardly approaches man

as a *moral* agent, and still less as a spiritual being. It chooses to put altogether out of consideration that every individual of the race possesses a *something* incomparably more precious than all the discoveries of all the physical and mathematical sciences, and all the productions of all the mechanical arts from the beginning to the end of the world. Certainly it does not deny that man has a soul, but it treats it as a truism taught to boys and girls in their catechism, and disagreeably repeated on Sundays at church; but not to be thought of during the week by sensible men of business. The nineteenth century is one of facts, but *this* fact, which outweighs all others, as the ocean does a drop of water, is not a favourite one with it.

For if, quitting the mechanical arts and the experimental sciences, we advance and ask what progress has been made in the higher speculation of the human mind, we find that this science has fallen with the many into absolute disrepute, from the number of conflicting theories which have arisen one after the other, each for a time prevailing, and too often paving the way, like the low philosophy of Locke, for the Deism and Pantheism of succeeding minds. Gray's insulting remark, that "metaphysic spins her cobwebs, and catches some flies," but too faithfully represents the general feeling as to that noble science at present. In short, the modern thinker, as he goes on from the domain of *sensible* things, gradually loses his footing, he finds the landmarks removed, and rival geographers disputing the lie of the country; and if he is a man of ordinary wisdom and prudence, he stops with the reflection that life is too short to spend any of it on a science which has been reduced by the conflicts of its cultivators into a chaos of uncertainty.

In the field of morals is the prospect much more encouraging? We are not now speaking of Catholicism and its authorized teaching, but of that floating, popular, and certainly most uncatholic mind which charges it with fostering ignorance and slavery. *What is its code of moral laws? Who*

could say? We have but to look to any morning's *Times* for the most unscrupulous lying, the most cruel calumny, the most barefaced assertion. Because it is anonymous, and so beyond punishment, it shows no conscience—no feeling. It will riot and gloat over the distress of a nation, and the expatriation of multitudes; it will call the solitude peace, and view with complacency the departure of a people's bone and sinew, if only it can be delivered from that standard of truth and right which Catholicism, in its most suffering and hampered state, rears in the world. Where, we may ask, are the moral systems which in a reign of three hundred years it has produced? It is not yet equal to interpreting the decalogue. And if you would not tempt it to blasphemy, do not put before it a case of conscience, for nothing does it hate so much as casuistry. It is its byeword for chicanery and falsehood.

But oh that proud, that myriad-minded Protestantism, ranging over earth and sea, from China to California, to gather their treasures for its place and hour of pride, which lay adoring itself in one long protracted act of self-deification, during six months in the glass house, watching the nations brought before its footstool, and saying, I am their Queen, "I shall not sit as a widow, and I shall not know barrenness!" Carry it into a yet higher region than morals, into the light of Grace and Holy Scripture—how miserable and benighted it appears! Its heroes here are pygmies. Their eyes gaze not on these objects. These substances are too impalpable for their grasp. Here a thought has often struck us. Certainly no one of her Majesty's subjects made a better or more rational use of the Exhibition than the Queen herself. The most illustrious in each department of art were at her daily bidding to explain every new invention, the most complicated machinery, the manifold treasures of the physical world, from its rudest to its most refined productions. We doubt not that they did it each one well and ably in his sphere. Well, these are subjects which interest different classes of people, some one, and some another; their utility is various, their preciousness

in proportion. But other subjects there are of universal importance, which cannot be ignored without a grievous loss by any single human being. Supposing her Majesty had be-thought herself to ask of her several conductors, day after day, a statement of their belief on these four subjects, the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, Original Sin, and Grace. If the replies given to her under this supposition could be put down and ticketed, we will venture to say that no productions of the Great Exhibition would have been, to say the least, more curious and instructive. Only they would probably have defied analysis and arrangement. The greatest men in modern art and science, who would take shame at being ignorant of the latest discovery in chemistry, the latest theory of geology, or the latest application of machinery, would probably show more ignorance, and, certainly, more variation, on these momentous subjects, than half a dozen children taken at hazard out of any Catholic school. This is what free inquiry and the Bible sown broadcast over the world have done in three centuries for the master science of theology, and the primary virtue of faith.

We admit, then, that in the mechanical arts, and the physical sciences, in all which concerns the conveniences of the purely material life, there has been a great advance. We are thankful for it. The most delicate lady may now be swept over the country, without fatigue, at forty miles an hour, in the midst of soft cushions, and surrounded with books, who, three centuries ago, must have submitted to pick her way over abominable roads at four miles an hour, strapped on a pillion to a groom's girdle. But this material life of ours is not all: after you have given their utmost value to all the precious things contained in the Great Exhibition, there remains for man, yet, a higher world of thought: there are the needs of the whole spiritual nature: there is the science of mind, the science of morals, and the science of theology: there is truth of language, truth of things, and truth of morals; there is that highest light of all, "which lightens every man

that cometh into the world," the light of the Divine Word. With regard to these, so far from knowledge having increased, we assert that in all uncatholic countries, and in each country in proportion as the spirit of Catholicism has declined, there has been a retrogression, a diminution of light, feebleness instead of virility, doubtfulness instead of certainty. We proceed to state the connection of this with Protestantism.

The war of Luther, though seemingly directed against particular doctrines, was really waged with the principle of authority itself. After the dust of the conflict was cleared away, the work which he was found to have accomplished was the emancipation of the individual mind from submission to the general mind of Christendom. The fabric of Christianity had been raised on an external, objective basis: its message came from without to the individual, answering, indeed, to certain inmost needs, to aspirations and ideas felt within, but independent of these, and standing over against man with a command and a control superior to him. The whole system radiated from the Person of God the Word Incarnate: by Him it had been set up in the world: by Him it was sustained, and energized in a living society, divine because the virtue of its Founder was in it. Luther, on the contrary, proceeded from self: his own mind, his own judgment, was his standard: disguising this both to himself and others, he professed obedience to the written Word alone: but the interpretation of this book being left to the individual, the real standard became the mind or feelings of the individual. Christianity, till then, had owned obedience to its Founder, perpetually as it were incarnate in that society which Himself had termed His Body. Luther substituted for this a subjective basis in each believer. Obedience, henceforth, to an external government became impossible; it was an infringement on the most sacred rights, on the new-found and highly prized liberties of the true believer. He was himself the spiritual man, judging all things, and judged of none. We are far, indeed, from asserting that Luther knew what he was about. There was a great and

subtle and combining spirit using him as an instrument, who had formed his plan, a vast and skilful one, though the agent had none.

Luther's reform was established in England, and before the end of the century a man of great genius arose, to carry into the domain of the arts and sciences, for their restoration, as he asserted, the precise idea which Luther had applied to religion. The principle of authority, of tradition, of deduction and development, having been overthrown in things divine, what more natural than that Bacon should propose the principle of induction, that is, of proceeding from the particular to the universal, as the foundation of all human science. And as the sciences of mind, of morals, and of theology, proceed from certain data, and are built upon deduction more than on induction, what more natural likewise than that he should throw himself on the physical and experimental sciences, as alone, from his point of view, admitting of stability, certitude, and progress. He called man away from paths in which, as authority had been discarded, no landmarks remained, to an endless and assured progress which they might ascertain for themselves step by step : which would daily recompense them by fresh conveniences, helps, and ornaments of life. Let them leave their "*idola theatri*," to which they had been paying a vain and fruitless homage : all nature was waiting to pour forth her treasures into the lap of humanity, if it would cease to meteorize, and rather humbly search her ample bosom, analyse and weigh her forces, and direct them to assuage the wants of man : man, that is, as he was formed from the dust, and to the dust returns. He had divined the rising genius of England : he had forecast her horoscope, and determined her empire : as if by a magic wand, he had felt the treasures which yet lay hid in her mines and mountains, the unsorted elements of a material prosperity beyond what the world had yet seen. She has listened to his call, and his idea has been enshrined in her heart, has become the centre of her life, and is the real object of her worship.

The work was not yet complete. There was wanting one to apply to the science of mind the idea which Luther had introduced into religion and Bacon into physical science. There was wanting one to place the starting point of mental philosophy in the individual man; in the creature and not in the Creator; in the pure analysis of self. That one was found in Descartes. Discarding the objective basis on which mental philosophy had hitherto rested, he attempted to build the most necessary and absolute verities, the Being of God, and the existence of creatures, on the internal sense. *Cogito, ergo sum*. That is, he built belief on doubt; he founded the universe on the individual. He did not rest on the tradition which had never perished from the human race, and had been restored full and perfect, and unfolded by Christ, with conditions that ensured its permanence and purity. He put aside those ideas which are deposited by the Creator in His creature's mind before and beyond proof. As Luther's process was analysis applied to religion, so his was the same analysis applied to the mind. As Luther's process has terminated in biblical rationalism, and the overthrow of faith by scepticism, so Descartes' process has issued in the denial of natural truths. The abuse of Bacon's principle has been shown in its application far beyond the experimental sciences and mechanical arts, of which it is the proper instrument, and in the great predominance which it has given to these over all other studies.

It is not too much to say that the whole tissue of modern thought and feeling, outside the Catholic Church, and within it, so far as those are concerned who are not deeply touched by her spirit, is wrought out of these elements. The self-sufficiency, the independence, the dislike of authority, whether in spiritual or civil matters, the reduction of truth to opinion, the measuring of things by their material utility, in one word, the predominance of body over spirit, and of matter over mind, have their root here. Let us see whether the system of Luther, Bacon, and Descartes has contributed to the spread of knowledge truly so called—has made men capable of

imbibing more or less of those emanations from the Fontal Light which St. Bonaventure described above.

I. And first as to the light of Grace and Holy Scripture. Luther found this diffused in one great religious society, animated and held together by a common faith. As the infant instinctively turns to the mother for the stream which supplies its life, so every individual soul in that great family looked direct to the mighty Mother of spirits for its draught of heavenly love, reclined in trust on that unfailing bosom. drew support and peace from those eyes of love. The first work of the reformer was to teach the children that their trust in their Mother was vain and dangerous; that they should see, compare, and judge for themselves. He, indeed, with a strange infraction of his own principle, told them what they should believe; he had discovered it himself in St. Paul's Epistles, which for fifteen centuries the Church had not understood. By-and-by Calvin arose with a fresh doctrine, which he too had gathered from the same Epistles by a like process, and which he enjoined, *proprio motu*, on all true believers, who took the Word of God for their guide. Presently a third appeared, a hard-headed Swiss, far more thorough-going than either, but equally imperative in enjoining others to believe as he did, on the principle of private judgment. The Reformation, as established by Elizabeth in England, was an amalgam of the doctrines of these three, with a certain residuum of Catholic truth, without logical connection of parts, as might be imagined from its parentage, and absolutely devoid of any spiritual idea by which it could cohere. It had instead a material soul, and lived on the confiscated lands of the old Church. Not but what the reformed doctrine, in a more spiritualized and explosive state, charged the atmosphere all around, and burst out in Puritanism, and Presbyterianism, in Independents and Anabaptists, in Quakers, and later still, in Wesleyans, and a host of small sects, which defy analyzing, or even naming, one and all the true children of that principle of division and dissolution with which Luther began. More

than three centuries have passed ; we see what they have *destroyed*, may we ask what they have *built up*? Evil, as all theologians tell us, has no substance ; it is but the negation of good ; and in accordance with this, the benefactors of mankind may be known throughout all ages infallibly by one token, that they have *constructed* ; and the malefactors of the race as surely by another, that they have *destroyed*. Which did the Reformers ? After three hundred years look at their work in Germany, Switzerland, Scotland, America, and most of all in England. There, if anywhere, every outward circumstance seemed to promise permanence and immutability. A powerful Queen clothed their idea with the richest material body : determined that it should not moulder away, she sought to fix its lineaments by embalming it in Thirty-nine Articles ; and she guarded it jealously with the axe and the rack. Could she rise from her grave, what would she behold? The favourite creation of her genius, which she had planted throughout the land, interwoven with the whole fabric of the constitution, married to the nobility and gentry, surrounded with the dread array of law, in spite of all these scarcely held together by means of a foul and ignominious lie. She would see her successor in that spiritual headship forced to declare that the very first doctrine of the heavenly life was yet unsettled, that her clergy espoused opposite sides, and that, in spite of all material ties, the only means to maintain them in one outward communion was to sanction their teaching contradictory opinions on baptism. If they differ about the beginning, how much more about the course and maturity of the heavenly life. Amid the ten thousand volumes on sacred subjects, which in three hundred years the learned leisure of that richly endowed society has produced, we ask in vain for a *science of theology*. The so-called divines are all at issue with each other ; they are but agreed in rejecting Catholicism, which *is* a system. But they have none of their own. Incredible as this may seem, it is true ; and what is yet more incredible is, that they seem to have no sense of this deficiency.

They do not see the connection of one doctrine with another; they do not need entirety or wholeness in their teaching; great gaps disturb them not; incoherencies do not disarrange their notions. They began with the text of Scripture, and with the text of Scripture they end. It is to them as a huge quarry of fine marble, which they have never wrought. Or rather, perhaps, the glorious temple which the Church had reared their ancestors with sacrilegious hands tore down, and they are still gazing on the ruins; or, where fragments of the walls are still standing, the most that they do is to raise a shed against them, light a flickering fire with the logs of the old roof-beams, and shelter themselves with the name of Catholic principles.

But now we may surely ask in this, the most important and primary of man's needs, a guide to lead him through his forty years' pilgrimage to the land of promise, is the light of Grace and Holy Scripture diminished or augmented? Is there knowledge, where all principles are disputed? Can there be faith, where no divine authority is recognized? Such, during three hundred years, has been the work of Protestantism, a simple undoing; what in the same period has been that of Catholicism? That great body of truth which it had when Luther arose, it has still, whole and unimpaired. It has been, moreover, perpetually solving doubts, perfectionating details, developing consequences of truths before received, gathering a harvest of saints, establishing a multitude of holy and self-denying congregations, collecting itself up more and more in its supreme head, and feeling that its strength lies in the chair of Peter. Its children more than ever trust their Mother. Faith leads them to knowledge, and love preserves harmony between the intellect and the will.

It is especially, after considering the facts of the last three centuries, from this point of view that we recommend the thought of a modern philosopher to the author of the charge against Catholicism, that it tends "to confine the intellect, and enslave the soul." "Those superficial minds, who regard the Catholic as

a slave because he is subject to a rule, do not perceive that this rule, which is nothing else but truth itself, is the foundation of liberty. The Catholic rule is the principle which prevents the human mind from diminishing truth, and therefore, from restricting the limits of the field in which it can expatiate. In fact, as man cannot step on vacuity or nothingness, where ground fails to plant the foot upon, the only arena in which genius can exercise itself and display its powers is that of truth. Thus the law which preserves the true, as the vital element and the home of the mind, is as necessary to philosophic liberty, as that which forbids governments to alienate territory is to the liberty and security of States." *

2. From religious principles, let us proceed to political. Luther laid down that the individual judgment, conscience, and feelings formed the rule of belief. Locke and Rousseau applied this to politics, and forth came the grand dogma of the sovereignty of the people, the instrument of subversion and destruction in modern times. All power is from on high, said the ancient Catholic tradition; all power is from below, says the new political Protestantism. If man had a right to judge of Revelation, to admit so much as he pleases, and to modify what he dislikes in a religion coming to him with the strongest sanction from without, who can deny to him a similar right in respect of governments, the best and most lawful of which has only an *indirect* commission from God, while the title of His Church is of *direct* divine institution? It was a problem quickly worked out in practice, and first of all in that government which had usurped the rights of the Church. Charles I. paid the forfeit of his head for the crime of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. The spirit which established the Reformation overthrew the Monarchy. Its ultimate triumph in England remains to be chronicled by posterity; but who can doubt that the old English Constitution is gone to seed, and that we are advancing with the smoothness and the speed of a river above the cataract to the headlong fall

* Gioberti, Introduction to Study of Philosophy, b. i. chap. 8.

and the deep pool of democracy? But in Europe generally, this principle, making, that is, the individual the starting-point in religion and in politics, born in Luther, perfected by Locke and Rousseau, is agitating the several nations, and everywhere working to overthrow established powers, till society itself is struggling for mere existence. It is a principle of pure anarchy and dissolution, proceeding from the individual to the family, and from the family to the nation, and tainting in all alike the first springs of obedience. It inverts the primary rule of *obligation*, on which not only civil government, but morality itself, is founded. For whereas, the whole order of the universe springs from that absolute right which God as Creator possesses over all His creatures, the correlative of which is an absolute duty in man to God, and relative duties to his fellow-men as children of a common parent, out of which relative duties relative rights between man and man spring, so that there are four links in this chain which is attached to the very throne of God: on the contrary, the principle of Luther and of Locke in religion and in politics, and by consequence in morality, begins from the bottom, and has accordingly no basis; for man has no rights whatever towards his fellow-creatures without presupposing a Creator, and no rights towards God at all, but duties only. Such, then, is the light which this great principle of Protestantism—which may be termed, indeed, its beginning, middle, and end—has shed upon human *obligation*, as it touches the individual, the family, or the state. For its fruits look through Europe at present, which is become one huge battle-field, between the old traditional principle of *power from on high*, and the new revolutionary watchword of *power from below*. The Church, as she was herself the great exemplar and most perfect type of the former—as her chief in St. Peter's chair is the representative of her Incarnate Lord, and rules by direct commission from Him—so had she in every European country fostered and gradually educated civil politics resting on the like basis. She had first sown and then developed in them

the seeds of freedom, built not on imaginary rights of man, but on absolute duties towards God; freedom which, therefore, had a basis as strong as the primary obligation of morality. This she had done, and all Europe was advancing forward peaceably to the development of these free constitutions, when the Reformation violently arrested the process, and threw back some countries on despotism for the maintenance of order, while it hurried others forward into a false freedom based upon anarchy, for such indeed is power which springs from the individual. As the Church contains the most perfect form of monarchical power, her constitution being the direct inspiration and habitual inworking of the Incarnate Word, so she sustained the first and most vehement assault of the dissolving principle; which having wreaked its full violence on her, has gone on to attack and corrupt all temporal governments. We are witnessing, in political anarchy, and moral socialism, the *dénouement* of religious individualism.

3. After religion and politics comes the appreciation of *ends*, which Protestantism has set up among us. And here, to listen to it, one might well imagine that Christianity had come into the world to promote civilization; as if a pleasant and peaceable intercourse between man and man, the development of commerce, the accumulation and distribution of wealth, discoveries in physical science, the diffusion of conveniences, the easing the wheels of society, the making this world, in fact, the home, and this life the object of man, were the grand end which the Lord of all had in view in giving Himself a sacrifice for His creatures. One would think as much as this might have been done at less cost. So desirable is it to forget "the fire" that was to be kindled and "the sword" that was to be sent on earth; so acceptable to put out of mind the prophecy that "nation should rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom," and that "earthquakes and pestilences" should bear witness to that broken moral order without the restitution of which nothing is esteemed as good in the counsels of God. The key-note of Christianity is self-

sacrifice; the key-note of civilization is self-enjoyment; no wonder that if you measure the Church's utility by the standard of civilization she is judged to fail in her work. Now, a main work of Protestantism was to destroy all that operation of the Church which bore witness to its superhuman charity; the sacrifice of self in works of mercy which entail privation of the domestic life became odious to those who placed their supreme good in that domestic life. That wonderful habit of mind, which is exhibited to us in manifold expression, but always the same essence, in the lives of the saints, is matter of simple unbelief to Protestants, at the bottom of which is a still stronger dislike. Why turn society upside down? why shake off the dust of the world from your feet? why deny father and mother, brother and sister, wife and child? why treat the body as a wild beast, and torment the mind? There is one vision ever before the eyes of such men, which these complainers see not; the vision of a cross, and One thereon raised against a black sky. There is a voice ever in their ears, Take up *your* cross, and follow Me. On the other hand, there is quite a different order of things very attractive and winning in its way. Comfortable homes, easy locomotion, abundance of food, bridges and railways and canals and docks and ships without end, powerful fleets, vast colonies, a world-wide empire, the fair array of a well-ordered government, the charms of a well-chosen society. Now, both of these cannot be *ends* at once to the same persons. And surely their judgment of all things will be very different in proportion to which end they take. What is knowledge in the estimation of the one, will be ignorance to the other. There is no doubt whatever that the latter will charge the former with "confining the intellect and enslaving the soul."

4. And this brings us to our fourth point, the knowledge which is in request, the arts and sciences which are in estimation, at the present day; and so, the education which is most valued, and the distinction which is most coveted. Theological truth, then, in consequence of the fundamental

principle of Protestantism, having become a bone of contention between an infinite number of sects and private opinions, which, with the Bible all the while in their hands, are agreed upon nothing, from the dogma of the Blessed Trinity, to the existence of sin—the only way for any peace at all which such a society has discovered is to set this sort of truth aside altogether, to vote it a bore, and perseveringly ignore it. Next, moral truth, as might be expected, and the grounds of moral obligation, are plunged into almost equal uncertainty. The whole theory of morals, as to the individual, the family, and the state, is unsettled by the unsettlement of religion. The next highest class of studies, coming, it will be remembered, under St. Bonaventure's *truth of things*, is the science of the mind, Metaphysics, truth according to our ideal conceptions; and here, thanks to the application of the one Protestant principle, proceeding from the individual, whether it be the inward or the outward sense, nothing is determined, all is contradiction, between rival schools, and so the science is in the utmost disrepute. So that it is in the physical and mathematical sciences alone that Protestantism finds certitude, and material utility being its standard, it is in the application of these to the ornamental, the culinary, the medical, the locomotive, and the commercial arts, that it places the grandeur and the progress of a nation, the eminence of individuals, the good done to the world, and the needs of education. We would indeed assign no scanty meed of praise to these sciences and arts. We are not disposed to underrate the value of the steam-engine or the uses of chemistry; but it is something too much to prefer physical before moral and religious truth. In a late article, the *Times* contrasted the thanks given to Sir Joseph Paxton for the invention of the glass house, and those bestowed on Mr. Stephenson for the tubular bridge, "objects," as it said, "truly Catholic," with those given to Dr. Newman for his discourses! That is, it could appreciate the curious convenience of the building, and the wonderful mechanism of the bridge, but a volume on the Being of God, and the

destinies of man, was entering, in fact, on forbidden ground, stirring up the *odium theologicum*, dividing families, thrusting pins, with their points outwards, in the soft cushions of our railway carriages, and troubling that physical order, which the *Times* alone recognizes, by the introduction of miracles. How thoroughly odious to such a spirit would have been the personal presence of the Divine Lawgiver Himself, when the investigation of His sublimest laws, and the recognition of His supernatural operation, is so distasteful! But the year has furnished us with the strongest instance of that absolute idolatry of the material arts which forms the temper of our age. Day after day, for six long months, the whole enthusiasm of the public press has been lavished on the Great Exhibition. The account of the concluding scene in the *Times* of October 13th may fitly be termed the apotheosis of matter. We quote it here as the best illustration of our subject which can be given:—

“On Saturday the Great Exhibition closed its wonderful career, and the public took their last farewell of its splendours. After being open for five months and eleven days, and concentrating in that time a larger amount of admiration than has probably ever been given within the same period to the works of man, the pageant terminates, the doors of the Crystal Palace no longer yield to the open sesame of money, and in a few days hence thousands of hands will be busily engaged in removing all those triumphs of human skill, and those evidences of natural wealth, which the world was assembled to behold. It was natural that such an event should be regarded by all who witnessed it with no ordinary degree of emotion. Feelings of gratified curiosity, of national pride, and of enthusiasm at the public homage paid to industrial pursuits, were tempered with regret that a spectacle so grand and unique should ever have a termination. It is only when we are about to lose them, that we begin to find the value of objects which have insensibly become endeared to us. As with the building, so it was also with many of the works of

art, the treasures of wealth, and the examples of ingenuity which it contained. The 'Amazon,' Van der Ven's 'Eve,' Strazza's 'Ishmael,' the two French bronzes, and many other contributions of the highest artistic merit were, for the last time, to be gazed at by the admiring multitude. . . .

"It was drawing near five o'clock, when from the top of Keith and Co.'s Spitalfields silk trophy, the whole nave, east and west, the area of the transept, and the galleries, might be seen packed with a dense mass of black hats, through which, at intervals, a struggling female bonnet emerged here and there into light. The vast multitude had now become stationary, and were evidently awaiting, in silence but intense excitement, the last act of a great event, immortal in the annals of the nineteenth century. It was a most solemn and affecting scene, such as has rarely been witnessed, and for which an opportunity cannot soon again arise. Words cannot do it justice, and fail utterly to convey the mystery and grandeur thus embodied to the eye. Let the reader fancy what it must have been to comprehend within one glance fifty thousand people assembled under one roof, in a fairy palace, with walls of iron and glass, the strongest and the most fragile materials happily and splendidly combined. Let him, if he can, picture to himself that assemblage in the centre of that edifice filled with specimens of human industry and natural wealth, from every civilized community, and the remotest corners of the globe. Let him tax his imagination to the uttermost, and still beyond the material magnificence of the spectacle presented to him let him remember that the stream of life on which he looks down, contains in it the intellect and the heart of the greatest metropolis, and the most powerful empire in the world; that strong feelings, such as rarely find utterance in a form so sublime, are about to find expression from that multitude, and that in heathen times, even when liberty was still a new power upon the earth, the voice of the people was held to be the voice of God. Not only the days, but the minutes of the Great Exhibition were numbered, and the first

sign of its dissolution was given by Osler's crystal fountain. Just before five o'clock struck, the feathery jet of water from its summit suddenly ceased, and the silence of the vast assemblage became deeper and more intense. The moment at last came. Mr. Belshaw appeared at the west corner of the transept gallery on the south side, bearing a large red flag in his hand. This he displayed as the clock struck, and instantly all the organs in the building were hurling into the air the well-known notes of the national anthem. At the same moment the assembled multitudes uncovered; and those who witnessed this act of loyalty from an advantageous position will long remember the effect which it produced upon their minds. Where just before nothing was visible but a mass of black hats stretching away until lost in the distance, immediately there appeared a great sea of upturned animated faces, and to the solemn silence of expectancy succeeded a volume of sound in which the voices of the people were heartily joined. These cheers were continued for several minutes, and when the last of them died away, there passed over the entire building, and with an effect truly sublime, a tremendous rolling sound, like that of thunder, caused by thousands of feet stamping their loyalty upon the boarded floors. Under this demonstration every part of the edifice trembled, and, as it swept from west to east, many an eye was raised with anxiety to the girders and pillars, which in long perspective were stretched out before them. And now the time had arrived for the death-peal of the Exhibition to be rung out. Some one hung out from the gallery of the transept a piece of calico, on which was inscribed the well-known passage from Shakspeare's 'Tempest,' etc. :—

' Our revels now are ended ; these our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits, and
Are melted into air, into thin air ;
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,—
Yea, all which it inherits, shall dissolve,
And, like this unsubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind.' "

Thus the spirit of this age describes the closing of the Great Exhibition, in language which a mediæval Christian would have thought more appropriate to the last judgment. Let us give, indeed, their due honour to industry, patience, invention, artistic skill, and genius of every kind, but remember, withal, that a single act of moral virtue, of self-sacrifice, in the least intellectual of His rational creatures, is of more value in the sight of God than all which this Exhibition contained. The world, it seems, thinks far otherwise, and this prodigious vanity fair is to be the turning-point of its future destinies, and to convert first England, and then the whole earth, into a manufactory of utilitarianism, and realize, we suppose, the scheme which was frustrated at Babel. For in the same article we read :

"The second issue which the Exhibition raises, viz., how best we should proceed in the industrial career which lies before us, has hitherto been chiefly dealt with in the various schemes for the appropriation of the surplus. Some think that we must effect a radical change in our educational system—that we must substitute living science for dead literature, and distribute the honours and rewards of life in channels where they may fructify to the use of the commonwealth instead of being limited to the learned professions, the military and naval services, and the residents of our universities. To others this seems a slow and a doubtful process. They advocate, therefore, the principle of association as the best for securing industrial progress. They say, bring the leading men in manufactures, commerce, and science, into close and intimate communication with each other,—establish an intelligent supervision of every branch of production by those most interested and likely to be best informed,—have annual reports made in each department, and let the whole world be invited to assist in carrying forward the vast scheme of human labour, which has hitherto been prosecuted at random and without any knowledge or appreciation of the system which pervaded it. The public must eventually decide this contest of opinions,

and their verdict, whichever alternative it inclines to, or whether or not it embraces both, will not only determine one of the most important questions that the Exhibition has raised, but prove fraught with the gravest consequences to the welfare of this country, and of mankind at large."

That Divine Being who appears here to be entirely forgotten will, we are confident, prove strong enough, and prudent enough, to disconcert this utopia of commercial prosperity, and to guard for the moral agents whom He has created and redeemed some better termination of their existence, some higher object for their toil. We may now, then, sum up what has been done for the highest interests of humanity by Protestantism in the last three hundred years.

I. At the commencement of that period there was one idea thoroughly rooted in the mind of Christendom, which the course of fifteen centuries, with all its revolutions of empires and change of races, had preserved, and made, as it were, the anchor of the human race. It was that the Very Truth and the Very Goodness had come into the world, assuming a human form, had published all saving doctrine to men, and not only so, but had set up in His own person the beginning of a human society, to which the guardianship of that doctrine was entrusted; that for this very purpose He had promised to it a perpetual indwelling presence, and an unseen spiritual guidance, which should never fail, but overmaster human weakness, and resist the innate corruption of man. By belonging to this society, by obeying what it commanded, and by believing what it attested, man was to be saved; it was God's witness to man which could utter no falsehood, for the Spirit of truth was with it and in it. The great work of Protestantism has been to scatter to the winds this idea: to destroy this anchorage of humanity amid the storms of life; to breathe distrust of this divine maternity; to leave, in short, man to himself, so that he should receive of this body of heavenly doctrine just so much as approved itself to his individual judgment. A great gift, indeed, to the child, to teach him

that he had no mother ; a precious boon to the race, to instruct it that the corruption of Adam had, after all, been too profound and ineradicable for God Himself to overcome, and that, after He had set up His tabernacle among men, humanity remained as dark and solaceless as it was before. As time had corrupted the tradition of truth given to Adam, to Noah, and to Abraham, so too had it fared with the revelation of the Divine Word Himself. And so, as far as men are Protestants, they have lost this idea. They think it fanaticism to entertain it, and bigotry to impose it on others.

Christendom was once a great federative republic, of which Christ's vicar was the head and common father. The national distinctions of its several parts were but accidents in the higher and essential existence which they had as one Christian people, with a common faith, a common hope, a common charity. Protestantism has done its utmost to destroy this republic. What would it substitute ? What is it even now proclaiming to us as the daystar of peace risen on the world ? A trade confederation, which is to join all nations, Catholic and Protestant, Jew, Turk, Infidel, and Heretic, on a principle whose simplicity equals its sublimity and its universality. Buy in the cheapest market, sell in the dearest. This is the palmary discovery of the year 1851. Free trade instead of the Catholic Church ; the Crystal Palace for the shrine of the Apostles. The Peace Association undertakes what the Prince of Peace has failed to do.

2. Christendom, too, had one faith, but Protestantism having great objections to that, and having pulled it all to pieces, has likewise a substitute. Leave the question of religion to the private consciences of men, and the ministers of the denominations they may severally choose. Teach them no longer "sectarian," but "Catholic" truths ; not infractions of the laws of nature by miracles, but exemplifications of them in hydraulics and pneumatics. Neither heretic nor Turk denies that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles ; that the law of gravitation governs the solar

system; that Julius Cæsar was a great commander; that Davy's discoveries in chemistry, and Cuvier's in zoology, have benefited the world. Teach men, therefore, mathematics and astronomy, history, chemistry, botany, and zoology, which they *are* agreed upon, and leave them to themselves on morals and religion, where they are *not* agreed. "Some think that we must effect a radical change in our educational system—that we must substitute *living science for dead literature.*" A theory built on the bones of the Mammoth or the Ichthyosaurus is *living science*; one resting on the dictum, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," or that other, "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," is *dead literature*. In three hundred years Protestantism has produced at least three hundred interpretations of the latter. Who would be so unreasonable as to expect it to teach any one of them to the exclusion of the rest? This idea struck the great administrative genius of the age. He modestly insinuated it in his address to the Tamworth reading-room; but he saw that it was worthy of a wider application; he discerned in it a panacea for the wrongs of a nation, and upon it he founded the Queen's Colleges in Ireland.

3. But it is not only the whole system of objective dogmatic truth which Protestantism has reduced to the condition of a private opinion; not only morals which it has so messed and mauled that it can entrust no professor to teach them. On these two depends the cultivation of the inner and more secret life of the soul. And this it leaves a wilderness. By its own principles it cannot enter there. The imagination may revel in the most dangerous sins of thought; it meddles not with them. Here is a science, one of the utmost conceivable importance, one of universal application, of primary necessity, which it totally ignores. The science which produces saintliness is part of its *dead literature*. It is very true that without the mother it cannot have the children; and as the justification it teaches remains to the end external, the daily and incessant task of purification which Catholicism

imposes may be got rid of altogether, or, at least, left to every one to perform unaided. Here, then, it passes over, untouched and unrelieved, the worst of all slaveries, a moral slavery, which likewise overclouds the intellect on all matters which rise above the material life. And here it is especially that since the rise of Protestantism the great Catholic mother has put forth her superhuman strength and heavenly compassion. Here it is that she has descended into the depths of humanity, and while redeeming multitudes from the dominion of former vices, and restoring them to the divine kingdom, whom a miserable apostate system suffers to perish as the helots of crime, she has formed others to the most perfect resemblance of their Lord, and wrought into them the divine lineaments with such skill and power, that perhaps the ages of martyrdom can scarcely produce their Ignatius, their Philip Neri, or their Theresa.

4. Education is felt by men of all religious and political parties to be the great question of the day, which is to determine not merely the well-being, but the very existence of society in the next generation. And among all these parties, too, there is felt a great zeal, an earnest desire to improve and extend education. And yet equal to the importance of the question is felt to be its difficulty. Why is it that, with the best will in the world, no scheme can be contrived by one sect of Protestants which will satisfy even another sect of the same Protestants? Why is the National Society for the Education of the Poor divided in itself, and yet at daggers-drawn with the Committee of Council? Why is every forthcoming scheme looked upon by Dissenters with bitter suspicion? From Mr. Denison to Mr. Fox the same difficulty stares them in the face; *they are not agreed upon any system of religious or moral truth to be taught*. As there is no authority on earth to which all bow, the opinion of every man is as good as his neighbour's, or, at least, he thinks so. It is not merely with us, but with themselves, that Protestants are completely at issue here. Human ingenuity cannot devise a

plan which shall satisfy at once Churchmen and Dissenters; and the notable scheme of the State, giving a merely secular education, and banishing religion into the background, is but a desperate attempt to find a way out of the wood, by sacrificing the intractable element altogether. Now this difficulty, which spreads like a moral paralysis over the frame of society, frustrating zeal and self-denial, is entirely the making of Protestantism. To Catholics it does not exist. On the most important of human concerns—on the element which enters into all human knowledge—which pervades all arts and sciences, and is the main instrument of education—we are of one mind. Our religion is not our hindrance, but the very pillar of our strength. The State Delilah is but begging of Samson to surrender the secret source of his power, when it asks us to lower ourselves to the condition of those who have no faith and no dogmas, to whom baptism is a bone of endless contention, and the apostolical succession a disputed point, maintained by curate, suppressed by canon, but scouted by primate. We are not in the sad condition of those who are “ever learning, but never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.” We need not take refuge in physical science from the perpetual aberrations of the spiritual mind. We are not reduced to exclude the chapel from our educational structures, because we are not agreed upon a worship to be offered in it. Before we yield this great point, let Protestantism rather own its real misery, that it is but a mere agent of dissolution, it can but lop off one after another the divine gifts bestowed upon the Church, it can but pervert, dislocate, or misrepresent her system, and narrow the inheritance of divine truths; it cannot build one stone upon another in Christian life, from the child’s initiation to the rest of the departed. It begins with doubt, and ends in search; how can it educate? One must *possess* truth before one can *impart* it. “Buy the truth, and sell it not,” it is written. We *have* bought it, with three centuries of persecution, material and moral. We *have* it, full and complete, the source of future growth and expansion

illimitable. Many who were once its enemies have come to us, won by celestial beauty, and humbly bowing down to its yoke. Shall we now surrender one atom of it to those who already fear its approach, who so dread its power that they have taken up the discarded arms of material force, and, powerless to persuade, have descended once more to persecute? who, seeing the moral dissolution of their own Establishment, think to arrest the progress of Catholicism by a bill of pains and penalties?

5. Withdraw from the world the Christian idea, that is, a society divinely constituted, to which the possession of spiritual and moral truth is guaranteed, by incorporation with which man is taken into the circle of a higher existence, brought under divine influences, and taught to labour through the course of this passing life for a superior inheritance; withdraw this, and the hopes, the desires, the passions of men become fixed on material wealth, as the standard of this world without reference to the next. Now, the alienation of men from the study of spiritual and moral truth, the universal extolling of the physical sciences, and disproportionate cultivation of the mechanical arts, as improved by the former, and ministering to all the comforts and conveniences of life, prove to what an extent this has been done. The state of England appeared of late to a thoughtful foreigner a picture of Rome under the late Emperors. Another eminent though misguided writer of the present day says: "Civilization, which terminates in corruption, when improvements in sensible things bear the palm over moral progress, and facts over ideas, produces ordinarily a species of speculative and practical sensualism, which differs little from impiety." * This seems exactly to express our state. A boundless capitalized wealth, ramifying over the world, evermore multiplying and reproducing itself, stimulating and rewarding all manner of artificial inventions, with just so much religion as does not interfere with the enjoyment of all this, constitutes

* Gioberti,

what may be called the naturalism of society. This spirit is ever repeating the boast of Augustus, that he found Rome of brick, and left it of marble. Nero went further still in his house of gold ; nor looked he with greater scorn on the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, when brought before him as Jewish vagabonds, preaching among the gorgeous palaces and temples of Rome the doctrine of the Cross, than looks this modern spirit now on any religion which teaches suffering, the necessity of a definite belief, and the supremacy of dogmatic truth. It accepts the Bible, but on one condition, to interpret it for itself. Its great cities are crowded with practical infidels ; its country villages, with the old churches of another faith in their centre, and a religion without worship, celebrated one day in the week, have relapsed into Paganism, yet it proclaims itself as the humanizer of the world, the home of knowledge and liberty—a liberty of the fallen will, a knowledge which excludes the Being of God and the spiritual nature of man from its objects.

6. And this spirit, too, has found itself an organ, which exactly represents its interests—an organ all-powerful, as it thinks, in its forces, universal in its range. The new ruler of our modern world is Journalism. Within the last fifty years, it has shot up among us to the stature of a giant. What was once the mere communication of news, threatens to absorb into itself all powers of civil government ; to dictate decisions on all questions, religious, social, political, artistic, literary ; to wield all moral influences in the world, and exercise over man's inmost nature a despotism far more crushing than that of Russian serfdom. Organic changes in our written Constitution are but the reflection of its will. In France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, it is neither king, parliaments, presidents, ministers, nor congresses, which rule, but newspapers. The daily press is the pretorian guard of modern States, who give and take away an empire to which that of old Rome was limited in range ; for no part of our complex modern life, not taste, nor science, nor morals, nor

religion, are free from its prying search and imperious decision. The tyrant is everywhere. It is not an era which promises peace or stability, but perpetual change; a levelling and superficial literature; a liberalism which hates all truth as exclusive; and lynch law for all those who do not obey this new voice of the people.

It needs not the gift of prophecy to see that the Duke's question as to our parliamentary reform twenty years ago, "How will His Majesty's Government be carried on?" will merge under this new power into a larger one, "How will society be carried on?"

7. Thus we find, in all the different phases of society, the substitution of the human kingdom, whose end is nationality, for the divine kingdom, which is the unity of Catholicism. And, indeed, those who do not apprehend the divine kingdom, must almost of necessity fall back on the human or national as the highest object. Citizenship, by the law and need of his nature, man must have; if it be not the heavenly, it will be the earthly: *civitas Dei* or *civitas Diaboli*. In the rejection of the idea of the Church, and with it of dogmatic truth, in the leaving the inner life an uncultivated waste, in reducing education to instruction in those arts and sciences which deal with nature and matter, but reach not spirit, and so giving over the higher part of man to the empire of chance or self-will, or individualism, in weighing all things by the standard of wealth, and the effect produced on material convenience, and in that dominion of journalism which is the expression of all these, we see the recession of society back into the status of ancient Paganism; that is, it takes up with regard to the Church of Christ, with all its divine gifts and privileges, summed up in one word, infallibility, the position which ancient heathen society held towards that body of primitive tradition which originally came down from God. Modern heresy corrupts the Christian tradition, as Paganism did the primitive. The past year has given us, in the Great Exhibition, an instance of what this society admires, loves, and

values, of the unity which it *can* conceive, that is, the nations of the earth connected by increasing trade and reciprocal interests, and the satisfying of man's sensuous nature, by all artificial productions. The same year has given us, too, as remarkable an instance of what this society *cannot* conceive—the unity which it is determined not to acknowledge. The cry against the Catholic hierarchy, from beginning to end, was, that it invaded the sovereignty of the nation—that is, the nation would not open its eyes to the existence of a spiritual jurisdiction, or the thought of a kingdom of souls. It reproduced, unknowingly, the feeling of the old heathen Emperor, that a Priest sitting in St. Peter's See was as little to be tolerated as a competitor on the throne. The Prime Minister argued, with much simplicity, that it was the exclusive pretensions of the Supreme Pontiff which gave offence; if he would but admit that Catholics were one of the many Christian sects, he would meet with no opposition, but live on sufferance like the rest. This is the head and front of our offending, in the reign of Victoria as of Diocletian, that we claim to be a kingdom. For being a king our Lord was crucified, and the world is ever reproducing against His mystical body the accusation and the punishment. And so Catholicism “confines the intellect and enslaves the soul,” by setting before it a great circle of supernatural truth which it could not discover for itself, and cannot subject to itself by analysis, but must be content to receive and adore. Catholic ignorance is the preference of moral and spiritual to physical truth: and Catholic slavery the tenet that man must suffer before he can enjoy; and that the Cross is the measure of the world.

II. The second proposition which we have to maintain follows from the whole course of the preceding argument. It is the impossibility that those who disbelieve the Catholic faith can educate Catholics.

St. Bonaventure has given us above the basis of all true education: “As all these illuminations derived their origin

from One Light, so all these sorts of knowledge are directed to the knowledge of the Holy Scripture, are shut up in it, and completed in it, and by means of it are ordered to the illumination of eternity." In man, the highest work of God in this visible creation, all knowledge, whether of the mechanical and industrial arts, of rational, of natural, or of moral philosophy, must be subordinate to that relation in which he stands to God, his beginning and his end. And the root of all his moral knowledge is laid in supernatural truths, which come to him by tradition and inspiration from God, and are grasped by an inward power of his soul. Thus his other lights are "shut up" in the fourth light, that of Grace and Holy Scripture, and are "completed in it" and "by means of it are ordered to the illumination of eternity." The great philosopher begins his moral treatise, by telling us that one art is subordinate to another art, and one science to another science, "as harness-making to riding, and riding to the art of war; so that in all these the ends of the superior are preferable to all that are ranged under them as being pursued for their sake. If, then, there be any end of actions which we choose for itself, and all the rest for it, and if we do not choose everything for the sake of something else, for thus the procession is infinite and our search vain and fruitless, then must this be the supreme good." * Now, that which the great heathen intellect had laboriously to search for, we have brought home to us by a supernatural gift, and guarded by an infallible authority; the one relation in which man stands to God; and so his proper *work*, his appointed *end* as a creature. To mould him for this work, to order him unto this end, is the province of education; the *leading forth* as it were of the creature to the Creator. And every art and every science through the whole reign of mind and matter which is not used as a ladder for this ascent, is perverted from its proper object; and this is a great source of human error, to make that which is subordinate superior, and the means the end. For every portion of God's empire bears a natural witness to its

* Aristotle, Ethics, b. i. c. i.

Maker; every art of civilized life is an inspiration from Him; every science is but the reflection of some one of His attributes.

“Guardando nel suo Figlio con l'Amore
 Che l'uno e l'altro eternalmente spira,
 Lo primo ed ineffabile Valore,
 Quanto per mente o per occhio si gira,
 Con tanto ordine fe', ch' esser non puote
 Senza gustur di lui, chi ciò rimira.”*

But as the ruder ancient idolatry showed itself in a worship of sensible forms and self-chosen symbols, stopping short of God in some creature, so the modern more refined idolatry of science, art, and literature, has pursued these in and for themselves as ends; resting in them selfishly, and turning the very remembrances of the Supreme Benefactor into means of forgetting Him. “The original fault,” says a philosopher, “having infected human nature all throughout, reflects itself in all its points, and communicates to them its intrinsic vice, which consists in transporting the ultimate end of *The Being* into that which *exists*. Thus, for instance, the original sin of civilization consists in regarding temporal utility as its ulterior end; the original sin of science, in placing its beginning and its end outside of God; that of literature and the arts, in aiming at the agreeable, rather than at true beauty; and so of the rest.”† This was the crime of the mystic Babylon. “Thou hast said, I shall be a lady for ever. Thy wisdom and thy knowledge, this hath deceived thee. And thou hast said in thy heart, I Am, and besides Me there is no other.”‡ And it was precisely on commerce and the mechanical arts, thus pursued and gloried in, that the woe was denounced. “The merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her, for no man shall buy their merchandise any more. Merchandise of gold and silver and precious stones, and of pearls and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner of vessels of ivory, and all manner of vessels of precious stones, and of brass, and of iron, and of marble, and

* Paradiso, c. x. i.

† Gioberti.

‡ Isaiah xlvii. 7-10.

cinnamon, and odours, and ointment, and frankincense and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men." "In one hour are so great riches come to nought, and every ship-master, and all that sail into the lake, and mariners, and as many as work in the sea, stood afar off, and cried, seeing the place of her burning, saying : What city is like to this great city ?" * As these are the words of Scripture in exhibiting the great apostacy itself, it is evident that this is *the* danger to which education is exposed, of being seduced by the creature, and in very admiration of the wisdom, the glory, the beauty, the skill, which are spread over creation, drawn away from the great moral Ruler, whose eyes are for ever fixed on us, looking us through and through, whether the hearts which He has created for Himself are indeed faithful to Him. Now, from every false standard of education, and so from idolatry of the material arts and physical sciences, which besets England in this century, we, as Catholics, if we be true to ourselves, are divinely protected. We are the children of that great Mother of souls who, from the beginning, has fulfilled her maternal guardianship, as well amid the seductions of the old Roman idolatry, the ruins of northern barbarism, the yet unformed and vigorous youth of Europe's intellect, as now in the soft sensualism of infidelity, setting before us that all instruction must be begun and ended in this—that we are moral agents to be led by the choice of free-will to a supernatural end. In all that concerns the true relation of man to God, she speaks a clear and consistent language ; she has the measure of man's inner nature ; can penetrate its folds, relieve its troubles, and calm its misgivings. She can nourish and she can heal ; can guide the most timid, and overmaster the most potent spirit. She views the whole circle of the arts and sciences from their centre, in their due subordination, and the harmony willed by God. Undazzled by the light of the natural sciences, she bids them follow in the train of their elder and nobler sister,

* Apoc. xviii.

Theology. With her, the undying part of man is that by which she values all the rest; she seeks, above all, to determine his moral choice. Thus she sets forth the divine counsel to man, and the interpretest of God's will becomes the educatress of humanity.

But it is here precisely—here in the central point between God and man—that Protestantism, by its revolt against God and the Church, has fallen into a state of absolute impotence to educate. It does not speak with any one consistent or determinate voice as to the relation between God and man. It is not agreed upon what He has revealed; and can but interpret a hundred different ways the volume which it not only asserts to contain the Revelation, but to contain it so written on the surface, that none can fail to understand it. About all Christian mysteries, that is, the whole range of the supernatural and the superintelligible, it can only wrangle with its several, not members, but sections. Being inorganic, it has parts, but no limbs. What can it do then with man, so far forth as he is a *spiritual* agent? A divine authority distinctly setting forth a revealed truth is needed to educate spirits. When for these Protestantism refers men to the Holy Scriptures, it acts as a civil governor would do, who referred litigants to Blackstone's Commentaries for the settlement of their suit. That is, it abdicates the spiritual government of man, and leaves him to his private judgment; whereas, the very office of education is to mould and determine that judgment. As little does it venture to govern the moral agent. What Protestant father's heart, what clergyman's, will not bear witness to this fact, set forth at the commencement of the most winning of modern tales?—

“ Charles Reding was the only son of a clergyman who was in possession of a valuable benefice in a midland county. His father intended him for orders, and sent him at a proper age to a public school. He had long revolved in his mind the respective advantages and disadvantages of public and private education, and had decided in favour of the former. ‘Seclu-

sion,' he said, 'is no security for virtue. There is no telling what is in a boy's heart; he may look as open and happy as usual, and be as kind and attentive, when there is a great deal wrong going on within. The heart is a secret with its Maker; no one on earth can hope to get at it, or to touch it. I have a cure of souls; what do I really know of my parishioners? Nothing; their hearts are sealed books to me. And this dear boy, he comes close to me; he throws his arms round me, but his soul is as much out of my sight as if he were at the antipodes. I am not accusing him of reserve, dear fellow; his very love and reverence for me keep him in a sort of charmed solitude. I cannot expect to get at the bottom of him :

'Each in his hidden sphere of bliss or woe
Our hermit spirits dwell.'

"It is our lot here below. No one on earth can know Charles's secret thoughts. Did I guard him here at home ever so well, yet, in due time, it might be found that a serpent had crept into the Eden of his innocence. Boys do not fully know what is good and what is evil; they do wrong things at first almost innocently. Novelty hides vice from them; there is no one to warn them or give them rules; and they become slaves of sin while they are learning what sin is. They go to the university, and suddenly plunge into excesses, the greater in proportion to their experience."*

O most touching and eloquent confession of that impotence, deep-rooted in the system itself, which frustrates in Protestant educationists talents, and zeal, and kindness, even keen-eyed affection and moving example, of their best fruits! What could an Arnold do here? What but send forth into society a host of inquiring minds, earnest and anxious to improve, but without fixed principles or moral anchorage, the chosen spoil and instruments of heresy? Thus, then, by a necessity of its nature, Protestantism remits the moral agent

* Loss and Gain, p. 1.

—as it did the spiritual—to self, to the individual judgment; and so in this point, too, abdicates the office of an educator. In bringing up the young it is driven to discard the idea of any definite religious dogma, and of any inward moral governance: the first, through its intestine divisions, as it acknowledges no living authority; the second, because it professes not to enter into the inward world of the thoughts.

But the man himself, the being capable of praise or blame, subject to conscience, and to eternal reward or punishment, consists in these two things, acceptance or rejection of supernatural truth divinely revealed, choice of moral good or evil, by the exercise of free-will. God has subordinated everything to this. For this, so far as we can judge of final ends, He created the world. The moral act of the creature gifted with intellect and free-will is so precious in His sight, that with reference to it He orders the whole course of the world. The most terrible of all mysteries—the existence of moral evil—finds its only solution here, in the abuse of free-will. How inconceivably valuable then, in the eyes of Him who cannot look on sin, yet permits through thousands of years this hourly repeated multitude of sins, is the right use of free-will, the act of virtue, by which man approaches nearest to God, and as a second cause is an image of the First! Though the act of creation is far beyond our conception, yet far greater still, both in power and in goodness, is the act of redemption, by which the Restorer renders His creature capable, with His help, yet without injury to his own free-will, of concurring with his Maker in a moral end, of determining for himself an eternity. This is the highest point of dignity in man's nature, by which he is weighed both here and hereafter; for which it is as nothing that he should endure countless sorrows, wear away his days in trial, and be put to the most tremendous arbitrament. He must risk the unutterable loss of the Supreme Good through eternity, in order that he may have the privilege of gaining that Supreme Good by his own choice. And as this is what is most precious, so this is what

belongs to the whole species, the power of merit and demerit; a self-imposed limit that God has set to His omnipotence, in order to raise His creature to the likeness of Himself. How slight, how unspeakably slight, in comparison with this, are all other differences in man—differences of intellect, skill in science or art, and in every accomplishment prized by society! If education be to lead man forth to the Creator, herein lies its seat, in moving this free-will to the all-important choice, in preserving it from seductions and false shows of good, in winning betimes the intellect to truth, and the heart to goodness.

No. It is the last invention of Protestantism to resign this ground altogether. Dogmatic truth it declares to be doubtful, and moral agency beyond its control. It professes acquaintance with all sorts of gases, but declines managing the conscience. It treats of every disease which affects the blood, except concupiscence. Its professors are to write history, without the bias of morality or religion. It promises to impart every science, without consideration of their final ends. "The superior light of grace embraces," says St. Bonaventure, "the eternal generation and incarnation of the Divine Word, the order of living, and the union of the soul with God;" these are the only points which the new system of education excludes from its encyclopædia. It is not that the physical sciences may not be made an effective instrument in disciplining the mind; it is not that they are not full of value in themselves, replete with sources of interest for the intellect, as well as contributing to material wealth. It is not, therefore, in teaching these, and in applying them carefully to the industrial arts, that this new system is objectionable. The order, beauty, and harmony of the universe as God's work, are richly exhibited in them, and worthy of man's study; their use is obvious, and their cultivation most desirable. The sin lies in ignoring their relation to a higher knowledge, in excluding the cultivation of the spirit which should inform them from being the basis of education. This system has

infidelity for its first principle, because, while giving a *public* and authorized instruction in languages, sciences, arts, and literature, it leaves religion and morality to be dealt with *privately*, as open questions, on which men may innocently differ. A teaching body, therefore, so constructed, has no soul. In religion it is neutral, in all else positive. By the law of its being it preaches indifference to all its scholars in spiritual truth. Its professors, as individual men, have their private belief, and are Jews, Protestants, Infidels, or Catholics, as the case may be; but, *as Professors*, they simply ignore spiritual truth. In treating their specific subjects, whether language, history, abstract or experimental science, they are to exclude the divine and moral element; instead of reducing all arts to theology, which is the Christian scheme of education, they are to banish theology from all arts. No particle of matter, nothing within the bounds of time and space, is unworthy of their inquiry, save the point contested by modern thinkers, God and His dealings with man. What, we may ask, is infidelity, if this be not?

As all training of the moral and spiritual being is here discarded for the simple reason that the teaching body is at issue about what that training should be, it results that instruction takes the place of education. However elaborate and complete this may be, it still leaves the greatest work of all undone. Again, the finer influences of religion, as well as its direct teaching, are cut off. Religion is, in a high degree, a matter of personal influences. A sort of moral electric fluid is continually passing from all teachers to their pupils; if this be not positively Catholic, it is certain to be positively uncatholic. The supposed neutrality is unreal. All the gain is on the side of Protestantism and Infidelity. The real concession is to them; and private judgment sits enthroned in the very *penetralia* of education. As free trade stands to the Catholic Church, so this system of teaching to a Catholic university. If the nations of the earth can be brought into a permanent bond of union by considerations

of material interest, and exchange of commodities, then individual souls may live in harmony without a common faith and hope. But a little time will show whether such a promise be not delusive. What could Antichrist more desire than such a state of things? Yet we are told that his times will be times of trouble, confusion, and extreme suffering.

But what must be the effect on the young of a system of teaching in which all forms of religious belief, or unbelief, are indifferent? The mere statement of such a principle seems heavier than any condemnation which can be expressed in language. Perfect indifference, it seems, is the very crown of the undertaking; its realization the very token of success. What a mistake must the Author of our religion have made in uttering these words, at the first promulgation of His faith, "He that believeth not shall be condemned!" How wrong the Church in interpreting His words to man, "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus!" The *Belfast Mercury*, a zealous advocate of the new system, says in this present month (November), as quoted for approval by the *Times* :

"We have taken the trouble of endeavouring to ascertain whether or not the different religious denominations are represented in the lists which we publish, and the result of our inquiry is, in the highest degree, satisfactory. If it were allowable to show to what denomination each student belongs, the public would see in the details as complete an illustration of the united system as could be desired. But to do this would be to deviate from the principles of the colleges, in which, except as far as the Deans of Residence are concerned, *denominational distinctions are set aside and disregarded*. But, we may mention, that in lists of honours all parties are represented, and represented, too, in a manner which shows how thoroughly *the high principle of the system* has found a response in the public mind. We might refer, in proof of this, to the scholarships for any of the years. Let us take one of the lists as an example, though any of the others would equally illustrate our remarks. We find in one division a Roman Catholic

holding the first place, followed by a Unitarian, after whom come several students of the General Assembly, while a Roman Catholic brings up the rear. Turning to the other division, we find a different state of affairs. There a student of the Established Church leads; next him comes a Presbyterian of the Assembly, then a Roman Catholic, afterwards Assembly men, and at the close one or two Churchmen. In the lists for another year a General Assembly man leads in one division, and a Methodist in the other, while a Covenanter stands last in the one honourable array, and a Churchman in the other. Such is a fair representation of the state of affairs as exhibited at the examinations that have just concluded. *We trust the time is not far distant when it will not occur to any one to ask of what religion any of the students are; but, for the present, the subject is of the utmost interest, and we have deemed it right to show how admirably the mixed complexion of the students who have gained distinctions corresponds with the principles on which the college is based.*"

From this instructive passage we learn two points: that indifference in religion is a "high principle, which finds response in the public mind;" and that its ultimate result, shortly to be expected, is, that "it will not occur to any one to ask of what religion a student is." It is not of the smallest consequence what you believe, says the defender of the new education.

These several students, then, are connected by a bond, which, whatever else it is, is not religious. We need not ask what sort of belief such a system practically favours, or to which it inclines. The first thing it does is to call upon Catholic youth to regard with respect, as teachers, those who, if Catholics, are teachers upon the tenure of keeping their faith within their own bosom, and if not, are looked upon by our supreme authority, the Church of God, either as very guilty, or as very unfortunate.

Again, it sets up a standard totally different from that of the Church, and opposed to it. It has commendations,

honours, and rewards, for languages, arts, and science; it teaches them with authority, and promulgates them to the best of its ability. It does none of these things for religion, true or false. Its highest merit is, to leave that alone, considering it a boon to let the Catholic rest in his faith, as the unbeliever in his heresy, for, indeed, it knows neither, and is superior to both. Scarcely had we written these words, when we found them thus strongly corroborated in the letter of the Bishop of Liège, respecting the installation of a royal college of mixed education, dated October 21, 1851.

“The Belgian constitution,” he says, like our own, “guarantees the entire liberty of worship, and nothing could stand in greater opposition to that liberty than to force Catholic parents to entrust their children to men who are not so, or to oblige those children to receive religious instruction from a chair placed by the side of, or on a level with, that where persons would teach diametrically the contrary, or in the presence of other professors whose conduct would imply the denial of the education received.

“And, nevertheless, it is the last unconstitutional and unreasonable and, I may say, anti-social system, which has become the stone of stumbling. Is it not true, Sir, that the policy has been adopted of maintaining the paradoxical principle in virtue of which it would be free to the State, it would be *even more conformable to the constitution*, to people the establishments of middle instruction with literary men of all kinds, Catholics, Protestants, religious, sceptical, practising or not practising their religion—(and would not the recent organization of our Athénées furnish more than one proof of this?)—because, according to this paradox, scientific instruction, given it matters not by whom, would be the great, the only object with which the State has seriously to occupy itself, and that religion, religious education, would be nothing but a mere accessory, which it would be better to abandon to the family and to the Church. Have they not the air of saying to us, Give us a Catholic Priest, since article eight of the law requires

it ; we will pay him well—we will take care that he shall be enabled freely to give his lesson of religion—we will even provide that there shall be none but respectable people in the establishment ; leave that to us, but do not distress yourselves about what these respectable people may think, believe, or do in religious matters—you have nothing to do with that ; worship is free ; we are, as a power, dogmatically tolerant ; if you do not wish to be as we are, go your way, we will do without you ? Yes, this is the position they have taken ; they are bent on doing without us, because we, Sir, have before us the *non possumus* of Scripture.”

He adds, further on—

“ When the child, who allows nothing to escape his observation, hears the almomer say that it is a grave duty to go to Mass, to confession, to the Holy Table, and when he sees that men, whom he is taught to respect, his professors of history, literature, etc., never go there, does not this child rapidly come to doubt of the dogma as well as of the precept ? and thenceforward, the passions aiding the work, is not the loss of his faith as imminent as that of his morals ? ”

Can it be forgotten, ought it to be unmentioned, that the power which nominates such teachers is the bitterest foe upon earth of the Catholic faith and name ; that for three centuries it has renewed against it, in this country, the persecutions of the early ages ; that, within the last twelve months, it has denounced our most sacred mysteries—the very sacrifice of our Lord Himself—as “ the mummery of superstition ; ” that it has hounded on men to burn our chief pastors in effigy, and to add to the funeral pyre the image of her whom all generations call blessed ; that it has anew, by a legislative act, proscribed the spiritual jurisdiction of our supreme head ; and that the main organ which supports this system of education exults at the draining away of Celtic blood from Ireland, in order that the Saxon Protestant may occupy the soil ? If the professed rule of a system so favoured be religious indifference—the leaving each student in quiet possession of his religion or his

infidelity—can we doubt what its real tone and moral atmosphere will be? can we think that it will fail to justify the anticipations of its founders?

Let us pass to another point. What has been the position of the Church towards national education and the development of the human mind in former times?

Since she emerged from the persecution of the Roman Emperors, she has been the great educating body in the world. She has headed the march of thought, and systematized knowledge as it advanced. Her Bishops, in their several dioceses, maintained schools; her monastic bodies, in the darkest and most evil times of revolution and conquest, fostered and propagated whatever learning there was in the world. As Europe settled into its more modern state, she founded in the universities schools of a wider range than the old diocesan or conventual bodies. From age to age, and in every country, the Holy See is found giving its sanction to these great institutions. Pope Gregory XVI., in his decree of 13th December, 1833, declares that the most illustrious universities of Europe were founded with the consent and support of the Roman Pontiffs. How well this statement is supported may be seen by the following catalogue:—

In England, the universities of *Oxford* and *Cambridge* were enriched with many privileges by the Popes. In Ireland, that of *Dublin* received the rights of a university from John XXII., in 1320.

In Belgium, that of *Louvain* was founded in 1425, by Martin V.; that of *Douay*, at the request of Philip II., on the plan of Louvain, by Pius IV., in 1559.

In Denmark, that of *Copenhagen*, after being planned by Eric VIII., in 1418, with the consent of Martin V., was set up by King Christian I., in 1478, and enriched by Sixtus IV., with privileges similar to those of Bologna.

In France, that of *Orleans* was confirmed in 1307, by Clement V.; that of *Bordeaux* was set up in 1440, by Eugenius IV.; that of *Cahors*, founded in 1332, by John XXII.;

that of *Dole*, confirmed in 1423, by Martin V.; that of *Poitiers*, founded in 1431, by King Charles VII., and confirmed by Martin V.; that of *Pont-a-Mouson*, founded by Gregory XIII., in 1572, at the request of Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine; that of *Rheims*, issuing from the foundation of Eugenius III., in 1148, at the time a Council was holding there; that of *Toulouse*, founded by the Pope's legate in 1228, confirmed by Gregory IX. in 1233, afterwards enriched with further privileges by Innocent VI.; that of *Besançon*, founded by Nicolas V. in 1450.

In Germany, that of *Bamberg*, founded in 1648, by the Bishop Melchior Otho, and confirmed by Innocent X.; that of *Bale*, founded in 1457, by Pius II.; that of *Cologne*, founded in 1385, by Urban VI., and largely privileged; that of *Dillingen*, confirmed by Julius III. in 1552; that of *Erfurt*, made a university, first by Clement III. at Avignon, in 1388, during the schism, and then by Urban VI. at Rome, in 1389; that of *Frankfort*, granted by Alexander VI., enlarged in 1506, by Julius II., and more fully confirmed in 1515, by Leo X.; that of *Fulda*, set up in 1732, by Clement XIII.; that of *Friburg* in Bresgau, and *Grißwald* in Pomerania, confirmed in 1456, by Callixtus III., and that of *Gratz* in Styria, in 1385, by Sixtus V.; that of *Halle*, granted to Albert, Cardinal Archbishop of Magdeburg, in 1531, by Clement VII.; that of *Heidelberg*, first confirmed by Benedict XII., about 1341, then by Urban VI., in 1386; by Boniface IX., in 1393; by Paul III., and Julius III., between 1544 and 1555; that of *Ingolstadt*, confirmed in 1459, by Pius II.; that of *Leipsic* in 1409, by Alexander V.; that of *Mayence* in 1477, by Sixtus IV.; that of *Olmutz*, in Moravia, in 1572, by Gregory XIII.; that of *Paderborn* in 1616, by Paul V.; that of *Prague* in 1348, by Clement VI.; that of *Rostock* in 1419, by Martin V.; that of *Salzburg* in 1625, by Urban VIII.; that of *Tubingen* in 1477, by Sixtus IV.; that of *Vienna* in 1365, by Urban V.; that of *Wittemburg* in 1502, by Alexander VI., and in 1506, by Julius II.; that of *Wratistlaw* in Silesia in 1623; that of *Treves* in 1454, by Nicolas V., and in 1474, by Sixtus IV.

In Spain, Italy, and Portugal, all existing universities were either founded or approved by the Roman Pontiffs.

In Poland, that of *Braunsberg* was confirmed by Gregory XIII., about 1572; that of *Cracow*, begun by King Casimer in 1344, privileged by Urban V. in 1354, completed in 1400, by King Vladislas Jagellon, with the consent of Boniface IX.; that of *Wilna*, founded in 1576, by King Stephen Bathory, confirmed in 1579, by Gregory XIII.

In Sweden, the ancient school of *Upsal* was erected into a university, by Sixtus IV. in 1477, at the request of its Archbishop, James Ulpho, and endowed with the same privileges as the university of Bologna.*

In these high schools whatever knowledge the world possessed was most diligently cultivated. So well established was the hierarchy of the arts and sciences under Theology their queen, that the Church, so far from feeling jealousy of them, and the Holy See in particular, encouraged them to the utmost. Especially it recommended and established professorships in the various branches of learning then pursued. In England, the mediæval Bishops were the great founders of colleges. But great as were the benefactions of a Wykeham and a Waynflete, and so many others in our own country, yet for munificence and love of learning, one who was a Spaniard, an Archbishop, and a Cardinal far outshines them all. Single-handed he planned, he built, and he endowed, not a college, but a university, with ten colleges, and forty-two chairs. Thus was the noble-minded and saintly Ximenes employed while Luther was still an obedient monk in his cell, and Henry VIII. a Catholic monarch, and a loving husband. It is worth while to quote the account of the American historian; for what a single old man did three centuries ago, may not the faith and

* The above information is derived from H. Conring, *De Antiquitatibus Academicis Dissertatio VII.* (Gottingæ, 1739); John George Hagelgans, *Orbis Literatus Academicus Germanico-Europæus*, (Francfort, 1737); and C. Meiners, *Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der hohen Schulen unsers Erdtheils* (Gotting. 1802-5); writers who, though not Catholic, yet admit that the Roman Pontiffs deserved well of the republic of letters. They are quoted in the *recueil* of documents concerning the foundation of the university of Louvain.

the love of a nation, which has passed through the fire for its Catholicism, do now? Cannot ten millions of Catholics in Ireland, Great Britain, and America, rival even one Ximenes in the Middle Ages before the Reformation was heard of?

"This illustrious prelate, in the meanwhile, was busily occupied, in his retirement at Alcalá de Henares, with watching over the interests and rapid development of his infant university. This institution was too important in itself, and exercised too large an influence over the intellectual progress of the country, to pass unnoticed in a history of the present reign.

"As far back as 1497, Ximenes had conceived the idea of establishing a university in the ancient town of Alcalá, where the salubrity of the air, and the sober, tranquil complexion of the scenery, on the beautiful borders of the Henares, seemed well suited to academic study and meditation. He even went so far as to obtain plans at this time for his buildings from a celebrated architect. Other engagements, however, postponed the commencement of the work till 1500, when the Cardinal himself laid the corner-stone of the principal college with a solemn ceremonial and invocation of the blessing of Heaven on his designs. From that hour, amid all the engrossing cares of Church and State, he never lost sight of this great object. When at Alcalá he might be frequently seen on the ground with the rule in his hand, taking the admeasurements of the building, and stimulating the industry of the workmen by seasonable rewards.

"The plans were too extensive, however, to admit of being speedily accomplished. Beside the principal college of San Ildefonso, named in honour of the patron saint of Toledo, there were nine others, together with an hospital for the reception of invalids at the university. These edifices were built in the most substantial manner, and such parts as admitted of it, as the libraries, refectories, and chapels, were finished with elegance, and even splendour. The city of Alcalá underwent many important and extensive alterations

in order to render it more worthy of being the seat of a great and flourishing university. The stagnant water was carried off by drains, the streets were paved, old buildings removed, and new and spacious avenues thrown open.

“At the expiration of eight years the Cardinal had the satisfaction of seeing the whole of his vast design completed, and every apartment of the spacious pile carefully furnished with all that was requisite for the comfort and accommodation of the student. It was, indeed, a noble enterprise, more particularly when viewed as the work of a private individual. As such it raised the deepest admiration in Francis I., when he visited the spot, a few years after the Cardinal’s death. ‘Your Ximenes,’ said he, ‘has executed more than I should have dared to conceive; he has done with his single hand what in France it has cost a line of kings to accomplish.’

“The erection of the buildings, however, did not terminate the labours of the primate, who now assumed the task of digesting a scheme of instruction and discipline for his infant seminary. In doing this he sought light wherever it was to be found; and borrowed many useful hints from the venerable university of Paris. His system was of the most enlightened kind, being directed to call all the powers of the student into action, and not to leave him a mere passive recipient in the hands of his teachers. Besides daily recitations and lectures, he was required to take part in public examinations and discussions, so conducted as to prove effectually his talent and acquisitions. In these gladiatorial displays Ximenes took the deepest interest, and often encouraged the generous emulation of the scholar by attending in person.

“Two provisions may be noticed as characteristic of the man. One that the salary of a professor should be regulated by the number of his disciples. Another, that every professor should be re-eligible at the expiration of every four years. It was impossible that any servant of Ximenes should sleep on his post.

“Liberal foundations were made for indigent students,

especially in divinity. Indeed, theological studies, or rather such a general course of study as should properly enter into the education of a Christian minister, was the avowed object of the institution. But in this preparatory discipline the comprehensive mind of Ximenes embraced nearly the whole circle of sciences taught in other universities. Out of the forty-two chairs, indeed, twelve only were dedicated to divinity and the canon law; while fourteen were appropriated to grammar, rhetoric, and the ancient classics; studies which probably found especial favour with the Cardinal, as furnishing the only keys to a correct criticism and interpretation of the Scriptures. Of these professorships, six were appropriated to theology; six to canon law; four to medicine; one to anatomy; one to surgery; eight to the arts, as they were called, embracing logic, physics, and metaphysics; one to ethics; one to mathematics; four to the ancient languages; four to rhetoric; and six to grammar.

“Having completed his arrangements, the Cardinal sought the most competent agents for carrying his plans into execution; and this indifferently from abroad and at home. His mind was too lofty for narrow local prejudices, and the tree of knowledge, he knew, bore fruit in every clime. He took especial care that the emolument should be sufficient to tempt talent from obscurity, and from quarters however remote, where it was to be found. In this he was perfectly successful, and we find the university catalogue at this time inscribed with the names of the most distinguished scholars, in their various departments, many of whom we are enabled to appreciate, by the enduring memorials of erudition which they have bequeathed to us.

“In July, 1508, the Cardinal received the welcome intelligence that his academy was opened for the admission of pupils; and in the following month the first lecture, being on Aristotle’s ethics, was publicly delivered. Students soon flocked to the university, attracted by the reputation of its professors, its ample apparatus, its thorough system of in-

struction, and, above all, its splendid patronage, and the high character of its founder. We have no information of their number in Ximenes's lifetime; but it must have been very considerable, since no less than seven thousand came out to receive Francis I. on his visit to the university within twenty years after it was opened.

“Five years after this period, in 1513, King Ferdinand, in an excursion made for the benefit of his declining health, paid a visit to Alcalá. Ever since his return from Oran, the Cardinal, disgusted with public life, had remained with a few brief exceptions in his own diocese, devoted solely to his personal and professional duties. It was with proud satisfaction that he now received his sovereign, and exhibited to him the noble testimony of the great objects to which his retirement had been consecrated. The King, whose naturally inquisitive mind no illness could damp, visited every part of the establishment, and attended the examinations, and listened to the public disputations of the scholars with interest. With little learning of his own, he had been made too often sensible of his deficiencies not to appreciate it in others. His acute perception readily discerned the immense benefit to his kingdom, and the glory conferred on his reign by the labours of his ancient minister, and he did ample justice to them in the unqualified terms of his commendation.

“It was on this occasion that the rector of San Ildefonso, the head of the university, came out to receive the king, preceded by his usual train of attendants, with their maces or wands of office. The royal guard at this exhibition called out to them to lay aside these insignia as unbecoming any subject in the presence of his sovereign. ‘Not so,’ said Ferdinand, who had the good sense to perceive that majesty could not be degraded by its homage to letters; ‘not so: this is the seat of the muses, and those who are initiated in their mysteries have the best right to reign here.’”

The historian, after recording the immense expense to which the same Cardinal went in preparing and printing the

first polyglot Bible, "a work of surpassing difficulty, demanding an extensive and critical acquaintance with the most ancient and consequently the rarest manuscripts," for which "the precious collection of the Vatican was liberally thrown open to him, especially under Leo X., whose munificent spirit delighted in the undertaking," for which "he obtained copies of whatever was of value in the other libraries of Italy, and indeed of Europe generally," for which he "imported artists from Germany, and had types cast in the various languages required in his foundries at Alcalá," proceeds:—

"Such were the gigantic projects which amused the leisure hours of this great Prelate. Though gigantic, they were neither beyond his strength to execute, nor beyond the demands of his age and country. They were not like those works which, forced into being by whim or transitory impulse, perish with the breath that made them; but taking deep root were cherished and invigorated by the national sentiment, so as to bear rich fruit for posterity. This was particularly the case with the institution at Alcalá. It soon became the subject of royal and private benefaction. Its founder bequeathed it, at his death, a clear revenue of fourteen thousand ducats. By the middle of the seventeenth century, this had increased to forty-two thousand, and the colleges had multiplied from ten to thirty-five.

"The rising reputation of the new academy, which attracted students from every quarter of the Peninsula to its halls, threatened to eclipse the glories of the ancient seminary at Salamanca, and occasioned bitter jealousies between them. The field of letters, however, was wide enough for both, especially as the one was more immediately devoted to theological preparation, to the entire exclusion of civil jurisprudence, which formed a permanent branch of instruction at the other. In this state of things their rivalry, far from being productive of mischief, might be regarded as salutary by quickening literary ardour, too prone to languish without the spur of competition. Side by side the sister universities

went forward, dividing the public patronage and estimation. As long as the good era of letters lasted in Spain, the academy of Ximenes, under the influence of its admirable discipline, maintained a reputation inferior to none other in the Peninsula, and continued to send forth its sons to occupy the most exalted posts in Church and State, and shed the light of genius and science over their own and future ages."

Such, it appears, was the work of one Franciscan monk, not having the fear of the Bible or of the Reformation before his eyes; of a prince of the Church, so little aware that its policy was "to confine the intellect and enslave the soul," that he was wont, being an excellent biblical critic, to preside at the meetings of the great scholars who were editing his Bible, after their daily labours. "Lose no time, my friends," he would say, "in the prosecution of our glorious work, lest, in the casualties of life, you should lose your patron, or I have to lament the loss of those whose services are of more price in my eyes than wealth and worldly honours."*

This work of Ximenes, unrivalled in splendour as the act of one man, presents itself to us just at the termination of the mediæval period, and in speaking of it we may sum up the position of the Church towards education for the five hundred preceding years. All the universities, scattered over Europe, and established in honour and immunities by the Church's chief pastor during this period, had for their basis Catholic faith and teaching, and for the range of their instruction all that was thought valuable in the human knowledge of the day. Once more has the Holy See come forward, and having, a few years since, exhorted the Belgian Bishops to found afresh, on Catholic principles, the university of Louvain, now in like manner invites the Irish Episcopate to fill up this long-felt need of Ireland. It is demanded by a population more than double that of Belgium, including, as we must, those Catholics in the British empire, and in the United States, who

* Prescott's *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, the Catholic, part ii. ch. 21.

would avail themselves of it. There is not a place within the vast Anglo-Saxon dominions for ten millions of Catholics, where youth of eighteen years and upwards can obtain, from Catholic teachers, the inestimable benefit of university education. They must do homage to the principle of infidelity and religious indifference, in order to obtain the secular instruction of the Queen's Colleges, or they must submit to heretical teaching, and all the temptations which the richest foundation in Europe offers at Trinity College as the price of apostasy. Has there ever in the world existed a greater and more pressing need than this? Have the faith and the morals of Catholics ever been exposed to greater danger? If this need be not supplied, if this danger be not averted, who can forecast the future without alarm? "A mournful experience makes it certain that in these pestiferous universities (of Dublin, Edinburgh, and Glasgow) Irish Catholic youths, almost without number, have made shipwreck both of faith and morals."* Such is the sad lament addressed, lately, by six Irish Bishops to the Prefect of Propaganda. But the Holy See has spoken, and the episcopate has answered even by the voice of a national council, and we doubt not that every private Catholic will do his part. If we want further encouragement, look at the intense hatred shown to the very name of a Catholic university by the Protestant English press. The evil spirit knows his exorciser; his furious outcries forecast his defeat. In the authority of the Holy See we have the guarantee of success. Ireland will add another to the forty-four universities, exclusive of those in Italy, Spain, and Portugal, established by the authority of St. Peter's successor. For its success there are two qualifications which now, as in former times, we consider indispensable. Because, as Christians and Catholics, we require a training of the moral and spiritual nature of man above all other things—because that which excludes, or shifts away from itself, such a responsibility, we must consider no education at all, but the surrender

* "Breves vindiciæ," etc., quoted in the *Tablet*, November 22, 1851.

to Infidelity and Protestantism of the noblest of all arts and sciences, and a plain confession of impotence in the very point where teachers should be most strong—we do not, therefore, rest satisfied with any system which does not embrace, according to their respective merits, all branches of human learning and science, whether physical or mental. This, and no less, is what we look for from the love and generosity of Catholics, to establish in the next few years.

But, after the time of Ximenes, the Church passed into a more troubled period, and encountered the great revolt of the human mind against spiritual authority. At the first outbreak, the power which she had so long exercised of guiding education, and moulding the spirit of man, seemed, in part at least, to be passing from her. For well-nigh a generation it appeared doubtful to what extent disaffection would spread, and instead of beating back the furious spirit of religious sedition by a greater internal energy, she laboured as one scarcely able to collect her powers. Yet all this while God had been fashioning in secret a sharp weapon for her to wield. He was preparing for her again the empire of education. It was the question of that day, as it is of this. Scarcely a few years after the departure of Ximenes to his rest, a gay courtier, a gallant soldier, was stricken down in a border combat of that same land. It was a long and painful wound, and as he lay on his sick bed he passed into the very presence of spiritual things—he saw the two standards and the warring hosts drawn out in world-wide and world-long combat. He saw, too, the vision of the King in His beauty, and of the King's Mother by His side. Then he rose a new man, with all the powers of his being turned to that one object, and intensified; and there began a life which, in its superhuman self-surrender, is itself an infinitely greater miracle than healing the leper, or raising the dead. In less than twenty years—the very years which Luther spent in blaspheming authority, and breaking vows—that self-beggared nobleman, having set himself in middle age to school, like a child, to learn grammar, is

found at Rome, the head of a society of saints and heroes inferior but to himself, having the sanction of the Apostolic See, and bent with all-mastering energy to direct once more the education of Europe, and to carry into it every branch of knowledge on the basis of Christian faith. And the spirit of that soldier of God did not die ; it diffused itself not only into his own society, but likewise, from that example, other religious bodies, which since have arisen in the Church, set themselves especially to the great work of education. In these latter days, when revolt was most widely spread, and enmity bitterest against the Church, her work, too, has been greater and more perfect in the hearts of her children than ever before ; her pattern of holiness has been more exact, her rule over the thoughts more severe, her foundations of the spiritual life more deeply laid. Through all the period of disorganization, from its rise in Luther to its consummation in the great French Revolution, never has she sanctioned any education which was not based on the Catholic faith. Then came a wholesale destruction of her universities, her colleges, her religious institutions ; the confiscation of their endowments, the dispersion both of teachers and pupils. Then Europe sowed the wind, and now she is reaping the whirlwind. Fifty years ago the Church's chief pastor was driven into captivity by a nation the Church's eldest born, and died in exile ; since then one Emperor and two Kings of that nation have died in exile also, and the whole land stands quaking at what has happened and may happen again to it, from its own children's broils. All Europe, too, with its hundreds of thousands of armed men, waits in fear for what is scarcely warded from it, this great breaking up of society. And what is the cause of this ? That Europe has unchristianized education, stripped and fettered the Church, run headlong after arts and sciences, sensual literature, and material luxuries, but disregarded truth.

There has been a great destruction. All through the eighteenth century those principles of infidelity, which, alas !

came forth from England, and passed to the French encyclopaedists, and their German compeers, the chosen friends of that wretched Frederic, misnamed Great, were sapping all authority both in the spiritual and the temporal order of things. The chosen object they had in view was to emancipate education from the control of religion. And one power of Europe they found singularly adapted to their purpose. For one government there is, so unfortunate as to be founded on infidelity; one royal family, which became royal as a guerdon for losing its faith; one country, which received half the reform from Luther, and the other half from Calvin; and so without belief even in its own infidelity has been tumbling ever since from depth to depth, until its religious state defies analysis, and its political power subsists only by the sword. Prussia, under Frederic, was indeed just the atmosphere so exhausted of religious vitality as to receive Voltairian education, and accept physics and mathematics instead of the God whom it had betrayed. Here was the paradise of purely secular education, military discipline instead of religious fear, the sciences, the arts, and the morality of the barracks. On went that great demoralizing anarchical flood, the spring-tide of sensualism, unbelief, and pseudo-liberty. It beat against the monarchies of Europe, and sapped their spiritual strength, while it found favour with monarchs by seeming to exalt the temporal power at the expense of the Church, till an Austrian Emperor became its tool, and a King of France its victim, involving in his fall the throne of St. Louis. Destruction had indeed gone to its utmost point, when the very altar of the Most Holy was polluted with the living presence of the heathen Venus. Then arose that great soldier of fortune to reconstruct in the midst of the wilderness. He attempted to establish an education which should catch all classes, from the savant to the peasant, in its network. The people, he knew, must have a religion, and he was not the man to give them the abortion of Luther or of Calvin; so to his education, which should embrace, above all things, those material arts

and sciences which were the basis of his scheme, he added the Catholic faith, not as a queen, but as the handmaid of his power; not to rule in the hearts of his subjects, but to wear his livery, and to consecrate his empire. He worshipped material prosperity as heartily as Frederic, but he would not exclude religion as Frederic, under the inspiration of Voltaire, had done. It was to be the mortar of those walls on which he would rear a universal empire. The Church's high priest should inaugurate the crown which he himself, and he alone, would set on his own brow. Such was the idea of Napoleon in setting up his famous university, the drag-net which he cast over France, to gather every faculty and passion of man for his service. It was not properly *mixed* education, for he engaged that Catholics—and they were the vast majority of his people—should be taught the Catholic faith; his colleges had chaplains, chapels, and sacraments; he did not expect society to go on without its soul. But Catholicism in these establishments was not to *rule*, but to *serve*; to be, not the homage paid by the spirit of man to the king of spirits, but an officer of the Emperor's court. Under such conditions truth itself—so perilously shaken by the storms of the age, and banished from the hearts of men by worldly passions—could not regain its empire. We have now seen the result. The year 1848 has satisfied, at least, the most unbelieving, that the material arts and the money interests of life cannot make a national society hold together. M. Cousin is fallen into disrepute. M. Thiers loudly professes himself a Catholic. The historian of the French Revolution proclaims that the university has not done its work, or rather has done a work very different from that which society required of it. He is for destroying its monopoly, for making a *bonâ fide* Christian and Catholic education. In this alone he sees a future basis for society, as well as government. The extremity of the danger, the suspension of all the great powers of temporal government, the sight of a society in which, beside brute force as embodied in the army,

not one moral power, save the Church of God, remains standing, has caused the scales to drop from eyes so long jealous of the Church. He sees that it has come to an absolute and final choice, between the holy mother of saints and the evil one. Nor has one nation only been brought to its senses. An Austrian Emperor has undone those fetters which the Emperor Joseph imposed—happy if it be not too late, and if his own zeal for religion be recompensed by the loyalty of his subjects. The race of Hohenzollern itself would gladly give a religion to its people, had it one to give. Such is the instability, the universal agitation of mind, which acknowledge no authority, and have no anchorage in heavenly hopes; so rotten that forced compromise between two heresies which no one believes; so extreme the empire of doubt in that country which first set up for its rule the bare text of the Bible interpreted by the individual; so dissolved is society in the land where secular education has reigned triumphant. They are turning round, and stretching out their hands in supplication to the Church of God; they venerate in her more than ever what is unchangeable, amid ceaseless changes and the dread of the future; what is spiritual, amid the impotence of temporal powers; what is orderly, wise, and temperate, amid the outbreak of disorder, folly, and rashness. They not only see that pyramid whose head emerges now as ever above the “many waters” of human conflict, but they long to be in safety on the rock of Peter.

At such a moment, when this mixed secular education has been tried by whole nations, and either rejected, or endured because the ruin is irremediable, and license has gone beyond cure,—when all the nations of the continent have seen through the pernicious deceptions, it is proposed as the great boon for the sufferings and wrongs of Ireland. This statue of Dagon, which has fallen down of itself headless at the threshold of truth, is reared up again amongst us, carefully brought over, dressed in fine clothes, sumptuously housed, and set down with much parade for Catholics to worship. The very thing

which has brought France and Prussia to the brink of destruction, is to heal the dissensions of Ireland. Though England itself, with all its Protestantism, and with all its sects, will not have it, and retains in the heart of the nation the principle of truth strong enough to abhor the doctrine of indifference, it is to be forced on our poverty. That which with one accord the statesmen of the continent will have no longer, is to be introduced among us as the earnest of future prosperity, and we are promised, if we take it kindly, that very soon Catholicism will be a matter of pure indifference among us; "the time is not far distant when it will not occur to any one to ask of what religion any of the students are."

Yet we are assured by those who have carefully studied the system that it fails to produce the very fruit which it most boldly promises. So far from the qualities of the scientific mind, thoughtfulness, close attention, sustained vigour of research, a strong will to conquer difficulties, being called forth, the force of the mind is lost upon multiplicity of objects. Youths come out not only without a faith, or a scandal to the faith they profess, by their practical indifference to its precepts, but with a smattering of many sciences which only proves how a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. On no one feature of past French education under the university do impartial examiners dwell so much as this. Eminent mathematicians, and chemists, and the rest, are not produced, but middling amateurs and peddlers in the sciences. Under this promised reign of knowledge, real learning is become as rare as true genius. And add to this, where immorality in practice does not exist, a thorough perversion of the moral judgment in its standard of things; a preference given to physical truth and material inventions, over belief in the primary truth on which all religion rests, accompanied with a disdain for the sublimest and most ennobling Christian mysteries, as if they were the mere subjects of "sectarian" divisions, and profitless controversy.

There has been, then, a great destruction; let there be also

a great reparation. The Church of God has not lost her power. The spring of life is not dried up among the nations of the earth. Let science advance to its utmost limits, and the arts of all nations be promoted by a never-ceasing rivalry, still the Church possesses the key of universal truth; she is the prophet in the world, to whom every power, spiritual and moral, physical and artificial, bears witness. Whatever truth a Newton, a Cuvier, a Laplace, may discover, she can harmonize, for He who dwells in her is the end as well as the beginning.

“Le cose tutte quante
Han ordine tra loro; e questo è forma
Che l'universo a Dio fa somigliante.
Qui veggion l'alte creature l'orma
Dell' eterno valore, il quale è fine
Al quale è fatta la toccata norma.” *

And this work of restoration to which she now calls her children, is the re-edification of Catholic schools; what Ximenes did in 1517—a single monk of St. Francis on an episcopal throne—the power of numbers, instinct with the same love which burns in Catholic hearts, may accomplish now. A half-penny subscription propagates her missions, why should it not fill her schools? If her faith be precious to the savage, is it not equally so to her children at home? We have, on the one hand, a government without a faith, the supporter of infidelity, and the enemy of our religion throughout the world; which has just proscribed every spiritual act done in our religion as done by virtue of the spiritual jurisdiction of its head; which offers us *not* the means of educating our own people in their faith, Catholics as Catholics, but insists that they shall first descend to the level of having no faith at all. On the other hand, we have many millions now bound together, not only by common love, but by common persecution, by a calumny without limit in its falsehoods, without remorse in its misrepresentations. We have millions, also,

* Paradiso, c. i. 104.

across the ocean, in our own colonies, and in the great republic, bound by the same chain of love to the persecuted faith, full of sympathy, ready and able to assist. Here are elements of power, and an omen of success.

Of such a restoration of Catholic schools—the Church's great work of construction in the latter half of the nineteenth century—need we repeat once more that the indispensable basis is the Catholic faith itself, maintained and inculcated as the primary law of its existence? The practice of the Church, from the catechetical schools of Alexandria to the present day, is uniform, and the system of instruction in the West, began by St. Augustine, widely extended by the Benedictine and other orders, carried out to its utmost limits in the mediæval universities, restored and reinvigorated by the teaching orders of later times, continued without let or exception to the great French Revolution, and afresh stamped with new authority by her latest decisions, tells us decisively as the reason of the case itself, how she interprets her Lord's great command, "Go and make disciples all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." In her eyes this must come *first*. Principle and history are here agreed.

The second point which we would inculcate in this restoration of Catholic studies is, their *range*, which must include all existing knowledge and science. Whatever is a need of the age, must not be neglected. We do not mean that everything must be begun at once, but that from the beginning a plan must be kept in view, which shall, in the end, satisfy all wants. While we think that no education is worthy of the name which does not first and above all set itself to mould man's spiritual nature, which does not plant within him faith, as the root of all proficiency, and the spring, not only of the moral, but the intellectual being; yet, having this, we deem that we have the key to all God's works, and laws, and operations. There is not an art or science into which the principle of faith does not enter, on which it does not shed light. The knowledge of the first cause, and of the final end,

assists men in studying them all. There is not one from which, however extended, or reaching whatever results, the Catholic Church has anything to fear. It is only when the heretical spirit takes possession of them, reads them amiss, reaches but half truths in them, or falsely interprets whole ones, that danger arises to her faith. Take the most extreme case which could happen; the substitution, that is, of the experimental sciences as the general instrument for disciplining the mind of the higher classes, instead of the learned languages and their literature. There is no opposition between such sciences and the Catholic faith. The circle of revealed truth committed to the guardianship of the Church belongs to another region. These have the sensible and the intelligible for their domain; she, while never contrary to reason, is yet above it, reaching the supernatural and the superintelligible. Those sacred mysteries, with which her whole mind is possessed, and in the dispensing of which lies the deep spring of her secret life, leave to the reason of man its full range, but only require it to acknowledge the limits set to its weakness, and prepare it for the difficulties which exist in nature, and encompass even the best-known paths of science, by the utterly insoluble secrets of God. It is true that the most wonderful works of God in nature have failed, by themselves, to lead the human spirit towards Him, and men of great renown in the study of anatomy and astronomy have become sceptics; but it was because they came to those studies with a moral nature ill prepared, from a religious system which they had never heartily accepted, or which, from its onesidedness, never satisfied either their feelings or their intellect. With the safeguard of divine faith beforehand, it would have been far otherwise. Had they received, with a first love, the great truth and its consequences, "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," every page which they afterwards unfolded of that "rich wisdom of the Word," whether in the visible heavens, or in the frame of man, in plants and flowers, or the strata of the earth, or its chemical constitution, would have

deepened their humility and their love to its Author. There is a great gap between the kingdoms of nature and grace, notwithstanding their numberless analogies, which faith only can fill up; and therefore it is that the Catholic starts with a great advantage over all other men in those pursuits. There is, then, no excuse for excluding from Catholic studies any art or science, which has its positive merit, which has won its place in the inventions and progress of the age, and supplies any recognized need of our civilization. This universality of *range* is necessary for success, and is subordinate in importance only to the *basis* of faith itself.

Thirdly, the *objects* to be kept in view are manifold. We need to meet and overcome infidelity, on what it fancies to be its own ground; we need to rescue the physical and the intellectual sciences from its sway; we need to set forth once more a higher standard in the world than mere material progress. Especially in our own country has history been perverted to serve the cause of error. Minds of no common order, and learning of no mean range, have been devoted to treat the course of human affairs, the rise, advance, connection, and dependence of nations, excluding, as far as possible, the existence of the divine kingdom amongst them, or vilifying its spirit, and distorting its tendencies. The philosophy of history is become its sophistry. Those who have turned rebels against the divine kingdom have hated to hear of its agency; and modern times have been described in fullest detail, by authors who pass over nothing except those achievements of charity, those works of heroic self-denial, which make their highest praise. Nor must we omit the incalculable advantage which the Elizabethan heresy has derived from the possession which it has taken of the ancient Catholic universities. Itself without a spiritual idea to hold it together—utterly earthly, and of this world—it entered into the very richest inheritance of wisdom coming down from the ages of faith. Reform sat enthroned in those glorious ancient halls which were worthy to hear a St. Bernard preach, and a St.

Thomas lecture. Reform has dispensed the rewards which so many generations had stored up for learning. It has had the pick and choice of a great nation's youth ; it has watered them from wells which it had not dugged, and fed them in vineyards which it had not planted. And if spiritual truth have gradually perished away ; if all wherewith they have to satisfy minds bent on the old faith of Christendom be "the stammering lips of ambiguous formularies," still a certain humane culture has lingered on in those old abodes ; a certain character has been formed in them which had its greatness, and its beauty, and its classic grace. And Catholics, deprived of these, their own proper homes, have had no like schools of education, in which, on the basis of their own perfect faith, they could be trained in all that ancient times have left of great and good. Surely it is time that this great deficiency be supplied.

Once more, and fourthly, as a *condition* of success we must name a perfect unity of thought and purpose in the teaching body. Mixed education makes this impossible. Thus the Bishop of Liège remarks, in his valuable letter ; " 'What is your secret,' an intelligent man one day asked me, 'for making your establishments flourish ?' 'It is,' I replied to him, 'the homogeneousness of the professorial body ;' and that may easily be conceived. When all the members of that body have but one thought and one action, to inspire into the minds of youths, with the love of knowledge, that of virtue and religion, may one not expect, with some confidence, happy results ? But what are we to expect where there does not exist this unity of views and actions ?—where, for want of professing the same principles, the masters do not form, in reality, one and the same body, and cannot either combine, or direct their efforts towards a common end ; where, too often one destroys by his conversation or by his example, what the other is seeking to build up ? How could establishments of this nature prosper or deserve public confidence ?"

And it is because we see one man singularly qualified for so great a task, because we see in one, and perhaps in one

alone, the conjunction of a name which has attained to European celebrity, a genius embracing the most opposite qualities, a widely extended learning, and a will most admirably tempered, that we hail with the utmost joy and satisfaction the appointment of Dr. Newman to be the Rector of the Catholic University. It is a pledge for ultimately effecting all that we could desire, such, perhaps, as none other could be given.

To sum up, in few words, the whole of our argument. A concurrence of circumstances has produced a tendency greatly to overvalue the mechanical arts, and the experimental sciences, as being the means of material enjoyment and prosperity. A disposition is even shown, more and more, to make education mainly consist in giving instruction in these, and to subordinate all other knowledge as accessory to them. But the education of man, being what God has made him, and considering the end for which he is made, consists, primarily, in the training of the free will to moral action. Such a training is the work of faith, and the object of faith is revealed truth. Therefore, Protestantism is unable to bestow such a training, because in destroying the principle of authority, and breaking up the system of revealed truth which rested on it, it has made faith impossible. And again, by removing the check of confession, it has lost all control over the heart and its issues. Still more unable, for the same reason, is Infidelity to accomplish such a work, having rejected even those portions of revealed truth which Protestantism has, although inconsistently, retained. Protestantism, therefore, full of internal dissensions, and without power to present to its pupils any body of moral and spiritual truth which they are to believe as certain, or any living authority, which they are to obey as divine, proposes to evade the difficulties which itself has made, by avoiding such subjects altogether, and by giving up the attempt to train the moral nature. On the other side it offers as a temptation an exuberant display of all the arts and sciences which rest on the undisputed ground of physical

knowledge. Mixed education is accordingly a surrender to heresy, schism, and self-will, of the whole nature of man which is above and beyond this knowledge; an abnegation of the highest end of our being. Catholic education, on the other hand, for which we hail the institution of a Catholic university, is the realization before all, and above all, of that highest end. But, this secured, it proceeds to group around it the various sciences, accomplishments, and arts of social life. First of all, indeed, it deals with that which is immortal, universal, and most precious in man; that free-will by which he is made after the image and likeness of God; but while preserving throughout a due superiority to the enlightenment, strengthening, and direction of this, it fosters every branch of knowledge according to its intrinsic merit and value. And Catholicism has, in its firm possession of the truth, and by its faith in the unity of the divine will and operations, an assurance that no science either now exists, or can possibly arise, which, rightly and fully understood, shall be at variance with that knowledge which it imparts to guide the moral nature. It starts, then, from the principle of faith, well knowing that it clears and strengthens all powers of the intellect, and above all that it imparts to the will an indomitable energy and a calm courage, which are the best part of genius itself, and are necessary to win not only success in every path of our mortal life, but a place in the higher creation of God hereafter. Truth is the centre of its circle, but the circumference embraces all human arts and sciences. It must ever repeat, with the great Christian poet,—

“ *Lo maggior don, che Dio per sua larghezza
Fesse creando, e alla sua bontate
Più conformato, e quel ch’ei più apprezza,
Fu della volontà la libertate,
Di che le creature intelligenti,
E tutte, e sole, furo e son dotate.*” *

In guiding, strengthening, and purifying this free-will consists

* Paradiso, c. 5, v. 19.

its great task; but on the indestructible basis of divine faith it raises the perfect fabric of human improvement and culture. For such a work the time is most propitious. The spirit of unbelief, inaugurated by Protestantism in modern Europe, has broken up all dogma, and destroyed all spiritual authority, outside of the one Catholic society; the Anglican pseudo-Church lies split down to the middle by internal dissension, and, in the midst of wealth and social influence, conscious of her deadly wound; the sects, which are the irregular offspring of her fornication with the State, present to the thoughtful eye a mere chaos of private judgment run mad. Let the Church of God but maintain her dear-bought liberty, let her not seek to be a pensioner of heresy, but rest on her inward powers and the love of her children; let her unfold, for the education of those children, the unspeakably precious inheritance of faith and knowledge, which she has guarded for eighteen hundred years—and a great triumph is before her. She will yet rescue the nations from the moral anarchy into which they have plunged themselves. She will gain, over the reasoned infidelity and deranged free-will of the nineteenth century, a greater triumph than she wrought in the times of St. Augustine or St. Thomas, and be at once the fortress of society and the fountain of knowledge.

December, 1851.

RELATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND
STATE

ESTABLISHED IN ENGLAND BY THE
REFORMATION.

RELATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

THIS little work* is on a subject-matter always interesting, but especially so in the actual state of the Anglican communion. The name and high position of the author have induced us to read it carefully, and we shall begin our remarks by letting him set forth his own view in his own words, pointing out afterwards wherein that view is inadequate.

“By Erastianism,” says the author, “I understand that system of opinions, and that course of action, which deprive the Church of Christ of independent existence, and resolve it into the function of the civil government. It is the more needful to consider the nature of this system, because by many it has been supposed to be involved in an admission of the Royal Supremacy, since it has often been supposed that the Church of England designed to surrender her liberty to the temporal power, and that the clergy are inconsistent when they assert their independence. But the characteristic features and essential principle of Erastianism can hardly be understood without some knowledge of the circumstances which have led to its prevalence. For this purpose we must go back to those great events which convulsed Europe during the sixteenth century. I propose, then, to consider, first, what

* A Sketch of the History of Erastianism. By Robert Isaac Wilberforce, A.M. Archdeacon of the East Riding of Yorkshire. London: Murray.

principles of Church authority were engendered either here or abroad by the Reformation; secondly, how these principles gave birth to the system of Erastianism; thirdly, what effects have followed from its predominance."

The author, accordingly, pursues this inquiry in three chapters, in which he respectively sets forth three different systems as to the distribution of Church authority between the spiritual and the temporal power, which he considers to have prevailed successively since the Reformation. The first of these he calls "the Episcopal system;" the second, "the Territorial system, or Erastianism;" the third, "the Consistorial system, or the effects of Erastianism."

The "Episcopal system," which he considers to have prevailed for some time in Germany after the Reformation (though so far as regards that country it is surely a misnomer), and in England from 1534 to 1688, "implied the union of two authorities, that of the priesthood and that of the king" (p. 41). "The royal co-operation was supposed to confer that completeness on the National Church, the possession of which made its sentence equivalent to the sentence of the Church universal in its power of binding the consciences of the king's subjects" (p. 46). "It was an alliance between the clergy and the Crown, by which each party gained protection against those opposite enemies, the Presbyterians and the Pope. The Church's courts were protected by the royal power; while, on the other hand, the prince's authority was sustained by the co-operation of his native clergy" (p. 25); and more particularly, dividing Church authority into "a question of persons and a question of things;" as to the former, the Crown "left the ministration of orders untouched." Whether it arrogated mission to itself, he would seem to leave doubtful; "the question of communion was supposed to be left as formerly to the courts of the Bishops," and "the right of patronage was rested on the fact of ancient endowment" (p. 13), while as to the latter, the author dwells much on the declaration of the twentieth Anglican Article, that "the Church hath authority

in controversies of faith ;” seems doubtful in what proportions this so-called Church authority was divided between the Crown and the clergy, but states that, “impossible as it is to discern how much was to be ascribed to the one, and how much to the other authority, nothing can be clearer than that the two, taken collectively, were supposed to possess a final power in the interpretation of doctrine” (p. 21).

There appears to us considerable indistinctness in this view of things, and one important error as to fact, which we shall hereafter point out ; but here our object is to state the author’s meaning.

In the second chapter he traces how both in Germany and in England the “Episcopal system” was destined to change into the “Territorial,” of which the “principle was that the consent of the clergy was not required for the settlement of questions of doctrine, which must be decided exclusively by the temporal power” (p. 33). This system he considers identical with that of “Thomas Lieber, or Erastus, as he called himself, a physician and professor of Heidelberg, born A.D. 1524,” who taught “that the civil magistrate has not only a peculiar commission, as being invested by divine appointment with a place in the Church’s administration (which the Episcopal system was ready to allow), but that he possesses this power by inherent authority, whether he be a Christian or no ; and further, that he is not bound to refer to the Church, as directed by supernatural guidance in the discovery of truth” (p. 36). Omitting the introduction of this system into Germany, we will pass to his review of those “influences which have tended to introduce that Territorial or Erastian system in England, which the combination of Pietism and Liberalism rendered prevalent in Germany” (p. 41). And here he considers that “two especial causes have been at work, the first in the age of the Tudors and Stuarts, the second in that of their successors : the first, the ancient belief in the divine right of kings ; the second, the modern disbelief in the divine right of the Church. It was shown that the Episcopal

system implied the union of two authorities, that of the priesthood and that of the king: to exalt the kingly, or to break down the priestly authority, was alike fatal therefore to the ancient theory, because it destroyed the harmony of its parts; so that both tendencies led to an undue exaltation of the temporal power, or to the adoption of Erastianism." This influence, exerted by the notion of the divine right of kings, is traced out very effectively from pp. 41-60, and the progress of disbelief in the divine right of the Church, with its results, from pp. 61-70.

In the third chapter he treats of the "Consistorial system or the effects of Erastianism," for "the Episcopal system has given way, both at home and in Germany, to pure Erastianism. It remains to observe the effects of the alteration in either country" (p. 78). And here the progress of things in Germany affords an instructive comment on their course in England. "Now to suppose," says our author, "that man's faith is to be taken blindly from the ruler under whose control he lives; that each sovereign has a right to prescribe such a religion as he pleases, and that his subjects are bound in conscience to accept it (which is the Territorial system, or Erastianism), all this is so contrary to the first instincts of nature, that it is impossible that men should submit to it without reluctance. Those who receive the teaching of the Church, believe that she has promise of guidance from God's enlightening Spirit; but no such claim is ever advanced by the parties who wield the civil sword. On this ground, then, the Territorial system was opposed by Pfaff, the learned chancellor of Tübingen, who describes it as "that worst pest of the Church, a Caesaropapacy." In place of it he introduced what he called "the Consistorial system;" viz. the theory that "the prince's interference in Church matters was not derived either from hereditary right, or from territorial supremacy, but from the free concession of the people" (p. 79). "Now this power might be supposed to belong to the body of the people, either by natural right, or by divine institution. The last is the theory of Presbyte-

rianism, which has prevailed in all Protestant countries where the Crown did not favour the Reformation, and those who have adopted it still retain (as in Scotland) their ancient hostility to the Royal Supremacy." But the other theory, that of the Consistorial system, "asserted Church authority to rest upon the mutual consent of men, when they entered into relations with one another as members of the same nation" (p. 80); and where this is "laid down as supplying the general theory of Church authority, the notion that the Church claims any Divine guidance must be abandoned" (p. 82); so that this is identical with Rationalism. So much for Germany.

But now, "to turn to our own country. It may seem extraordinary that a nation so jealous of their liberties as the English should be content to renounce the most precious part of the heritage of men. For it has been shown in the last chapter that at present it rests with the Sovereign to explain finally what is the mind of the Church of England. The royal authority, when exercised in hearing appeals from the ecclesiastical courts, is not concerned with questions of property, but goes directly to the settlement of spiritual matters themselves. How can this be doubted, since it is plainly the Church's duty to correct erroneous teaching; and there is no question of any kind, which can arise in any Court of the Church, which is brought for final adjudication to any other tribunal? So that either the Church herself exercises no religious authority, or religious authority is exercised by the prince. For every authority which the one exercises in inferior processes is exercised in the highest instance by the other. The legislature, while vesting in the Sovereign the whole appellate jurisdiction of which a patriarch could be possessed, lays down with fearful exactness the breadth of that authority with which he is entrusted. . . . But if the civil judge undertakes to decide respecting the spiritual question itself, he usurps functions which belong to another department; so that the independent existence of the spiritual society is virtually denied" (pp. 82-84).

But now, "how does it happen that the English people acquiesce so readily in such an interference with the rights of conscience? Because the assertion of the unfettered liberty of individual belief has made many persons indifferent through what means the Church expresses her judgment. If they felt bound in conscience to respect her decisions, it would be of some moment by whom they were made; but why should men feel anxious about the decisions of a judge in whom they recognize no authority? Again, the power which was formerly vested in the person of the Sovereign is now held in common among the King and the estates of the realm, and is exercised practically by the Minister who has the confidence of the representatives of the people. While the determination of doctrine rests nominally, therefore, with the Sovereign, it depends really on the popular opinion of the day. And this is exactly that arrangement which Pfaff suggested as accounting for the state of things in Germany, and which he called the Consistorial system. So that while the forms of the Territorial system have remained, we have passed in reality to that other order of things, which has been shown to be so intimately allied with Rationalism. The world in general, however, feels little repugnance at leaving the decision of religious questions to the sovereign power, because the sovereign power is virtually 'their noble selves.' The decision in Church matters on late occasions has avowedly been less influenced by the strict rules of law than by a reference to public opinion; and thus the formal Erastianism of our position is made tolerable by that virtual deference to the public sentiment, which is the essential feature of the Consistorial system."

Now, so far we have endeavoured to sum up, with scrupulous correctness, the author's own view of the Anglican relations between Church and State in these three periods: the first, which followed the Reformation; the second, which was introduced by the Revolution; and the third, which comprises our own times. We can keenly sympathize with what

it has cost him to enter on so unpleasant a subject, to enter on it with courage and determined honesty ; and to make statements so bitterly unpalatable to the communion of which he is an ornament. We feel for the son who has been called by an inexorable duty to probe the deep and deadly wound of a mother. We fervently pray that his feelings may be relieved by the discovery hereafter that the supposed parent was but an adventuress—a monarch's cast-off mistress, now in her dishonourable age vainly striving to cover her nakedness with the gifts which purchased her seduction—who stole him in his infancy from his true mother, and is unable to satisfy the yearnings of his manhood.

For to his *principles* throughout we have happily nothing to object, nor, again, as to the practical condition in which he considered his communion to lie, disastrous enough, even pitiable, if one might pity the enemy of God. But there is one point in which we think his view is radically defective, as to the distribution of authority between the Crown and the clergy at the Reformation. All the evils which he now deplores, that “renouncing the most precious part of the heritage of men,” that “vesting in the Sovereign the whole appellate jurisdiction of which a patriarch could be possessed,” “that vital denial of the independent existence of the spiritual society” (pp. 82–84), follow from and are involved in that distribution of authority which was originally made. Yet of this he speaks doubtfully. “It is impossible to say how much was intended to be assigned to the clergy, and how much to the Crown, because the partition was neither fixed by law nor explained in theory. It was neither decided by the acts of the Church nor by the arguments of its writers” (p. 19). On the contrary, to us it appears that nothing can be more fixed, clear, and certain than this partition. Let us take Mr. Wilberforce's own criterion. “Let it at once be admitted that spiritual mission is derived from the temporal power, and then it is plain that the authority which commits a trust has a right to withhold it, it will follow that to decide upon the doctrinal

competency of those who are employed to teach belongs to the civil, and not to the spiritual power. And thus will the determination of doctrine become a matter of worldly cognizance, instead of being committed by inalienable right to Christ's spiritual body" (p. 18).

Therefore, in Mr. Wilberforce's judgment, which every Catholic theologian will confirm, all depends on the question from whom, after the settlement of the Reformation, the power of spiritual mission was derived in the Anglican Church.

But what is spiritual mission? Every Catholic will answer, that it is part of the power of spiritual jurisdiction, which assigns the conditions for *legitimate exercise* of the powers bestowed in orders; that is, it gives faculties to the Priest, it confirms the Bishop, it circumscribes the dioceses of Bishops; it is the power, in short, which sets in motion, and preserves in its due action, the whole hierarchy or imperium of the Church. Nothing can be more simple, or more absolutely a first principle of Catholic theology.

But Mr. Wilberforce somehow shrinks from the use of the term "spiritual jurisdiction," and gives a definition of mission which seems to betray the usual Anglican inaccuracy. The Crown, he says (p. 13), "left the ministration of orders untouched." This, putting out of view the question of the validity of orders given by the Edwardian ritual, is admitted by Catholics. But further, "mission may mean either the spiritual commission which is derived from the Church, or the temporal permission to live in a certain locality. There might have been a more direct statement, that the Crown did not arrogate to itself the first; but there is no direct assertion which attributes to it more than the second." Now, mission cannot mean "the temporal permission to live in a certain locality," for this is indisputably possessed by the temporal power in every State, Catholic, Protestant, or Heathen; by the Emperor in China, and the Grand Seignior in Turkey, as well as by the temporal governments of Austria or of England. Certainly it was not for denying this that More and Fisher

laid their heads on the block, nor for claiming it that Henry VIII. incurred excommunication. But perhaps by the term "spiritual commission which is derived from the Church," which he elsewhere calls "the *continuance* of the commission bestowed in ordination" (p. 3), he means what a Catholic means by jurisdiction, *i.e.* the lawful exercise of the powers of order, and the having subjects whereon to exercise them. But then there is every legal proof that the Crown *did* arrogate to itself this power; that is, it claimed to be the fountain-head of all jurisdiction, civil and ecclesiastical, nor did it only claim but became so by act of parliament, and has continued to be so, with the intermission of Mary's reign, to the present day. So far from not asserting, as Mr. Wilberforce will have it, it passed from assertion into action. This usurpation of the State begins with, and is plainly involved in, the Statute of Appeals, where the realm of England is stated to be "an empire, governed by one supreme head and king; unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms and by names of spirituality and temporality, were bounden and sworn to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience." Now, the king is indeed head of all persons spiritual and temporal, in their quality of citizens, and accordingly all, whether spiritual or temporal, owe him natural and humble obedience, *in the order of matters civil*; but he is not head of the spirituality *qua* spirituality, nor do spiritual persons owe him natural and humble obedience *in the order of matters spiritual*. For to assert this comes exactly to Mr. Wilberforce's definition of Erastianism, *viz.* "a system of opinions and course of action which deprive the Church of Christ of independent existence, and resolve it into a function of the civil government." For the possession of the divine powers conferred by ordination, when the use and exercise of those powers are directed and circumscribed by the State, does not leave to the Church an independent existence; and even real Bishops, when confirmed in their sees by the civil power, and so deriving their spiritual jurisdiction from that

power unto the several authorities dependent on them, become a function of the temporal government. Now, the Anglican Reformation was but the carrying out of this idea. Thus Bishop Gibson in his Codex, pref. p. 18, acknowledges "that the external administration of spiritual discipline and of all ecclesiastical matters, in established courts, and established forms, is by authority from the Crown and in subordination to the Royal Supremacy." This, he imagines, "takes off the reproach on the one hand of her affecting an independence;" as, on the other hand, the divine rights conveyed in orders to that of being "a mere creature of the State." Other Anglican writers, when they have proved the recognition by the State of spiritual powers existing in the reformed Bishops, imagine they have proved what is sufficient for the Church's "independent existence" in Mr. Wilberforce's sense; whereas the very purpose of Henry and Elizabeth was to have a real hierarchy, nominated, confirmed, maintained in action, corrected, *ruled*, in short, by themselves. They coveted only the power which the Pope had held, of being *head*; they did not wish to destroy or impair the body, but to derive intact that continual directive power and influence, and to exert that control, which constitute supremacy. A wise monarch does not impair the several powers of his subordinate magistrates, but he takes care that their dependence on himself be unquestionable; and so the Tudor sovereigns carefully maintained the spiritual powers of their Bishops, only making them entirely subordinate to themselves in the acquisition, maintenance, and exercise of those powers. Now, in one word, this is a supremacy of jurisdiction, and it includes spiritual mission as one of its parts. Nor can any words be more express and distinct than those of the Acts of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, which ascribe this whole supremacy of jurisdiction to the temporal monarch. Still more convincing is this language when they not only declare that ecclesiastical jurisdiction is annexed to the temporal monarch, but that the Papal authority, which consists in that very jurisdiction, "robs

the king of his honour, right, and pre-eminence."* Thus the Act 37 Henry VIII. cap. 17, declares, "Whereas the royal majesty is justly supreme head in earth of the Church of England, and hath full power and authority to correct, punish, and repress all manner of heresies, schisms, errors, vices, and to exercise all other manner of jurisdictions commonly called ecclesiastical jurisdictions." It is added that "the archbishops and bishops have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical but by, under, and from the royal majesty."† See also 1 Edward VI. c. 2: "All authority of jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal, is derived and deduced from the king's majesty as supreme head of these churches and realms of England and Ireland, and so justly acknowledged by the clergy of the said realms; so that all courts ecclesiastical within the said two realms be kept by no other power or authority, either foreign or within the realm, but by the authority of his most excellent majesty."‡ The body of ecclesiastical laws called "*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*" may at least be quoted, though never absolutely law, as a complete exhibition of the mind of those who wrought the change in religion; and it states, as Mr. Wilberforce remembers, that "the king has, and can exercise, the fullest jurisdiction, both civil and ecclesiastical, as well over archbishops and bishops, clergy and other ministers, as over laws, within his own realms and dominions." It is moreover stated in some of these Acts, that he has this power "by God's law," and that every monarch has the same in his own realm, which is at least consistent. Mary's reign having swept away this new spiritual supremacy, the 1st Eliz. c. 1 brought it back. The 10th sect. renews the laws of Henry touching the supremacy; reviving eight Acts of his, and declaring that the branches, sentences, and words of them shall be deemed and taken to extend to her highness, her heirs, and successors, as fully and largely as ever the precedents did extend to the late King Henry VIII. (Gibson, p. 43). That

* 28 Henry VIII., Gibson's Codex, p. 25.

† Gibson, p. 44.

‡ Gibson, p. 926.

the queen claimed exactly the same supremacy as her father and brother, is stated in her injunctions (Gibson, p. 54). "Certainly her majesty neither doth nor ever will challenge any authority than that was challenged and lastly used by the said noble kings of famous memory, King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI.," though she adds, insidiously and falsely, "which is and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm." But her power is in the same Act, sect. 17, more expressly defined as the very same which had been exercised by the Pope: that it "please your highness that it may be established and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, *as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been, or may lawfully be, exercised or used* for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, shall for ever by authority of this present parliament be ceded and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm." And the 19th sect. imposes an oath on all ecclesiastical persons that, "to my power I shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, privileges, pre-eminences, and authorities granted or belonging unto the queen's highness, her heirs, and successors, or ceded and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm." Surely it is hard upon Tudor lawyers and Tudor sovereigns to state after this, "that it is impossible to say how much (in the distribution of authority) was intended to be assigned to the clergy and how much to the Crown, because the partition was neither fixed by law nor explained in theory."

But these are acts of the State—yes, submitted to and acted upon by the Church, and guarded under threat of excommunication! for the second Canon of 1603 declares, that "whosoever shall hereafter impeach *any part of the king's regal supremacy* in causes ecclesiastical restored to the Crown, *and by the laws of this realm therein established*, let him be

excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of his wicked errors." Let it be well observed, that not merely the supremacy, as defined in the Thirty-seventh Article, "the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes," though that is strong enough and plain enough, but the supremacy "by the laws of this realm established" by the very acts of the Tudor princes, is thus guarded and imposed by the Church herself. Hard, again, to say, that the distribution of Church authority "was neither decided by the acts of the Church nor by the arguments of its writers." For let us add the very plain and specific words of one of the greatest (Hooker, vol. iii. p. 543):

"There is required an universal power which reacheth over all, importing supreme authority of government over all courts, all judges, all causes; the operation of which power is as well to strengthen, maintain, and uphold particular jurisdictions, which haply might else be of small effect, as also to remedy that which they are not able to help, and to redress that wherein they at any time do otherwise than they ought to do. This power being sometimes in the Bishop of Rome, who, by simple practices, had drawn it into his hands, was for just considerations, by public consent, annexed unto the king's royal seat and crown. From whence the authors of reformation would translate it into their national assemblies or synods; which synods are the only help which they think lawful to use against such evils in the Church as particular jurisdictions are not sufficient to redress. In which case our laws have provided that the king's supereminent authority and power shall serve, as namely, when the whole ecclesiastical, or the principal persons therein, do need visitation and reformation. When in any part of the Church, errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, enormities, are grown, which men in their several jurisdictions either do not or cannot help, *whatsoever any spiritual authority or power, such as legates from the see of Rome would exercise, hath done, or might heretofore have done,*

for the remedy of those evils in lawful sort (that is to say, without the violation of the law of God, or nature, in the deed done), as much in every degree our laws have fully granted that the king for ever may do, not only by setting ecclesiastical synods on work, that the thing may be their act, and the king their motion unto it, but by commissioners, few or many, who, having the king's letters patent, may, on the virtue thereof, execute the premises, as agents in the right not of their own peculiar and ordinary, but of his supereminent power."

There is one statement on which Mr. Wilberforce seems to rely a great deal in estimating the amount of authority left to the spirituality at the Reformation. He recurs to it again and again, as if it yielded him firm ground at least of principle among all the shifting sands of contrary practice and Erastian precedents. He sets his feet upon it and refuses to move, as if he would say, Though all that I hate and deplore actually prevails; yet it ought not so to be: the Church has been betrayed, the compact with her broken; she is insulted, depressed, but at least not herself a traitress. This stone of the god Terminus is the declaration of the Twentieth Anglican Article, that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith," on which he observes, "nothing can be more distinct than the general statement that all matters of doctrines are to be decided by the Church, by virtue of that divine commission to teach, with which it was invested by Christ our Lord" (p. 13). And referring to the Statute of Appeals, he says, to the like effect, "though an arbitrary and dangerous power was thus committed to the Crown, there was reason to hope that it would be exercised in conformity with the statements to which the Crown was a party, that the decision of doctrine rested with the spirituality." Now, no doubt the statute recited (and last year this clause was again and again quoted by those desirous to make out the most favourable case for the liberty of the Anglican Church), "that when any clause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learn-

ing, then it was declared, interpreted, and showed by *that part* of the said body politic called the spirituality, now being usually called the English Church." But the same statute declared that this spirituality, as *part* of the body politic, "was bounden and owen to bear, *next* to God, a natural and humble obedience to its supreme head and king." As the temporality was imperfect without its head, so was the spirituality. Just so when it is said, "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith," it means, not the body of the Church *without* its head, but *with* it,—the whole Church, head and body both; the spirituality, with its "supreme head," the Crown. To a Catholic these words would have a perfectly distinct and Catholic meaning; they would signify that the Episcopate, with its head and crown, the Pope, hath authority in controversies of faith. To an Anglican they have also a distinct, but a very uncatholic meaning; they signify, the body spiritual, with its "one supreme head and king," hath authority in controversies of faith. No doubt Archbishops, and Bishops, and other Church dignitaries, were meant to be *used* in what Mr. Wilberforce calls "the Episcopate system" set up by Henry and Elizabeth; but the enactive power, the supreme force, was to be given to all that they did, to their canons, to their judgments, by him, or by her, whom they had set up to be their head. But is Mr. Wilberforce aware of the very curious fact, that this much-trusted clause was not at all in the Articles as presented to Queen Elizabeth; that Cranmer had confined himself to stating that "the Church had power to decree rites or ceremonies," and that the Tudor mastiff-tigress, with a stroke of her pen, put in the clause on which he rests so much, having a juster as well as a bolder notion of Church authority than the tools she was using, and being fully minded that the Church, with herself for its head, should be just as strong, and have just as great a claim on the conscience, as the Church with the Pope for its head? Her favourite secretary Cecil only expressed the policy of his father and his mistress when he said, that "whatever the Pope had done in the Church, the

Queen could do." And this clause rested in obscurity till it was brought out and built upon by the divines of James and Charles. Hooker, in the passage just quoted, goes, it will be observed, as far as Cecil; for the power which, he says, our laws have fully granted to the king includes that exercised in the Gorham judgment. In truth, it being granted that the Church hath authority in controversies of faith, since controversies of faith touch the whole body, that authority will be exercised by the supreme power in the Church, as we have just seen in the case of Queen Victoria, who has determined that the efficacy of the sacrament of baptism is an "open question;" just as, if the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception pass from universal private belief into a dogma of faith, it must be, and can only be, by the judgment of St. Peter's See.

Now, to sum up the powers which composed this royal spiritual supremacy imposed on the Church at the Reformation. We have seen it begun by the Statute of Appeals calling the realm of England a body politic, containing a temporality and a spirituality under the king's headship. And so it was a political combination from beginning to end,—just as the present English mind refuses to consider the Catholic hierarchy in any but a political aspect, which it calls Papal aggression,—and the supremacy, thus inaugurated, had, when completed, a singular correspondence in its two parts, as it affected the temporality and the spirituality. In both it was thoroughly political; in both it was legislative, executive, and judicial. Legislative, for as the Crown convokes Parliament, and by its assent makes their votes to be laws, so it gives the Archbishop license for convocations or synods to meet, as well as adds the enactive force to their canons, without which they are void of coercive power. And the old power of issuing proclamations seems more than paralleled by the imposition of an entirely new Prayer-book on the spirituality without their concurrence, up to the canons of 1603. It is executive, for as the Crown nominates civil officers, and conducts the machinery of

ordinary government through them, so it not only nominates Bishops for election, but orders an officer to confirm them when elected, that is, to give them spiritual mission; and should the proper officer refuse, it may nominate others, his inferiors, to do the work over his head. Let Archdeacon Wilberforce well consider this provision of the law, for it is decisive as to the source of spiritual mission. Nor does it matter that not a single Anglican Archbishop has had courage to refuse consecration to the Crown's presentee during three hundred years, however objectionable as to faith or as to morals, so that the provision has never been acted on. It is judicial, for as all temporal courts of justice act by the Crown's authority, so the spiritual courts are courts of the Bishops, who are Crown officers, while supreme judgment in the last resort belongs to the Crown, now in a court of privy councillors, formerly in a court of delegates, deriving jurisdiction from it. The only difficulty in estimating the nature and extent of this supremacy arises from the dull, gross, and political manner in which it grasps spiritual powers; such, for instance, as that of jurisdiction, which is theologically divided into external, *in foro exteriori*, and internal, *in foro interiori*; whereas the State, in its eagerness after the former, seems to have cared little what became of the latter, as it only dealt with souls and consciences, and sin and the condition of men before God, while external jurisdiction belonged to the Church as the great visible empire of God upon earth, having its own most stately majesty and most orderly arrangement, its outward unity and universal citizenship, which even a Henry and an Elizabeth could appreciate. This, in the fulness of their flesh, they saw, and lusted for, and ravaged; but that, in the utter leanness of their souls, perhaps they left to their underlings, perhaps they thought not of at all.

Now, supposing the Elizabethan episcopacy to have possessed all those sacred powers which are given by consecration, and in order, and so are indelible, yet the power of spiritual mission is not one of these, even according to Archdeacon

Wilberforce's own showing, and it is absolutely necessary for the *valid* exercise of some of these powers of order, and for the *legitimate* exercise of all; for instance, without it a validly ordained Bishop cannot forgive sins, for he has no subjects. Why is it that no Anglican will look this question of the source of spiritual jurisdiction in the face? Why will no one tell us how Bishops Barlow and Seory, Hogskin and Coverdale, could give Dr. Parker spiritual mission to the see of Canterbury, or who did give it him but Queen Elizabeth, and how she had it to give? It is surely not honourable or conscientious to refuse to meet that one point on which, supposing them to be true Bishops, the legitimacy of the whole Anglican, American, Scotch, and Colonial episcopate rests. We earnestly press this matter on the notice of Archdeacon Wilberforce. If he will enter with his characteristic honesty into this question of spiritual jurisdiction, we are sure, with his keen appreciation of the Church's constitution, as a divine system of belief and practice, a spiritual empire, that the doubtfulness which now appears to linger on him will vanish: the bride of Christ will appear to him in her matchless beauty.

The Sovereign in England, then, was bent on taking the Pope's place over the spirituality, and he took it in spite of all absurdities and anomalies; he mounted the chariot of the sun: what wonder that the earth is dried up and parched and in full conflagration! What wonder that the hearts of Anglican Churchmen are fainting for fear, looking for vital warmth and kindness, and finding death instead! In spiritual matters, around them is a desolate wilderness, and all faces gather blackness. They have no one to look to. Their Bishops are a proverb of reproach in their mouths, of cowardice and unmanliness. Their wisest and most thoughtful divines fret away their heart in the solitude of their parishes, unable to defend, yet fearing to condemn. If ever an army was in rout, they are routed. Not a banner is raised to the rescue. Not a watchword goes through the ranks. O misery of miseries! To them the Church of Christ is a kingdom divided against

itself; to them the city of light is eclipsed in darkness; to them the dove, the undefiled one, lies in a nest of dark heresies; to them the body of Christ has its members tearing each other to pieces. Oh, pray for all hearts tender and true, that they be delivered from this hideous temptation to infidelity, and enter into the kingdom of truth, of light, and of peace!

We turn from this question raised by Archdeacon Wilberforce, observing only further that cruelly as he may be pained at the present state of things, shocked as every Catholic principle within him must be, he cannot, as we think we have proved, assure himself, or defend his communion, on the ground that the "Episcopal system" set up at the Reformation has been infringed as to the primary terms of its compact. The Crown is no more supreme now than it was then. It is the distinctive work of the Reformation which he reprehends, not a corruption and perversion of that work. The glorious doctrine of the Word made flesh has borne his spirit aloft into a purer region; he has once gazed upon the fountain of light; he longs for its warmth, and is clogged and suffocated among the fogs of Anglicanism.

For where in the Thirty-nine Articles, or in the range of Anglican Church literature—for theology there is none—will he find the following view of the Church? "The Christian faith was originally proclaimed as the *germinant principle of society*; and it cannot be otherwise than important that it should be perpetuated among ourselves under conditions not inconsistent with its original constitution and organic laws" (p. 1). "Thus did the intuitive conceptions of the Christian mind become fixed in authoritative expressions. The results of private thought and individual reverence acquired a form and shape, when they were embodied in dogmatic words by those who had authority to enjoin them. As the moral instincts of nature assume a new character when common consent has stamped them with the authority of laws, so that instinctive feeling with which Christians regarded the mysteries of the unseen world was matured by the Church's

judgment into the Catholic faith" (p. 136). "His guiding grace, the living principle of His mystic body, which had first dwelt in fulness in His Apostles as a gift of inspiration, was understood to dwell as a gift of interpretation in the collective episcopate. This was a point on which the ancient Church was as well qualified to give evidence, as any other on which its verdict is accepted. Do we accept its judgment that the Epistle to the Hebrews or the Revelation of St. John should be admitted into the sacred Canon; and can we deny the verdict which it had previously pronounced, that the most sacred doctrines were to be understood according to that view of truth into which the Holy Ghost guided its collective Fathers?" (p. 134). "The Church's authority does not interfere with the observations of sense or the inferences of reason; its province is that spiritual intuition which pronounces upon doctrines. And its witness is as conclusive in declaring the faith, as that of logic in explaining our ideas, or that of sense in communicating phenomena" (p. 139). "Natural intuition must be exercised in subordination to the testimony of humanity; spiritual to the testimony of the Church. The first has its origin in that plastic power which appoints our nature; the second in that pentecostal gift of the Holy Ghost, by which the whole body of Christ is animated. Rationalism, then, is that system of opinion which puts the first of these principles in place of the second. It does not positively reject religion, or disown Scripture, but recognizes no higher criterion than the judgment of mankind and the principles of nature. It supposes that the mass of men are competent in themselves to arrive at truth, because, through the multiplicity of opinions, opposite errors will eliminate one another. And therefore it either denies inspiration altogether, or denies at least that principle of divine guidance which is the necessary correlative of inspiration. In the first case it supposes the contents of Scripture to be discoverable by natural reason; in the second it supposes the canon of Scripture to be fixed by feeling or criticism; not by that guiding Spirit which directs the Church. Thus does

Rationalism dethrone and destroy that presiding principle which unites the body of Christ into one organic whole. For Church authority has been shown to be no arbitrary rule, but the result of that indwelling grace whereby the religious intuitions of individuals are matured into the Catholic faith" (p. 141).

It would seem that Archdeacon Wilberforce has deeply entered into what is called the doctrine of development. The principles here set forth are a real support and comfort to the Catholic, to whom the first, and the nineteenth, and every intervening or future century, must be bound together in one intimate union; who realizes in his every-day worship the blessed truth of the Church's infallible guidance; but what must they be to one who is required to believe and avow that, "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome has erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith:" and that "General Councils, when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and word of God), may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God."*

But if Mr. Wilberforce underrates greatly in our judgment the original evil done at the Reformation to the independence of the Anglican Church's spiritual existence, at least he is far from blind to the misery of her present condition. Let it be remembered that the following statements are wrung, we doubt not with anguish of heart, from that one of all her actual sons who has most distinguished himself in the study of dogmatic truth, a dignitary withal, and the brother of a Bishop, and the bearer of a venerable name. It is no enemy, but a child, high in position, higher in ability, who thus pronounces on questions which he knows will touch the heart, and perhaps influence the conduct of many.

"It was reserved for the year 1850 to see the Territorial system, or pure Erastianism, display itself in its full dimensions,

* Nineteenth and Twenty-first Articles.

and effect its full evils in England" (p. 77). And Erastianism is "the absorption of the Church by the civil government, the resolution of Christ's kingdom into a function of the State. In Erastianism the institutions of the old swallow up those of the new creation, and nature triumphs over grace" (p. 71). "To prescribe that none shall be appointed to the office of Bishop, except by the Sovereign, is to affirm the principle of Erastianism; it is to usurp the spiritual functions of the Church of Christ" (p. 74). "Such is the theory of the Church of England as exhibited in her laws; but such is *not* the practice, as illustrated by her actions. It would be difficult to find a more glaring contrast than between the prosperity of her apparent state, and the misery of her real situation. She claims to be the depository of a divine truth, which she has a superhuman commission to deliver; but the worldly power has in reality taken possession of her frame, and gives expression to its will through her organs of utterance." (This fact, which we see before our eyes, is the most exact and complete carrying out of Henry VIII's original idea, as first set forth in the Statute of Appeals, and illustrated in so many succeeding acts.) "She claims to be the salt of the earth, and she is in reality trodden under foot of men. This is the result of causes long in progress; but its consummation was the transference of the right of deciding respecting doctrine from spiritual to civil rulers; from those who possess authority in Christ's spiritual kingdom, to those whom God's providence has invested with natural power." (Which, again, was done in 1534, and not in 1850.) "No question of doctrine, however fundamental, can at present come into discussion in any court of the Church of England, in which the civil power would not finally interpret, explain, and define the will of God, and require the Church's officers to give effect to its interpretations." (And this, it must be added, would have been equally done by the Court of Delegates, nominated by the Crown, and deriving their jurisdiction from the Crown, not *necessarily* ecclesiastics from the beginning, nor *actually* so from the Restoration; though not this, but the

source of their jurisdiction is the real point at issue.) "And since the legislative powers of the Church are held in abeyance by penal statutes, its whole action is concentrated in that judicial department, of which it has been thus despoiled" (p. 145). For, as he elsewhere quotes Hoadly, "Whosoever hath an absolute authority to interpret any written or spoken laws, it is he who is truly the lawgiver to all intents and purposes, and not the person who first wrote or spoke them." *

The abstract injustice of all this is undoubted; but then it is the original pact; it is at this price that the Establishment has bought its civil status. What the Archdeacon has now discovered, Catholic writers from the commencement of the schism have not ceased to point out. For instance, Suarez, in the reign of James I., wrote a great volume against Anglicanism, which we recommend very heartily to Archdeacon Wilberforce's notice. Now, he will find (vol. xxi. lib. 3, c. 7, p. 130) that Suarez makes the particular Anglican error to consist, not in *denying* that there is a spiritual jurisdiction *in foro exteriori* for the Church's government, but in *annexing* it to the supreme temporal jurisdiction; the very point which he is now deploring as a new thing. "The mysteries of religion only, and the divine laws of the kingdom of Christ, are referred to those who do not possess the qualifications needed to decide them. And observe the effect of this intrusion upon sacred functions. It interferes with that law which has been shown to be a fundamental principle of the Church of Christ. It takes, as the ultimate judge in questions of doctrine, a human in place of a divine authority. The properties of the individual mind remain as they were before; but when we ask for that guiding principle by which the intentions of individuals are combined and directed, instead of a power which claims divine, we find one which claims human origin. Now, this was shown to be the fundamental principle of Rationalism. For Rationalism likewise is the substitution of nature, as the final criterion, instead of grace." (Here, again, Suarez has anticipated the

* From Wilkins' Concilia, vol. iv. p. 673.

author, for he told James I. that such was the basis of his religious establishment; and the British Solon, not being able to burn his person, burnt his book.) "Like Erastianism, it supposes that the impressions of men are to be moulded together merely by a natural rule; and that earthly wisdom and authority is a competent judge in matters of faith. Hence the fantastic reveries of the speculative German. Among our own countrymen, more inclined to political combinations than philosophic theories, the same tendency assumes a practical shape. They claim to dispense with that historical system which conveys to us the Church's judgment, because they have a sufficient criterion of truth and falsehood in their national good sense. The English people is too great to need any help in the settlement of its religion; it is able to elaborate a creed for itself out of those ancient documents, in which it is its will to place confidence. It will no more be dictated to in religion than in politics or in taste; and the people's mind will be reflected by the judgment of its rulers" (p. 147).

Things ought to be true which are concurred in by opposed authorities, for Archdeacon Wilberforce preaches before the University of Oxford on Sunday, May 18, 1851, much to the same effect as Father Newman at the London Oratory in May, 1850; and as his words are a most graphic description of that Erastianism, "the base and hateful features of whose real character" (p. 40) we are thankful to our author for exposing to his countrymen, we will terminate with them this notice of a most useful little book.

"We have not to inquire what is the dogma of a collegiate, antiquarian religion, but what, in the words of the Prime Minister, will give 'general satisfaction;' what is the religion of Britons. May not the freeborn, self-dependent animal mind of the Englishman choose his religion for himself? And have lawyers more to do than to state, as a matter of fact and history, what that religion is, and for three centuries has been? Are we to obtrude the mysteries of an external, of a dogmatic, of a revealed system, on a nation which intimately feels and

has established that each individual is to be his own judge of truth and falsehood in matters of the unseen world? How is it possible that the National Church, forsooth, should be allowed to dogmatize on the point which so immediately affects the nation itself? Why, half the country is unbaptized; it is difficult to say, for certain, who are baptized; shall the country unchristianize itself? it has not yet advanced to indifference on such a matter. Shall it, by a suicidal act, use its own Church against itself, as its instrument to cut itself off from the hope of another life? Shall it confine the Christian promises within limits, and put restrictions upon grace, when it has thrown open trade, removed disabilities, abolished monopolies, taken off agricultural protection, and enlarged the franchise? . . . The giant ocean has suddenly swelled and heaved, and majestically yet masterfully snaps the cables of the small craft which lie upon its bosom, and strands them upon the beach. Hooker, Taylor, Bull, Pearson, Barrow, Tillotson, Warburton, and Horne, names mighty in their generation, are broken and wrecked before the power of a nation's will. One vessel alone can ride those waves,—the boat of Peter, the ark of God.”

June, 1851.

v.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT CONCEPTION
OF MISSIONARY WORK ;
OR, THE JESUIT IN INDIA.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT CONCEPTION OF MISSIONARY WORK.

THIS little book* is a very simple and most touching account of the restoration and present state of the Jesuit mission in the vicariate apostolic of Madura, to the south of the great Indian peninsula. The author, Father Strickland, one of the missionaries labouring there, amid apostolic poverty and trials of every kind, is now in this country, for the purpose of bringing the needs of his mission more prominently before the eyes of Catholics. And in this short history he has certainly addressed a stirring appeal to their hearts. We commend the purchase of the book itself, which costs but two shillings, to every one of our readers, as the least offering which they can make to such a cause. But there is much in it intrinsically interesting. There are pictures of Christian devotion and martyrdom in past times, and of humble but most painful labours cheerfully undergone now in the cause of Christ, which cheer and refresh the spirit. In this district Father dei Nobili, Father de Brito, and St. Francis Xavier toiled and suffered; nor was a native convert, Devasagayam, a sketch of whose history and martyrdom is given, unequal to them in heroic fortitude and patient endurance. After all the reverses which the mission experienced by the withdrawal of its missionaries, first through the suppression of the Jesuits, and

* The Jesuit in India. London: Burns and Lambert. 1852.

then by the effect of the great French Revolution, there remain still within it 150,000 Christians; that is, about nine times as many as Protestantism, with all its efforts, and after spending enormous sums of money for a whole generation, is able even to claim in all India, as we shall presently point out. It is our purpose first to give a slight sketch of what Father Strickland's book contains, and then to glance at the forces now exerted by Protestantism in the same regions. If we do not deceive ourselves, our task will supply us with some striking and instructive contrasts.

The vicariate apostolic of Madura, we are told, is situated in the southernmost part of the peninsula of British India. It is a district extending from about 7.57 to 11.50 north latitude, and, in the widest part, has nearly three degrees of longitude. The climate is very relaxing, as the heat is almost continual even in the months equivalent to our winter. The great scourge of the country, which has been fatal to many of the missionaries, is cholera. The population may be rated at nearly four millions, partly Hindoos, and partly Mussulmans; of the former, about 150,000 are Christians, but the latter uniformly refuse to listen to instruction. The mission at present consists of one Bishop, who is a vicar apostolic, the Right Rev. Dr. Canoz, S.J., forty-two Priests, sixteen young Church students, four lay-brothers, and twenty-five catechists. The greater part are Frenchmen; there are five or six Italians, and but one English Priest. Among the three English students is a son of Sir Francis Palgrave, who, after gaining the highest distinction at Oxford, joined the Indian army; two years later, became a Catholic, and then left all to follow Christ, abandoning a career of high promise in the world for the humble lot of a missionary. What sort of a life these Fathers lead may be judged from the following details. The mission has but very limited funds, deriving from money and landed property about £100 a year; from clerical fees, and the voluntary subscriptions of native congregations, about £200; from the Propagation of the Faith, 30,000 francs, or £1200 a year; making in all

about £1500 for the support of the whole mission. *Each missionary scarcely exceeds one shilling a day to meet all expenses.* Sixty-two persons to support and clothe at one shilling a day amounts in the year to £1131 10s., thus leaving about £370 for buildings, reparations, care of churches, and all the contingent expenses necessary to carry on the mission in the most economical manner (p. 216). In a climate requiring from Europeans extraordinary precautions to preserve health, the accommodations provided for the missionary are as follows:—In most cases, the house occupied by him when he comes, is a mud hut, perhaps seven or eight feet wide, by twelve in length, thatched with palm-leaves; without windows, without even a door, and without furniture of any kind—not so much as a table or a chair. If there is a board of any sort to be found, he spreads on it the mat, which is his only bed. His food is nothing but rice, and curry made of lean tough fowls, when they can be procured (p. 125). Even this is an indulgence, brought about by necessity, after the most disastrous losses incurred by so inadequate a dietary. For, till Father Clifford's arrival in 1841, "the Jesuits in Madura never tasted meat or wine, but lived entirely on rice and fish; and often so little of these, that some now living can remember repeatedly fainting from exhaustion as they said mass in the morning. Even bread was a luxury almost unknown, for in every respect they lived as the poorer class of natives. This, joined to the excessive toil which they often underwent, spending hours in the confessional, and in giving instructions, riding long journeys from one Christian village to another, and having no better resting-place on their arrival than the wretched hut which has been described, was too much for the strength of men accustomed to better food, and in sufficient quantity, and made them an easy prey to cholera, or any other disease by which they might be attacked" (p. 159). After such statements, we are prepared for the result. "The startling mortality among the missionaries of Madura, which can scarcely be attributed to any other cause than the privations endured, sufficiently proves

that at present no other foreign mission is in the same want and need of assistance ; for in no other part of the Church has the mortality of the clergy been so great as one in about two and a half within ten years " (p. 201).

Within ten years after the re-establishment of the mission, twenty-one Priests have died out of sixty-four, all of them young men, and most not having reached the age of thirty-five. And, in the frontispiece, the writer is obliged to add, " by letters received from India since this book was put in the printer's hands, we are informed that two more of our clergymen have fallen victims to climate and privation." How entirely these noble hearts have been sacrificed to the poverty of the mission, and to the want of what, under the circumstances of their calling, are the mere necessaries of life, may be seen by the following statement which we take from a Protestant authority, whom we shall have to quote presently more at large. Out of 403 Protestant missionaries in India, " the number that died during 1850 was *four*. A careful examination of the different periods during which these missionaries have laboured in India will at once explode a fallacy widely circulated among the friends of missions in relation to the length of missionary service. It is generally believed that, in this country, owing to the deadly climate, the average duration of missionary life is seven years ; and many have come out as missionaries under this idea, that they would be certain to meet with a premature death. But this is a great mistake. From a careful induction of the lives or services of two hundred and fifty missionaries, we have found that hitherto the average duration of missionary labour in India has been sixteen years and nine months each. It was, doubtless, much less at first, and numerous cases can be adduced in which young missionaries were cut off after a very short term of labour. But a better knowledge of the climate, and of the precautions to be used against it, the use of airy dwelling-houses and light dress, with other circumstances, have tended very much to reduce the influence of the climate, and preserve health, so that the

average duration of life and labour is improving every year. As an illustration of this fact, we may state that, out of the one hundred and forty-seven missionaries labouring in India and Ceylon in 1830, fifty—we can give their names—are still labouring in health and usefulness; while of the ninety-seven others who have since died or retired, twenty laboured more than twenty years each. Several living missionaries have been in India more than thirty years. It is a remarkable fact, that the average missionary life of forty-seven of the Tranquebar missionaries last century was twenty-two years each."

Now, it is not for the sake of the missioners only that we must protest against so excessive a penury. No doubt the soldier of Christ, who dies in his Prince's cause, passes to his reward, and that the greater in proportion to the humiliation and the suffering undergone. But can the Church of God *afford* thus to throw away the lives of her champions? Are men endued with superhuman charity so rife, even within her bosom, that the ordinary rule of preaching the gospel is, in their case, to be suspended, and the labourer *not* to be accounted worthy of his hire? We do not ask for the bountiful supply which Protestantism provides even for the wives and children of its missionaries. But ought we to hear that, one after another, Catholic Priests have lost their lives, prematurely worn out by toil and hardship, because the mission was too poor to send them to the hills for the renovation of their strength, after a period of labour?

"The poor missioner of Madura, from his cabin in some plain of India, where a mat and a straw pillow are his only bed, whose whole furniture consists of a chair and a table, if he have one, after a long day spent in toil and privation, raises his voice to the Catholics of Europe, and begs them, by the compassion of Christ, to send him the means of supporting his catechists and servants, whose self-devotion is often tasked far beyond the bounds of ordinary virtue" (p. 221).

We should be pained, indeed, to think that such an appeal as is contained in the whole of Father Strickland's book, when

once made, could be made in vain, and that, too, at a time when the Protestant sects of England are spending yearly in India a sum which, in the hands of the Catholic Church, would supply the necessary resources to convert, in a short time, the whole of that vast empire.

But the mission of Madura has learnt from its first founders, in modern times, St. Francis Xavier, and Padre dei Nobili, that the loss of all things for Christ's sake is the way to win souls. We select, as a specimen of the interesting subjects contained in our little volume, the sketch of the latter of these great men, one, assuredly, who ranks high among the benefactors of the human race :

“The mission of Madura was founded by Father Robert dei Nobili, nephew of the celebrated Cardinal Bellarmine. Born in 1577, in Tuscany, of a distinguished family, he entered among the Jesuits at Naples; and, while still a novice, the historian Orlandini, his master, foretold that he would do much to promote the glory of God in India, for which he offered himself as soon as he had completed his studies. On reaching Goa he was sent to the Malabar coast, whence he proceeded into the kingdom of Madura, where the King, an ally of the Portuguese, had allowed a Christian Church to be built for the Paravas who resorted there for traffic. Father Gonsalvo Fernandez, a most fervent and zealous missionary, had laboured there for fourteen years, but had not converted a single native of Madura. The contempt felt for the Portuguese in consequence of their eating beef, drinking wine, and communicating with Pariahs, made the people fear to degrade themselves if they embraced their religion. Father dei Nobili resolved to strike at the root of this obstacle: he said, ‘I will become as a Hindoo to save these Hindoos,’ following the example of St. Paul, and making himself all to all to win all to Christ. After several years of study and preparation he, with his superior's permission, presented himself to the Brahmins, declaring, with strict truth, that he was not a Portuguese, or, as they called them, *Prangui*, but a Roman Rajah—that is, a

noble—and a *Suniassi*, that is, a penitent who has renounced the world and its enjoyments. The life to which he thus condemned himself was most severe. He could associate only with Brahmins. His whole food was milk, rice, herbs, and water, once in the day. His dress a long robe of yellowish cotton, covered with a surplice of the same; a white or red veil on his shoulders; a cylindrical cap on his head; and on his feet wooden soles resting on props two inches high, and held on by a peg passing between the great toe and the next. To this he added a cord, the distinctive mark of the Brahmin and Rajah castes; but theirs consists of three threads only, while his had three of gold and two of silver, and supported a cross. He told them that the three golden threads denoted the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity; the two silver ones the Body and Soul of the adorable human nature of Christ; and the cross His Passion and Death. He separated himself from Father Gonzales, and built a church and a house in the Brahmin quarter of the city, where he buried himself in prayer and solitude, never quitting his house, and allowing visits with great difficulty. Curiosity is a great stimulant: and to those who came to see him, his disciple used to answer that he was praying, or studying, or meditating on the divine law; and when admission was at length obtained, the Father was seen seated, cross-legged, in Indian fashion, on a dais, two feet high, covered with red cloth, and with a carpet and a fine mat before him. All saluted him by raising their hands joined above their heads, and bowing them to the ground. Even the noblest did this; and those who wished to become his disciples repeated it three times, and then went and stood behind him.

“His very extensive learning, the purity and perfection with which he spoke Tamul, and his extensive acquaintance with Hindoo poetry and literature, delighted every one, and his fame spread widely. The King wished to see him, but as he did not yet think it time to appear in public, the reply was, that the *Suniassi* was absorbed in prayer and contemplation.

It was taken for granted that he did not wish to go into the streets lest he should sully his eyes by looking on women; so high was the idea of his chastity, a virtue the more admired by the Hindoos because it is very little practised.

“But this vain reputation was not Father dei Nobili’s object; he aimed at the salvation of souls, and to succeed the better in this, he bound himself by vow to follow this new and painful life till his death. His first conquest was a Gourou, or Priest, with whom he disputed four or five hours a day, for twenty days. An abstract of this discussion would be both curious and interesting, but only a short account can be here given of his wonderful and most successful labours. Gradually disciples collected around him, and he instructed them in the catechism, and tried them well before he granted them baptism. Several among them were very remarkable for their holy lives, and Albert, the Gourou above named, had great power over evil spirits, and became distinguished for his sanctity. *Possession* was common among the Hindoos, as may well be imagined from the lives they lead, and Albert cast out many demons, sometimes obliging them first to testify publicly to the truth of the doctrines preached by Father dei Nobili; which made a great impression on the heathens. To this day the visible action of the evil spirit is by no means uncommon in India, and what reason is there to disbelieve the present existence of what we know on the authority of Scripture to have unquestionably existed formerly? If Christianity has diminished the power of the devil in Christian countries, we may naturally suppose that his power remains unbroken where the cross has never been planted. The good Father himself was also gifted with the power of healing miraculously, and during the time that he considered it conducive to the conversion of the heathens to remain secluded, he several times sent his reliquary by some of the converts to such persons, who were healed at its touch. After a time its great success excited the terror of the Pagans, and a persecution was raised against him, but he quietly continued his proceedings, availing himself

of the protection of some powerful friends, whom he had secured; and the storm passed away, as did others at different times. By degrees Father dei Nobili showed himself more in public, as he found he could venture to do so without shocking the prejudices of those whom he wished to gain to Christ. In one of his letters we find the following account of his day. 1st. The usual exercise of the Society, that is, meditation, holy Mass, self-examination, spiritual reading, divine office, etc. 2nd. Study of the Sanscrit and Badage tongues, and of the Vedas, or sacred writings of the Hindoos. 3rd. Composition of a large catechism, suited to the people. 4th. Four instructions daily, to catechumens, and to Christians. 5th. Audiences given to friends, and to those curious to see him, in which he had to listen patiently to the most ridiculous tales. For forty-five years he led this life, converting immense numbers, and gradually associating other missionaries in his labours. At one time a ridiculous report reached Europe that he had turned Pagan, and his uncle, Cardinal Bellarmine, wrote him a long letter, to remonstrate with him against such a crime; to which he replied by showing the great influence he had gained by his way of life, and giving a full account of his motives, which entirely satisfied his holy and learned uncle.

“His reasons for thus adopting native customs, and mingling among the natives as one of themselves, have been much questioned, not only by Protestants, but even by Catholics, apparently incapable of understanding the difficulties he had to contend with, or of appreciating his success. The contrast between the uselessness of all the efforts of his holy and zealous predecessor, Father Gonzales, and the numerous converts made by him, and those who trod in his footsteps, ought alone to be a sufficient reply; but when it is added that the good thus done has not been effaced by the long years of spiritual destitution which followed the destruction of the Society of Jesus, and that he acted throughout with the permission of his Bishop, we think every cavil must be silenced. So clear and forcible was his explanation, that it had great weight in

inducing Pope Gregory XV., later on, to allow the converted Brahmins to retain certain caste distinctions and customs, which, though apparently superstitious, were by themselves looked upon merely as marks of their nobility. The indomitable pride of the Brahmins, which seems born with them, and nurtured from their earliest breath, has always been a great bar to their conversion. The system followed by Father dei Nobili was the only method which ever met with success among them. Their dread of lowering themselves among their fellows by a change of religion, and being looked upon as Pariahs, for associating with Europeans, or Pariahs, was to most an insuperable barrier, which Father dei Nobili removed, in a great measure, by the manner of life which he led. This distinction of castes, and the contempt felt by the members of the higher castes for all beneath them, is still a great hindrance to the spread of Christianity; so much so, that even catechists have been known to object to instruct those of a caste inferior to their own, and when native Hindoos have been educated and ordained at Rome, those of a higher caste have found it difficult to acknowledge their sacred character.

“Father dei Nobili and a few others laboured, as we have described, for five and forty years. The mission was supported entirely by the resources spared with extreme difficulty by the establishments in the province of Malabar; for as Madura did not belong to Portugal, it received no funds from that country. The strict poverty practised by the missionaries enabled four to subsist on a sum calculated for only two; one was maintained by a small pension from his family, and two others by the rector of the college on the fishery coast, and by a house at Goa, with a little occasional help from the General of the Order. Had their resources been greater, could Father dei Nobili have carried out his plan of establishing a college for Brahmin converts, and have been seconded by a greater number of missionaries, perhaps Paganism might have been destroyed in Southern India. *As it was, these hard-working missionaries converted and baptized fully 100,000 idolaters.* At length,

sinking beneath his toils and privations, and nearly blind, Father dei Nobili was recalled by his Superiors, first to Jaffnapatam, and then to Meliapore, where he lived five years longer, exerting what strength and sight he had left in composing and dictating books in the native tongue for the assistance of his fellow-missioners.

“Throughout his career he had been particularly devout to the Blessed Virgin, under whose protection he placed his mission. To spread this devotion among his converts he composed Tamul verses in her praise. He died in Meliapore, in 1656, aged eighty” (pp. 31-40).

Not less interesting is the sketch which follows, of Father John de Brito's labours and martyrdom (pp. 40-46), and of the glorious fortitude shown by the native convert Devasagayam, whose case, we are told, was by no means a solitary one (pp. 52-60). Father de Brito, the process of whose canonization is now going on, “may be called the founder of the mission of Mysore, and is supposed to have brought nearly 60,000 Hindoos to the faith.” The result of all these efforts was that “in the beginning of the last century the Jesuits had added to the missions of Tanjore, Marava, and Madura, that of the Carnatic, which extended nearly two hundred leagues in length, and contained sixteen flourishing congregations. There were also many Christians in Bengal, and in the dominions of the Great Mogul. The French mission of Pondicherry alone numbered fully 60,000 native Christians, and was increasing daily; and without counting the northern districts, there were at least 1,200,000 Christians in the peninsula. Nor were these conversions ephemeral. The missioners, treading in the footsteps of St. Francis Xavier, spared neither time nor toil, and never baptized without ample preparation, and repeated entreaties on the part of the neophytes. The innocent lives of the Christians, and their firmness under persecutions, showed them worthy of the graces they received. The change of life produced by baptism was truly wonderful, and so astonished the heathens, that they imagined the holy oils were some

magic charm, so little could they comprehend such a complete alteration. Hereditary crimes were eradicated; converts from the robber castes ceased to steal; and missionaries have declared that they have heard the confessions of whole villages of Christians without finding one individual guilty of a mortal sin. Their firmness under persecution was even more extraordinary, for the Hindoos are a cowardly people, and very accessible to flattery, but Christianity seemed to change their nature, and to inspire them with the most generous and heroic faith" (pp. 50, 51).

Such and so fair was the progress of things towards evangelizing the great Indian peninsula, when the principal source, which supplied missionaries, was dried up by the suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773. For a time the seminary of Paris carried on the work, but the great Revolution destroyed this also. Then the Christians of India were left with very few Priests, who dwindled away more and more. At length, in 1836, the mission of Madura was once more entrusted to Jesuit Fathers, and 150,000 Christians have survived all these disasters, and testify to the vitality of that faith which St. Francis Xavier and Padre dei Nobili planted, and which Father de Brito, Devasagayam, and others, watered with their blood. Already three and twenty of these new missionaries, among whom is Father Clifford, brother of the present Lord Clifford, have laid down their lives in the work. Of the restored mission, then, we may say, as of the old one, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." These martyrdoms of poverty and over-exertion are perhaps keener, as they are certainly more prolonged, than those wrought by the sword or stake. Why should they not be as prolific?

Time would not allow us to comment on many interesting subjects which may be found in Father Strickland's pages. Such are the Christian ideas which he sees in Brahminism, the austerities of missionaries necessitated by Hindoo belief, the mode in which the difficulty of preaching to Pariahs was met,

the sketch of Dutch and Danish proselytism, of the Protestant missions, their purchasing of converts, and their sending their catechists to Catholic villages, rather than to heathen, as well as the brief notices of his brethren, and specially of Father Clifford, who have fallen victims to their zeal and their charity. Referring our readers for all these to the work itself, which bears written on it throughout the author's own character of simplicity and downrightness, we prefer to conclude these few remarks with a glance at what the Protestant sects are doing in the same regions. A slight comparison between the resources and the results of the two missions will prove, if we mistake not, the truest commendation of Father Strickland's object. For this purpose we shall take all our details from a source which may be supposed most favourable to Protestant missions, being none else than a summary of "the results of missionary labour in India, reprinted from the *Calcutta Review* of October, 1851," by a professed champion of the cause, who, for this purpose, had analyzed a great number of Reports.

Up to the commencement of the present century it would appear that the only attempt made by Protestantism to propagate itself in India, was the Tranquebar Danish mission, commenced in 1706. Begun by the King of Denmark, it was supplied almost entirely in men, and subsequently in money also, from the *soi-disant* Evangelical Church and University of Halle. Its missionaries best known to English ears were Ziegenbalg, Schwartz, and Gericke. By the end of the century, however, this mission had fallen into a very languishing condition. German neology had extinguished its spirit. A new era of Protestant missions begins with the founding of the Serampore Baptist mission in 1799. One after another, the London Missionary Society, the American Board, the Church Missionary Society, and the Wesleyans succeed. Presently the Bible Society comes in to aid the missionaries, and to supply the emissaries of the various sects with what seems to be their one common weapon of attack on heathenism, viz. the indiscriminate circulation of the Holy Scriptures. The

Protestant idea of converting an idolater seems to be flinging a Bible at his head. It is a very convenient substitute for martyrdom, or for that wonderful dedication of the faculties of the whole man—the patient labour of a life-long charity—which we see in Padre dei Nobili. Only prove its efficacy, and the steam-press of Printing-house Square, multiplied by Protestant gold, will advance with gigantic steps to the moral conquest of India.

But let us give the present efforts of Protestantism their full due. We wish every Catholic to lay to heart the following short statistical summary. Let him remember first that the sum raised by the Propagation of the Faith—and that mainly in France, by contributions from the poor of a *sou* apiece—for Catholic missions all over the world, the money offerings, that is, of at least one hundred and fifty millions of Catholics for that most sacred purpose, the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, amounts to somewhat more than a hundred thousand pounds a year. Now let us see what the Protestants chiefly of Great Britain, but in part also of the United States, have done and are doing. It is the Calcutta reviewer who speaks:

“Steadily advancing in their efforts, in the year 1830, after a lapse of twenty-five years from the entry of most societies into India, the missionary agencies stood thus. There were labouring in India and Ceylon *ten* missionary societies, including the great societies of England and the American Board. The missionaries were a hundred and forty-seven in number, and their stations were a hundred and six, scattered over all parts of the country. Since then, however, the interest felt by European and American Christians in the conversion of this country has greatly increased, and renewed exertions to secure it have been put forth with vigour. The discussions concerning the Suttee, the removal of old restrictions by the last charter, the publication of numerous works on Indian missions, and the appeals made to Christian Churches, have shown that India is one of the noblest fields where missionary labour may be carried on. The result is, that during the last

twenty years those Churches have nearly *trebled* the agency previously employed, have greatly enlarged the sphere of their operations, and are beginning to reap the most substantial fruits. With a view to exhibit these results completely and with scrupulous exactness, we have lately entered into very extensive correspondence with missionaries in different parts of India, and passed under careful review a large collection of missionary Reports, together with the recent religious literature of the various Presidencies. The facts thus elicited have been formed into a statistical table, and the following is a brief statement of its results:—

“At the close of 1850, fifty years after the modern English and American societies had begun their labours in Hindustan, and thirty years since they have been carried on in full efficiency, the Stations at which the Gospel was preached in India and Ceylon are *two hundred and sixty* in number, and engage the services of *four hundred and three missionaries*, belonging to *twenty-two* missionary societies. Of these missionaries *twenty-two* are ordained natives. Assisted by *five hundred and fifty-one native preachers*, they proclaim the word of God in the bazaars and markets, not only at their several stations, but in the districts around them. They have thus spread far and wide the doctrines of Christianity, and have made a considerable impression even upon the unconverted population. They have founded *three hundred and nine native churches*, containing *seventeen thousand three hundred and fifty-six members* or communicants, of whom *five thousand* were admitted on the evidence of their being converted.”

On first reading this last statement we were considerably puzzled to discover its meaning. In speaking of heathens converted to the Christian faith, it seems so very odd an expression to say that out of 17,356 so-called members, or communicants, “5000 were admitted on the evidence of their being converted,” the necessary inference being that the remaining 12,356 were admitted *without* such evidence; in which

case, of course, their membership is rather of an unsatisfactory character. But a passage somewhat further on elucidated the puzzle, and established the fact which we had been unwilling to assume. It is as follows, and we request particular attention to it:—

“The native Christian churches in India, established by missionaries, now amount to *three hundred and nine*. Some of these contain numerous members, but the great majority have but a few. It must be remembered, that the standard of admission into these little societies is not everywhere the same. Some missionaries admit members only upon good evidence of their conversion, arising from competent knowledge and consistency of Christian conduct. *Others require merely a certain amount of knowledge in their communicants, and the absence of great inconsistencies. By some the communion of the Lord's Supper is considered a church privilege to be enjoyed only by those who can appreciate it. By others it is counted a means of grace which shall fit men for understanding its ends. The number of members admitted on the higher standard is five thousand two hundred; of those on the lower, twelve thousand.* The care of these infant churches constitutes one of the missionary's hardest trials. While it is matter of thankfulness and joy to see their members forsaking idolatry, seeking the true salvation, and attending regularly the means of grace, their defects, their backslidings, and the grievous falls into sin which sometimes occur, prove how imperfect their character is, and give him many a bitter hour. *It is scarcely just to look for any high development of Christian excellence amidst the dense heathenism of India, and amidst a people as low in moral goodness as any on the earth.* The evil may be accounted for; how to devise a remedy is more difficult. Careful pastoral superintendence and instruction, raising the standard of admission into the body of communicants and members, and the faithful administration of Scripture discipline, may, under the divine blessing, tend to the elevation of native Christians, and by degrees diminish the evils which prevail among them.”

We recommend the writer who made this statement to read the history of Devasagayam, as sketched by Father Strickland, and the little French book of "The Seventy Servants of God who have suffered Martyrdom in China," etc. He will see that men of the weakest and most immoral races of the East, when received into the one true Church of God, have produced examples of heroism under suffering, and patient confession to the end, which would have done honour to the earliest ages of the faith. But the confessions here made are of great importance in estimating the character of those "three hundred and nine native Christian churches," which Protestantism claims to have founded.

We resume the statement which we had interrupted:—

"These church members form the nucleus of a *native Christian community*, comprising *one hundred and three thousand* individuals, who regularly enjoy the blessings of Bible instruction, both for young and old.

This, again, requires explanation, which the writer himself afterwards supplies in the following words:—

"*Connected with the native churches* is a body of individuals, cut off entirely from the great communities of Hindoos and Mussulmans. It includes not only the families of native Christians, but of many others who have cast off the restraints of heathenism, and placed themselves under the influence of the Gospel. *Though but nominally Christian*, they are all under regular Christian instruction; the children especially are cared for in the schools; and under the blessing of God much good may be effected among them in the future. It only remains to state how they are distributed:—

	Churches.	Members.	Christians.
Bengal, Orissa, and Assam	71	3,416	14,401
North-West Provinces	21	608	1,828
Madras Presidency	162	10,464	74,512
Bombay	12	223	554
Ceylon	43	2,645	11,859
	309	17,356	108,154 "

A Catholic, it may be observed, could not possibly extend the name of Christians beyond those called *members*. We are not even told that all these have been baptized, but we are told that twelve thousand out of seventeen thousand have been admitted on a very low standard, and without due evidence of their "conversion." And when this "native Christian community" of 103,000 persons, which is yet "but nominally Christian," is said to "have cast off the restraints of heathenism, and placed themselves under the influence of the Gospel," it means that, induced by motives which are not stated, and which we more than suspect to be of a very *material* kind, they allow their children to attend Christian schools, and themselves "enjoy the blessings of Bible instruction."

But to proceed with the reviewer's account. "The efforts of missionaries in the cause of education are now directed to *thirteen hundred and forty-five day schools*, in which *eighty-three thousand seven hundred boys* are instructed through the medium of their own vernacular language; to *seventy-three boarding schools*, containing *nineteen hundred and ninety-two boys*, chiefly Christian, who reside upon the missionaries' premises, and are trained up under their eye; and to *one hundred and twenty-eight day schools*, with *fourteen thousand boys and students*, receiving a sound Scriptural education, through the medium of the English language. Their efforts in *female* education embrace *three hundred and fifty-four day schools*, with *eleven thousand five hundred girls*, and *ninety-one boarding schools*, with *two thousand four hundred and fifty girls*, taught almost exclusively in the vernacular language. The Bible has been wholly translated into *ten* languages, and the New Testament into *five* others, not reckoning the Serampore versions. In these ten languages a considerable Christian literature has been produced, including from twenty to fifty tracts, suitable for distribution among the Hindoo and Mussulman population. Missionaries have also established, and now maintain, twenty-five printing establishments. While preaching the Gospel regularly in the numerous tongues of India,

they maintain English services in fifty-nine chapels, for the edification of our own countrymen. The total cost of this vast missionary agency during the year 1850, amounted to one hundred and eighty-seven thousand pounds, of which thirty-three thousand five hundred pounds were contributed in this country (India), not by the native Christian community, but by Europeans.

“The missionary agency connected with the direct preaching of the Gospel, to young and old, is thus distributed:—

	Missionaries.	Native Preachers.
In Bengal, Orissa, and Assam.....	101	135
In the North-West Provinces	58	39
In the Madras Presidency	164	308
In the Bombay Presidency	37	11
In Ceylon	43	58
	403	551

“The numerous band of missionaries here mentioned constitutes more than one-fourth of the entire body of missionaries sent into all parts of the world; and furnishes a splendid proof of the deep interest which Indian missions have aroused in the Church of Christ.

“It must of course be supposed, that of the whole number some were absent from their stations during the year through ill health; and we believe that twenty were so situated. The number of missionaries that died during 1850, was *four*.”

If death has been busy in the little Jesuit mission of Madura, he has dealt altogether as lightly, it seems, with the great body of 403 Protestant missionaries.

Of this great sum of £187,000 raised in 1850 for the Indian Protestant missions, £153,460 were drawn from Europe and America; and £33,540 were contributed by European Christians in India. But now let us glance at the multifold agency by which this sum is raised, and the many various, and, in part, antagonistic beliefs which supply it.

“The various Missionary Societies from which these efforts spring are *twenty-two* in number. Besides the great Missionary

Societies of England, the Established and Free Church of Scotland's Missions, and the American Board, they include the American Presbyterian Church; the American Baptist Missions; six Societies from Germany, of which the Society at Basle ranks first in its amount of agency; the General Baptist Society; the Wesleyan Missionary Society; the Irish Presbyterian Church, and others. To these we must add, the six Bible and Tract Societies of England and America. It is a most gratifying fact that, notwithstanding the numerous, and sometimes bitter controversies which occur among Christians of the Western world, their missionary messengers in the East Indies exhibit a very large amount of practical and efficient Christian union. While occupying stations apart from each other, and thus avoiding occasion of mutual interference with each other's plans, in numberless instances the labourers of different Societies cultivate each other's acquaintance, and preach together to the heathen. Almost all use the same version of the Bible; and the Christian tracts and books written by one missionary become the common property of all others. At Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, the Missionaries of all Societies are accustomed to meet monthly for mutual conference and united prayer. In these meetings, all general questions relating to the more efficient conduct of missionary operations, and common difficulties, and common success, are brought forward and discussed; while frequent occasions are furnished in private for cultivating personal friendships of the closest kind. Of the exceeding value of such union, as well as of its duty, scarcely too high an estimate can be made. In a land so given up to all moral abominations, as India is, *never could the prince of this world obtain a greater victory over the preachers of the cross than by inducing them, on trivial grounds, to turn their arms against each other.* And never can the agents of Christ's Church so justly hope for a sure triumph, as when they obey their Maker's command, in striving, with common efforts, with undivided affection, and united prayers, for the extension of His kingdom, and the conversion

of perishing souls. Let us hope that the 'Evangelical alliance' of Indian missionaries, throughout this great continent, may become more close, more pure, and more efficient every day; and that the few who, in pride of sect, stand aloof from others, may lay aside their estrangement, and become one with their brethren and fellow-labourers in the Lord's work."

The Protestantism of India in 1850 may answer, it seems, our Lord's question in the very words of Scripture: "Our name is legion, for we are many." Imagine, for one moment, the *common* Gospel which must be preached by these antagonist sects to the poor Hindoos. Few, perhaps, are more bitter in their hostility at home than High Church and Low Church in the Anglican Establishment, and every form of dissent outside of it, with each other, and Anglicanism. Imagine the Established and Free Church of Scotland, which have just split their land into halves at home, harmoniously preaching the Gospel side by side in India. Many of our readers may have seen on the broad pavement opposite the National Gallery a collection of animals, the admiration of passing boys and nursery-maids, termed "the happy family!" There dog and cat have laid aside their internecine hatred; rabbit and bird disport unattacked by either; the various antagonisms of the lower orders of creation seem suspended. They are each "content to differ" in their opposite instincts and appetites, and let each other alone. Such, apparently, would be the theological union inculcated by the reviewer. But then "the happy family" is happy on one condition,—*that it is duly fed by a common master, and does nothing.* Activity would at once destroy this seeming peace, call out contradictory tendencies, and deliver reptile, volatile, and quadruped, the canine and feline races, to the effects of their intrinsic enmity. Pretty much the same, we think, will be the result when Anglican and Presbyterian, Churchman, Wesleyan and Baptist, are seen seriously to attempt a common work, and that work the overthrow of a very deeply rooted idolatry, and the conversion of a sagacious and civilized people.

For, indeed, in sober truth, is not the very account given of Protestant missions by their own chosen advocate the *reductio ad absurdum* of Protestantism itself? How could, in the reviewer's words, "the prince of this world obtain a greater victory" than his own picture of things presents? Do the emissaries of twenty-two rival societies, paid by the contributions of Christians who are at issue with each other on almost every religious question, represent, indeed, "the one Lord, one faith, one baptism," which Holy Scripture enjoins? All who have had intercourse with the Hindoos tell us that they are a thoughtful and intelligent race, quick to discern contradictions and inconsistencies, and very observant of conduct and demeanour in those who presume to teach them. Now, the one only thing which the missionaries of these various sects possess in common is the Bible, that is, the *material, printed book*; for, as soon as they attempt to explain its *meaning*, they split into a hopeless disunion. What effect can we suppose that so heterogeneous a teaching will produce on the national mind of India? It may succeed in loosening their belief in their own idolatry, but what *positive* creed will it infuse instead? The real force on which these four hundred and three missionaries, with their attendant teachers, and their annual cost of £187,000, are manifestly relying, is the civilization of the nineteenth century, and the prestige of the English name. They draw youths to their schools by the desire to learn the English language, to be instructed in reading and writing their own vernacular tongues, to share in the manifest benefits of education, and to approach as near as they can to their conquerors. But take away these powers, which, after all, are of the earth, and earthly, and what living effect in their hands has the doctrine of the cross? That doctrine which was of old to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness, what transforming power, when wielded by them, does it manifest over the Hindoos? The grand result of four hundred missionaries, and twenty years' exertion of immense material

means, as put forth by their own advocate, is 17,356 *members* of the various sects, 5200 of whom have been admitted on what we shall compliment by calling a *sufficient* evidence of conversion, and the remaining 12,000 on what is allowed to be a low and uncertain one: and the production, in connection with these, of 100,000 individuals, who are called "but nominally Christian," though under Christian instruction.

On the other hand, after the withdrawal of its teachers, and a long course of adversity, we find, in the single Jesuit mission of Madura, 150,000 Christians still remaining. Is not this the difference we should expect between unity and diversity,—between heresy and faith,—between the one true Church and the manifold forms of error?

This was one contrast which it has been our purpose in these remarks to present. There is another quite as striking. We have seen the Jesuit mission of sixty-two persons supported at a cost of £1500 a year, allowing to each person little more than a shilling a day. This is far, indeed, from being adequate. But now hear at what rate the Protestant advocate estimates the services of the missionary:—

"In general, European and American Societies furnish the salaries of missionaries and catechists; other expenses are provided from local funds. We must, however, mention here (and we wish that the fact could meet the proper parties) that some Societies sustain their missionaries on a starvation allowance. Numerous missionaries in India receive less than a hundred and fifty rupees a month, and some little more than one hundred. This is economy at the wrong end, for it reduces the efficiency of those who must actually perform the labour. But none can say that missionary funds are extravagantly expended in any way. We have already pointed out that the whole agency of India and Ceylon, including the support of 403 missionaries, and the instruction of 113,000 children, *costs only* £187,000 *per annum*."

This writer complains that some missionaries receive so little as £180, or even £120 per annum; that is, ten shillings

or six and eightpence a day respectively. What would he say to the Jesuit allowance of one shilling a day? But this is not the whole case. Just as the household of an Anglican Bishop is considered by Parliament as unable to subsist, including the nursery, under a minimum of £4200 a year, so Anglican missionaries in India, without exception, we believe, receive as much as £250 if unmarried, and £300 a year if married; and we have heard of additional allowances, according to the number of children. Who will doubt, after this, of the truth of what Erasmus remarked, that the Reformation would end "in universal marriage"? It is a most wonderful carrying out of Luther's sermon on that subject. "Increase and multiply," it seems, is the command in the order of grace as well as in the order of nature, and after the same *mode*. We are not speaking without book, for the case has come before our notice of men, considered, through defective education, unfit for the work of the Protestant ministry in England, who were eager to go out to India, to marry on their missionary-ship, and £300 a year. It was a *settlement*, and not a bad one, to preach the Gospel to the heathen. But what is the ordinary £300 a year to the great Indian clerical "prizes," as Sydney Smith would say? "The Protestant chaplains maintained by Government amount to twenty-nine; of these nine receive seven hundred rupees per month, or £840 per annum; the rest have five hundred rupees per month, or £600 a year. They have, besides, 200 rupees per month allowance, when on their journeys to visit out-stations at fixed periods; and if they leave India after seven years' service, have the half-pay of a major, £173 7s. 6d. a year; if they serve ten years, their retiring pension increases to the half-pay of a lieutenant-colonel, £200 18s.; if they remain eighteen years, three of which may have been furlough, they have, on retiring, the full pay of a lieutenant-colonel, £365 a year." On the other hand, "the salary of the few Catholic chaplains allowed hardly ever exceeds one hundred rupees a month, or £120 a year; more frequently it is only half that sum, or even less, though they have charge of all the Catholic

soldiers, who, in some regiments, are as numerous as the Protestants." *

The people of India, then, have before them, not only the contrast between the unity of Catholic and the diversity of Protestant belief;—between one priesthood who teach one dogma, and a vast variety of agents belonging to different sects who are at issue with one another about every part of Christian doctrine and discipline; but likewise the contrast between poverty, self-denial, the complete abandonment of the comforts of this world, on the one hand; and, on the other, abundance, the full enjoyment of the domestic tie, and all its accompaniments, a considerable social position, in fact, the perfection of the *comfortable*, as it reigns in Anglican parsonages and pony carriages. And the people of India doubtless draw their conclusion as to which of these two is the doctrine of the cross, and which, likewise, the road to heaven. "Vishnou," says Father Strickland, "in the Hindoo mythology, came on earth, by a sacrifice of which He alone was capable, to save it from certain destruction. He subjected Himself to all the weaknesses and miseries of humanity, and to a cruel death, to destroy evil, and to make virtue reign. . . . Yet He is all the time the God of all, requiring from His followers faith and love, and a true and spiritual worship, a desire of being united to Him, self-denial, and a contempt of the world." The Hindoo sacred books "require prayer, fasting, works of benevolence, patience in suffering." "In honour of their false gods, they allow themselves to be suspended from a height by iron hooks passed through the muscles of the back; some go almost, or quite, naked, wandering about, eating only enough to preserve life, and subsisting on alms; others have made a vow of silence; some penitents beat themselves with whips." And "experience has proved that missionaries, in the interior, must practise the austerities displayed by the Hindoo penitents; and, accordingly, they dressed, as Father dei

* The Jesuit in India, pp. 117, 113.

Nobili had first done, in a piece of yellow cotton, with wooden sandals; they lived on rice boiled in water, with a few tasteless vegetables, and sometimes a little milk; they drank nothing but water, often muddy and bad; and slept on the bare ground, or, at most, on a tiger-skin spread on boards. They lived in mud cabins thatched with straw, which, in the rainy seasons, were often very damp; and their whole furniture consisted of a few earthen vessels, with palm-leaves for plates and dishes." When the natural conscience, or the remains of primeval tradition, or the stirring of the Divine Word speaks in such a manner to the Eastern heart, assuredly they will know how to reject the spurious and emasculated Christianity presented to them by a swarm of agents, who, far from showing contempt for the comforts of this life, settle down, and occupy the country with their wives and families. Surely they will recognize likewise in the poor Catholic missionary, and his doctrine of the cross expressed in his whole life and demeanour, the champion of that truth which still lies at the bottom of their own fables, and the ambassadors of that God who, "being rich, for our sakes became poor," and who died to save His creatures after commanding them to "take up their cross, and to follow Him."

But one observation more we must repeat. It is a thought for Catholic hearts to dwell upon, that the Protestant sects, mainly of England, are now spending, by voluntary contributions, £187,000 a year to convert India to their respective creeds. It has not been so in former times—it was not so fifty, nor, still less, one hundred years ago. Whatever may be the use made of this large sum in India (a question into which we have now no time to enter, but on which, we imagine, much may be said, and not a little is suggested by a perusal of the Protestant reviewer's summary of missionary operations, and their results), at least, we doubt not, that this sum is raised by many an act of self-denial, and accompanied by many a fervent prayer from the poorer

members of these various societies, and we doubt not that, from such alms and such prayer, a blessing will come to the givers. It may be that God, by this increase of charity and zeal for the heathen, is preparing these sects themselves for conversion to the Catholic faith, and the possession of the unspeakable blessing of Catholic unity and truth. And while we hope this, we hope, likewise, that their liberality will be a spur to the supporters of Catholic missions, and that "the Jesuit in India" will no longer be suffered to die prematurely for want of the mere necessaries of life, nor to languish on the payment of a shilling a day.

June, 1852.

VI.

ST. PETER, HIS NAME AND HIS OFFICE,
AS SET FORTH IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

TO PETER,
PRINCE OF THE APOSTLES,
THE ROCK OF THE CHURCH,
AGAINST WHICH THE GATES OF HELL SHALL NOT PREVAIL,
THE BEARER OF THE KEYS,
THE BINDER AND LOOSER ON EARTH AND IN HEAVEN,
THE CONFIRMER OF HIS BRETHREN,
THE SHEPHERD OF THE FOLD.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.



THE present work took its rise, and is largely drawn, from the very learned Father Passaglia's "Commentary on the Prerogatives of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, as proved by the Authority of Holy Writ," which was published in Latin, in 1850. The eighth and ninth chapters are, indeed, translations, respectively, of the twenty-seventh of his first book, and the first of his second book. And as to the rest, my obligations are more than I can specify. I owe, on the other hand, many excuses to Father Passaglia, for while I have only partially observed his order in treating the subject, I have considered his whole work as a treasure-house of learning, whence I might draw at my pleasure "things old and new," adapting them, as I thought good, to the needs of the Protestant mind, as familiar to me in England. Thus I have not scrupled to translate, to omit, or to insert matter of my own, according to my judgment. It seemed to me of paramount importance to present to the English reader the whole chain of Scriptural evidence for the Primacy and prerogatives of St. Peter. This chain of evidence is so strong, that, when I first saw it completely drawn out, it struck my own mind, brought up in the prejudices of Protestantism, with the force of a new revelation. I put to myself the question—Is it possible that they who specially profess to draw their faith from the written Word of God, would refuse to acknowledge a doctrine set forth in Holy Scripture with at least as strong evidence as the Godhead of our Lord itself, if they could see it not broken

up into morsels, like bits of glass reflecting a distorted and imperfect image, according to the fashion of citing separate texts without regard to the proportion of the faith, but presented in a complete picture on the mirror of God's Word? This picture is thus complete and perfect in Father Passaglia's work. Yet the form of that work, no less than its bulk, the scrupulous minuteness with which every opposite interpretation of so many adversaries in modern times is answered, as well as the fulness with which every part of the subject is treated, made me feel that a simple translation would not be tolerated by the impatience of a population which has little time and less mind for studies of this character. I have pursued, therefore, the humble task of *popularizing*, so far as I could, Father Passaglia's work, omitting, as I trust, no essential part of the argument, and grouping it under different combinations, each of which might be in turn presented to the eye, and so more readily embraced.

The importance of the argument, as it affects the Papal Supremacy, which is but a summary of the whole cause at issue between Protestantism in every shape, and the Church of Christ, cannot be overrated. If St. Peter be already set forth in Scripture as the Head and Bond of the Apostolic College, if he be delineated as the supreme Ruler who succeeds our Lord Himself in the visible government of His Church on earth, there becomes at once the strongest ground for expecting that such a Ruler will be continued as long as the Church herself lasts. Thus a guiding clue is given to us among all the following records of antiquity. Tradition and history become illuminated with a light which exhibits all objects in their due proportion and true grouping, when they are shown to be but the realization of what the Incarnate Word, His Church's one only Lawgiver, decreed from the beginning, set forth not only in prophetic image, but distinct command, and stored up in words of such exceeding power, that they bear the whole weight of the kingdom of God, stretching through all ages and nations, without effort or pressure. And if ancient writers

speak in no doubtful tone of St. Peter's prerogatives, yet clearer, more emphatic, and soul-piercing, as we should expect, are the words of God Himself, appealing in man's form to the mind and heart of man, whom He had created, and was come to redeem, and to knit into one eternal monarchy.

A subsequent part of the argument, namely, that the Bishop of Rome *is* successor to St. Peter, has been treated by the author in another work, "The See of St. Peter the Rock of the Church, the Source of Jurisdiction, and the Centre of Unity," specially in the fifth section, which ought, logically, to be preceded by this treatise. It is there proved that not only the Christian Fathers, as individual writers and witnesses, but the ancient Church in her universal Councils, did, with one voice, from age to age, regard the Pope as sitting in St. Peter's chair, which is proof enough, and all that can in reason be demanded, that the prerogatives given to St. Peter as Head of the Church were, in the belief of the Church, and in full accordance with our Lord's own promise,* continued on to his successors, and are as imperishable as the life of the Church herself.

September, 1852.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

AFTER the lapse of eighteen years the Author has the inexpressible pleasure of seeing the doctrine set forth by him in 1852, confirmed by the voice of the living Peter, who ever sits and rules in his See; a voice now issuing forth with the assent of an Œcumenical Council, the most majestic of all that have sat since the beginning of Christianity. The meaning

* Matt. xvi. 18.—"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," *i.e.* as founded on that rock. The foundation and the superstructure coexist for ever.

which St. Leo the Great and St. Gregory the Great gave to the passages of Scripture concerning Peter in the middle of the fifth and the end of the sixth centuries, and which has been maintained by their successors with the general acclaim of Christendom through all the intervening centuries, is thus afresh promulgated by an infallible authority for all future ages. In the profound sense of security and delight which such a decision carries with it, the writer cannot but express his gratitude to the Divine Providence which has placed his life at such a time. He rejoices to behold the unequalled grandeur of the Church assembled from the whole world, and bearing witness to the Rock on which it has been founded, and which through eighteen centuries has supported its weight.

Since the first edition he has had occasion to write a third work directed against a very peculiar theory, which supposes the unity of the Church to consist in the possession of a true episcopal succession and a real priesthood. This part of the Church's dower was undoubtedly possessed by certain ancient heretics and schismatics, who were not thereby preserved from the consequences of heresy and schism. The work entitled "Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church" applies the testimony of the Fathers of the first four centuries, and especially of St. Augustine, to this theory, showing how absolutely it was condemned by them in their time, and how entirely different an ideal of unity occupied their minds. These three works "St. Peter, his Name and his Office," "The See of St. Peter the Rock of the Church, the Source of Jurisdiction, and the Centre of Unity," "Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church," will be found to furnish a complete treatment of the Anglican position—if what its defenders have never ventured to set forth positively can be so called—as maintained against the Catholic Church.

MAUNDAY THURSDAY, 1871.

22, Portman Street, London.

ST. PETER, HIS NAME AND HIS OFFICE.

CHAPTER I.

THE NAME OF PETER, PROMISED, CONFERRED, AND EXPLAINED.

OUR Lord tells us that He came upon earth to "finish a work;" and He likewise tells us what that work was, the setting up a living society of men, who should dwell in Him and He in them; on whom His Spirit should rest, with whom His presence should abide, until the consummation of all things. For, the evening before His passion, "lifting up His eyes to heaven, He said, Father, the hour is come. . . . I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do. . . . I have manifested Thy name to the men whom Thou hast given Me out of the world. Thine they were, and to Me Thou gavest them; and they have kept Thy word. . . . Holy Father, keep them in Thy name, whom Thou hast given Me; that they may be one, as We also are. While I was with them, I kept them in Thy name. . . . And now I come to Thee. . . . I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from evil. . . . As Thou hast sent Me into the world, I also have sent them into the world. And for them do I sanctify Myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth. And not for them only do I pray, but for those also who through their word shall believe in Me; that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which

Thou hast given to Me, I have given to them, that they may be one, as We also are one. I in them, and Thou in Me; that they may be made perfect in one; and the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them as Thou hast loved Me. . . . And I have made known Thy name to them, and will make it known; that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them." *

In these terms the Eternal Word condescends to declare to us that the fruit of His Incarnation, the "finished work" which His Father had given Him to do, was the establishment of a society whose unity in "truth" and "love" should be so perfect, that He exemplifies it by the indwelling in each other of the Divine Persons; which should be perpetual and visible for ever, so that the world by it and in it should recognize His own mission, and believe in the Sender; and that the dowry of this society, thus perpetually visible, should be the equally perpetual possession of truth—the revelation of God's will—and of love, which is conformity to it. And He based these unexampled promises on no less a guarantee than the Almighty Power and ineffable Goodness of His Father, witnessed by His own dwelling amongst us in our flesh.

Elsewhere He termed this society His Church, declared that He would "build it on a rock, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it." †

He told those whom He had set over it to go forth in His name, and "to teach all nations whatsoever He had commanded them," adding the solemn engagement on His own part, "Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." ‡

His whole teaching is full of reference to it, setting forth its nature with every variety of illustration, enfolding it, as it were, with an exuberance of divine charity.

But two conceptions run through every illustration, and are involved in its primary idea, nay, as this was the finished work of His Incarnation, so are they found in His adorable

* John xvii.

† Matt. xvi. 18.

‡ Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

Person, from which His work springs. These conceptions are Unity and Visibility.

As the mystery of the Incarnation consists in the union of the divine and human natures, in one Person, and in the assumption of a body, that is, matter, by the one uncreated, incomprehensible, and invisible Being, whereby He becomes visible, so Unity and Visibility are the unfailing marks of His Church, and enter into every image of it, in such a manner that without them the image loses its point and significancy.

Accordingly He proclaims the Church which He was founding to be "the Kingdom of God," and "the Kingdom of Heaven," thus bringing before us the conceptions of order, government, power, headship on the one hand, dependence on the other, and a host of mutual relations between the Sovereign and the people, significantly remarking that "a kingdom which is divided against itself must fall." Now, a kingdom without unity is a contradiction in terms, and a kingdom of God on earth, which cannot be seen, would be for spirits and not for men.

So He calls it a "city seated on a mountain," which "cannot be hid," answering to His prophet's words, "the city of the great King," "His rest, and His habitation for ever."* Here again are embodied the notions of order, government, conspicuous majesty, impregnable strength.

Thus He inspires His Apostle to call it "the house of God, the pillar and ground of the truth."† The house must have its head, the family their father; the knowledge of that father's will is the truth which rests upon the family as its support and pillar. Outside of the family that knowledge may be lost, together with the will to obey the father and to love him; but within it is a living tradition, "familiar to the ear as household words." As long as the Master and the Father is there, a perpetual light from His face is there too upon His children and His servants. Divide the house, or corrupt its internal

* Matt. v. 14; Ps. xlvii. 2; cxxxi. 13, 14.

† 1 Tim. iii. 15.

life, and the idea of the house is destroyed; while an invisible house is an absurdity.

Again, the Lord, calling Himself "the Good Shepherd, who giveth His life for the sheep,"* terms His Church the sheep-fold, and declares that as there is one Shepherd, so there must be one fold.

But, rising yet in nearness to the Divine Person of the Word Incarnate, from whose side sleeping on the cross she is moulded, the Church is called His Spouse, as united to Him in eternal wedlock, "a great Sacrament," or mystery; and even yet more, His Body, as supported by the continual influx of her Head; and all her members are called "flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bones." †

It is evident, then, that in these promises and illustrations are set forth, as belonging to their object, a visible unity, a perpetual possession and maintenance of the truth, and the closest union with God, founded upon a most supernatural indwelling of the Godhead in a society of men on earth, the founding of which was the "finished work" of God the Word Incarnate. *Were these promises to fail in any respect*—which is utterly impossible, for while heaven and earth shall pass away, no word of their Maker can pass away—*it is plain that our ground for trusting in any promises of Holy Writ whatsoever would be demolished.* The whole Christian revelation rests on the imperishable life of the Church; because the corruption or division of the Church would falsify the written records of our faith, in which, after the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, and the Godhead of our Lord, no truth is so deeply embedded as the perpetual existence and office of the Church.

We have seen the idea of King, Lord, Master, Father, Shepherd, Husband, and Head, running through the delineation of the Church. And no society is complete without its ruler. Such was our Lord, while on earth—the *visible* ruler of a *visible* Church. "While I was with them, I kept them in Thy name." He went forth from His baptism to win souls.

* John. x. 11-16.

† Eph. v. 32, 30.

The water became wine in His presence. He bade men follow Him, and they followed. Power went forth from Him, and healed diseases. Grace flowed from His lips and conquered hearts. An innumerable multitude surrounded Him, of all ages and conditions. "And going up into a mountain, He called unto Him whom He would Himself; and they came to Him. And He made that twelve should be with Him, and that He might send them to preach." *

Here, then, the true Israel chooses the future princes of His house, who should sit with Him on thrones, judging the twelve tribes. Already, while yet with His Church, He is preparing for her future government, when His visible presence shall be taken from her. In three years all shall be accomplished, but when "the covenant should have been confirmed with many in one week, and in the half of the week the victim and the sacrifice should fail;" † when His Apostles should see Him no longer; was any one ordained to take that all-important place of supreme ruler which He had filled? For upon earth He had been in two relations to His Church: her Founder, and her Ruler. The former office belonged to His single Person; in its nature it could not pass to another; the work was finished once and for ever. But the latter office was, in its nature, likewise perpetual. How, then, should the charge of visible ruler, as man among men, be executed, when His Person was withdrawn, when He ascended up on high, when all power in heaven and earth was indeed given into His hands, and so the headship of spiritual influence and providential care; but when, nevertheless, that sacred Body was withdrawn into the tabernacle of God, and the Bridegroom was taken away for a time, and the voice and visible presence "what they had seen, and heard, and handled, of the word of life" ‡ "was with them and kept them" no longer. Should His Church, which had been under one visible ruler from the beginning, now have her government changed? Or had He marked out any one among the Twelve to succeed to His own office of visible head-

* Mark iii. 13.

† Dan. ix. 26.

‡ 1 John i. 1.

ship, and to be "the greater," and "the ruler"* among His brethren, His own special representative and vicar?

To answer this question, we must carefully observe and distinguish what is said and what is given to the Apostles *in common*, and what to any one of their number *in particular*; the former will instruct us as to their equality, the latter as to the pre-eminence which any one enjoyed over the rest, and in what it consisted.

Just, then, as at a certain period of His ministry, our Lord, out of the multitude who followed Him, selected twelve, to be His special attendants upon earth, and, when He should be taken up, to be the heralds of His Gospel among all nations, so out of the twelve He from the beginning distinguished one, marked him out for a peculiar and singular office, connected him with Himself in a special manner, and after having through the whole of His ministry given him tokens and intimations of his future destination, at last expressly nominated him to take His own place, and preside among his brethren. His dealing with this Apostle forms one connected whole, in which there is nothing abrupt or inharmonious, out of keeping, or opposed to what He said to others. What is at first obscurely intimated is afterwards expressly promised, again in fresh terms corroborated, and at last, in yet other language, but of the like force, most significantly conveyed,† while it is attested by a number of incidental notices scattered through the whole Gospel history. Thus ‡ it becomes necessary to consider each particular, as well as the whole sum of things said, *proper* and *peculiar* to this Apostle; to weigh first their *separate* and then their *joint* force, and only at last to form a united judgment upon all.

We are searching into the will of the Divine Founder of our faith, which He has not only communicated to His Church in a living tradition, but in this case likewise ordered to be set forth in authentic written documents. These

* Luke xxii. 26.

† Vid. John i. 42; Mark iii. 16; Matt. xvi. 18; Luke xxii. 32; John xxi. 15.

‡ Passaglia, pp. 35-37.

alone we are here considering, and the point in question is whether He decreed that all the Twelve should share equally in that divine mission and authority which He had received from the Father, or whether, while bestowing on them all very high and distinctive powers, He yet appointed one, namely Simon, the son of Jonas, to preside over the rest in His own place. We have, then, to consider all in these documents which is said peculiar to such Apostle, pointing out singular gifts and prerogatives, and carrying with it special authority of government. And we must remember that where proofs are numerous and complex, some which in themselves are only probable and accessory, yet have their force on the ultimate result. But this result must be drawn from a general view of the whole, and will collect in one the sum of proof both probable and certain.

Again, where many various causes concur, some more and some less, to produce a certain effect, the force of such effect is the force of all these causes put together, not of each by itself alone. Or where many witnesses are examined, whose evidence differs in value, although the testimony of some be in itself decisive, yet the verdict must be given after a consideration and review of all.

Now, the first mention which we have of the Apostle Simon is full of signification. Our Lord had only just begun His ministry; He had been lately baptized, and as yet had called no disciples. But two of John the Baptist's disciples hearing their master name Jesus "the Lamb of God," follow Him, are kindly received by Him, and one of them being Andrew, Simon's brother, finds Simon, and says to him, "We have found the Messiah. And he brought him to Jesus. And Jesus looking on him said, Thou art Simon the son of Jonas; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter:"* as if He would say, by birth thou art Simon, son of John; but another and a higher lot is in store for thee. I will give thee another name which thou shalt bear, a name in itself signifying the

* John i. 35-42.

place which thou shalt hold in My Church. Thou shalt be called, and thou shalt be, the Rock.

For why, when a vast multitude of our Lord's words and actions have been omitted, was this recorded for us, save that a deep meaning lay in it? Or what could that meaning be when our Lord, for the first time looking on Peter, promised to him and to him alone, a new name, and that a name given in prophecy to himself, a name declaring by its very sound that he should be laid by the builder, as a foundation of the structure about to be raised? So in the fourth century St. Chrysostom comments on the text, calling him "the foundation of the Church, he that was really Peter" (the Rock) "both in name and in deed;" and a little after St. Cyril, of Alexandria, "with allusion to the rock He transferred His name to Peter, for upon him He was about to found His Church."* The Creator of the world does not give a name for nothing. His word is with power, and does what it expresses. Of old, "He spake and they were made; He commanded and they were created." Now, too, He speaks, at the first dawn of His great spiritual restoration. When as yet nothing has been done, and not a stone of the divine building reared, He who determines the end from the beginning looks upon one who seemed a simple fisherman, and at first beholding him, He takes Simon, the son of Jonas, out of the roll of common men; He marks him for a future design; He wraps him in a prophetic title; He associates him with His own immovable power. Of Himself it has been said,† "Behold I will lay a stone in the foundation of Sion, a tried stone, a corner-stone, a precious stone, founded on the foundation. He that believeth, let him not hasten." And again, "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner; this is the Lord's doing, and it is wonderful in our eyes." And again, "A stone was cut out of a mountain without hands; and it struck the statue upon the feet thereof that were of iron and clay, and

* St. Chrysostom on the text. St. Cyril on John i. 42.

† Isa. xxviii. 16; Ps. cxvii. 22; Dan. ii. 35; Zach. iii. 9; Eph. ii. 20.

broke them in pieces. But the stone that struck the statue became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." And again, "Behold the stone that I have laid before Jesus: upon one stone there are seven eyes; behold, I will grave the graving thereof, saith the Lord of Hosts; and I will take away the iniquity of that land in one day." In reference to which St. Paul said of Christians, that they are "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, being framed together, groweth up into a holy temple in the Lord." It is plain, then, that our Lord, "both by the Old and New Testament, is called a stone." *

But this which He had of Himself, and by virtue of His own divine power, as the Word of God, He would communicate in a degree, and by dependence on Himself, to another. This is no modern interpretation, but the very words of St. Ambrose: "Great is the grace of Christ, who bestowed almost all His own names on His disciples. I, said He, am the light of the world, and yet He granted to His disciples the very name in which He exulted, by the words, Ye are the light of the world. Christ is the Rock, but yet He did not deny the grace of this name to His disciple, that he should be Peter, because he has from the Rock firm constancy, immovable faith." †

In the third century, Origen, on this very text, observes: "He said he should be called Peter, by allusion to the Rock, which is Christ, that as a man from wisdom is termed wise, and from holiness holy, so too Peter from the Rock." And in the fifth, St. Leo paraphrases the name thus: "While I am the inviolable Rock, the Corner-stone, who make both one, the foundation beside which no one can lay another; yet thou also art the rock, because by My virtue thou art established so as to enjoy by participation the properties which are peculiar to Me." ‡

* Theodoret on Dan. ii. 34.

† Ambrose on Luke, lib. 6, n. 97.

‡ Sermon. iv. 2.

Here, then, we have three facts : 1. That our Lord having twelve Apostles whom He chose, loved, and honoured, above all His other disciples, yet promised to one only a new name ;* and, 2. This a name in the highest degree significative, and most deeply prophetic of a particular office ; and, 3. A name peculiar to Himself, as the immovable foundation of the Church. This happened in the first year of His ministry, before, as it would appear, either Peter or any other Apostle was called.

The promise thus emphatically made to Simon, "Thou shalt be called the Rock," our Lord fulfilled in the second year of His ministry, when He distinguished the twelve Apostles from the rest of His disciples, giving them authority to teach, and power to heal sicknesses and to cast out devils. Then, says St. Mark, "to Simon He gave the name of Peter;" and St. Matthew, "The names of the Twelve Apostles are these : the first, Simon, who is called Peter;" and St. Luke, "Simon, whom also He named Peter." † And by this name He marked him out from amongst all his brethren, and united him to Himself. "He changes, too," says Tertullian, "Peter's name from Simon, because also as Creator He altered the names of Abraham, Sara, and Oshua, calling the last Jesus, and adding syllables to the others, but why did He call him Peter? If for the strength of his faith, many solid substances would lend him a name from themselves. Or was it because Christ is both the Rock and the Stone? Since we read that He is set for a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. I omit the rest. And so it was His pleasure to communicate to the dearest of His disciples, in a peculiar manner, a name drawn from the

* For the name Boanerges, which in one place is given to the two sons of Zebedy, is in the first place a joint name ; secondly, it is nowhere else referred to, and does not take the place of their birth-names ; thirdly, it indicates not an official dignity, but an inward disposition. We cannot doubt that such a name bestowed on the two brothers was a mark of great distinction, but, for the above reasons, it cannot come into competition with the name of Peter. See Passaglia, p. 44, n. 38.

† Mark iii. 14 ; Matt. x. 1 ; Luke vi. 14.

figures of Himself, I imagine, as being nearer than one drawn from figures not of Himself." *

It is, then, setting a seal on His former acts, drawing out and corroborating their meaning, that He once more, and in the most emphatic way of all, recurs to this name, attaching to it the most signal promises, and establishing its prophetic power. In the third year of His ministry our Lord "came into the quarters of Cesarea Philippi; and He asked His disciples, saying, Whom do men say that the Son of Man is? But they said, Some John the Baptist, and others Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets. Jesus saith to them, But whom say ye that I am? Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering, said to him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar Jonas because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

When we reflect that the first act of our Lord to Peter was to look upon him, and to promise him this name, a token of His omnipotence to Simon yet knowing him not, as that seeing him under the fig-tree was to Nathanael of His omniscience; and that when He chose His twelve apostles, it is said markedly "to Simon He gave the name of Peter," the force of His reply cannot well be exceeded. The promise of our Lord answers part by part to the confession of His Apostle. The one says, "Thou art the Christ," that is, the anointed one; the other, "Thou art Peter," that is, the Rock, the name which I gave thee Myself: My own title with which I invested thee. The one adds, "the Son of the living God;" the other, "And upon this rock I will build My Church," that is, as it is true what

* Cont. Marcion. l. 4, c. 13.

thou confessest, that I am "the Son of the living God," so my power as such shall be shown in building my Church upon thee whom I have long named the Rock, "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Not only this, but I will unfold to thee the full meaning of thy name, and declare the gifts which accompany it. "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." * That is, "The root and the offspring of David," "the holy one and the true one, He that hath the key of David; He that openeth and no man shutteth; shutteth and no man openeth;" as He gave to thee to share His name of the Rock, so He shall give to thee to bear in His name His own symbol of supreme dominion, the key which opens or shuts the true city of David; all ages shall own thee, all nations acknowledge thee, as *The Bearer of the Keys*; as long as My Church shall last, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, thy office shall last too; as long as there are souls to be saved, they shall pass by thy ministry into the gate of the Church. And further, as long as there need in my spiritual kingdom laws to be promulgated, precepts issued, sins forgiven, "whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

Who, indeed, can adequately express the gifts which the world's Creator and Redeemer here promises to His favoured servant? Thus in the fourth century St. Chrysostom labours to set them forth. "See how He raises Peter to a higher opinion of Himself; and reveals and shows Himself to be the Son of God by these two promises. For what belongs to God alone, to loose sins, and to render the Church immovable in such an assault of waves, and to make a fisherman more solid than any rock, when the whole world was at war with him, these are what He promises to give him; as the Father addressing Jeremias, said, 'I have made thee an iron pillar and a wall,' but him to one nation, whereas the other to the whole world. Willingly would I ask those who wish to

* Apoc. xxii. 16; iii. 7.

diminish the dignity of the Son, which are the greatest gifts, those which the Father gave to Peter, or those which the Son. For the Father bestowed on Peter the revelation of the Son; but the Son disseminated that of the Father and of Himself through the whole world; and *put into the hands of a mortal man power over all things in heaven, when He gave the keys to him* who extended the Church through the whole world, and showed it to be firmer than the heaven.* And not many years later St. Leo says, "That which the Truth ordered remains; and blessed Peter persisting in that strength of the rock which he received, has not deserted the guidance, once undertaken, of the Church. For thus was he set before the rest, that while he is called the Rock, while he is declared to be the foundation, while he is appointed the door-keeper of the kingdom of heaven, while he is advanced to be the judge of what shall be bound and what loosed, with the condition that his sentence shall be ratified even in heaven, *we might learn through the very mysteries of the names given to him, how he was associated with Christ.*" † This association passed, indeed, into the very mind of the Church, for among all the titles given by fathers and councils and liturgies to Peter, and expressing his prerogatives, the one contained in this name is the most frequent. Thus he is termed, "the rock of the Church," ‡ "the rock of the Church that was to be built," § "underlying the building of the Church," ¶ "receiving on himself the building of the Church," ¶¶ "the immovable rock," ** "the rock which the proud gates of hell prevail not against," †† "the most solid rock," ††† he to whom the Lord granted the

* St. Chris. on Matt. 16, Hom. 54.

† St. Leo, Sermon 3 on his anniversary.

‡ Hilary of Poitiers on Matt. xv. n. 6; on Ps. cxxxi. n. 4; on the Trinity, l. 6 n. 20. Gregory Naz. Orat. 26, p. 453. Ambrose in his first hymn, referred to also by Augustine, Retract. lib. 1, c. 21, and Epiph. in ancor. n. 9.

§ Tertullian de Monogam. c. 8. Origen on Ps. i. quoted by Eusebius, Hist. l. 6, c. 25. Cyprian, Ep. 71, and Firmilian, among Cyprian's letters, 74.

¶ Basil cont. Eunom. lib. 2, n. 4. Zeno, lib. 2, tract. 13, n. 2.

¶¶ By the same.

** Epiphani. Hær. 59, n. 7.

†† August. in. Ps. cont. par. Donati. Leo, serm. 98.

††† Theodoret, ep. 77.

participation of His own title, the rock,"* "the foundation second from Christ," † "the great foundation of the Church," ‡ "the foundation and basis," § "founding the Church by his firmness," || "the support of the Church," ¶ "the Apostle in whom is the Church's support," ** "the support of the faith," †† "the pillar of the Church," †† and by an authority sufficient alone to terminate all controversy, the great Council of Chalcedon, §§ "the rock and foundation of the Catholic Church, and the basis of the orthodox faith." |||

Thus, then, we have the name of Peter first promised, next conferred, then explained. And further light will be shed on this by the consideration of the purpose for which names in Holy Writ were bestowed by divine command on individuals, or their former names changed.

Now, of names opposed in Scripture there would seem to be three classes. ¶¶ The first and most common are *commemorative*, and are for the purpose of recording and handing down to posterity remarkable facts. Such are Peleg, "because in his days the earth was *divided*;" Isaac, from the *laughter* of his father and mother; Issachar, a *reward*; Manasseh, "God hath made me to *forget* my labours;" Ephraim, "God hath made me to *grow*;" *** and a multitude of others.

The second class may be termed *significative*, being imposed to distinguish their bearers from others by some quality. Such are Jacob, the supplanter; Esau; Edom, the red; Moses, the taken or saved; Maccabæus; Boanerges. †††

* Maximus of Turin, Serm. pro natali Petri et Pauli.

† Greg. Nazian. in Hom. archieratico inserta.

‡ Origen on Exod. hom. 5, n. 4.

§ Gallican Sacramentary, edited by Mabillon, t. i., Mus. Ital. p. 343. Synod of Ephesus, act 3.

|| Peter Chrysologus, serm. 154.

¶ Ambrose on Virginity, c. 16.

** Ambrose on Luke, lib. iv. n. 70.

†† Chrysostom, Hom. on debtor of ten thousand talents, tom. iii. p. 4.

‡‡ Philip, legate of the Apostolic See, in Act. 3 of Council of Ephesus.

§§ Council of Chalcedon, act 3, in deposing Dioscorus.

||| For the above references see Passaglia, p. 400.

¶¶ Vid. Passaglia, p. 54, note 47.

*** Gen. x. 25; xvii. 19; xxx. 18; xli. 51, 52.

††† Gen. xxv. 26; xxvii. 36; xxv. 25; xxv. 30; Exod. ii. 10; 1 Macc. ii. 4; Mark iii. 17.

The third and highest class are *prophetic*, and as such evidently can be imposed by God alone, who foresees the future. They are twofold: 1. Those which fore-signify events concerning not so much their bearers as others; such are Shear-jashub, "the remnant shall return;" Jezrael, "I will visit;" Lo-ruhamah, "not pitied;" Lo-ammi, "not my people." 2. Those which point out the office and destiny of their bearers; such as Noah, rest; Israel, a prince before God; Joshua, Saviour; Sarah, princess; John, in whom there is grace; and, after the divine name of Jesus, "who saves His people from their sins,"* Abraham, and Cephas, or Peter, which two neither commemorate a past event, nor signify a quality or ornament already possessed, but are wholly prophetic, inasmuch as they shadow out the dignity to which the leaders of the two covenants are divinely marked out by the very imposition of their name.

For it will perhaps bring out the pre-eminence and superior authority of Peter, if we consider the very close resemblance and almost identity of the dispensation into which God entered with Abraham, and that which Christ gave to Peter. But first we must observe how the more remarkable things occurring in the New Testament were foretold by types, images, parallelisms, and distinct prophecies in the Old. How † both our Lord, the Evangelists, and the Apostles, take pains to point out the close agreement between the two covenants; how the ancient ecclesiastical writers do the like in their contests with early heretics, or in recommending the truth of the Christian faith either to Jew or Gentile. They considered scarcely any proof of the Gospel superior to that which might be drawn by grave and solid inference from the anticipation of Christian truths in the old covenant. Now, among such truths, what concerns Peter is surely of signal importance, as it affects the whole judgment on the form of government which our Lord instituted for His Church.

Again, it may be taken as an axiom that, as a similitude

* Isa. vii. 3.; Os. i. 4, 6, 9; Gen. v. 29; xxxii. 28; Numb. xiii. 17; Gen. xvii. 15; Matt. iii. 1.

† Passaglia, p. 51,

of causes is inferred from a similitude of effects, so a resemblance of the divine counsels may be inferred from a resemblance of exterior manifestations. As effects are so many steps by which we rise to the knowledge and discernment of causes, so divine manifestations are tokens which unfold God's eternal decrees. Thus if the series of dealings which constitute God's dispensation to Abraham be very much like that other series in which the Scriptures of the New Testament set forth the dispensation given to Peter, we may conclude, first, that the two dispensations may be compared; and, secondly, that from their resemblance, a resemblance in the divine purpose may be deduced.

First,* then, "God at sundry times, and in divers manners, speaking to the Fathers" of that covenant of grace, into which He had already entered with our first parents, said to Abram, "Go forth out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and out of thy father's house, and I will make of thee a great nation." But when in the last days He began to fulfil that covenant, and to declare His will by His Son, Jesus said to Simon and Andrew, "Follow Me, and I will make you to become fishers of men," and to Simon specially, "Fear not, for henceforth thou shalt catch men." †

Abram hearkened to God calling him: "So Abram went out as the Lord had commanded him;" and Simon as readily obeyed Christ's vocation: "And immediately leaving their nets they followed Him." ‡

God rewarded Abraham's obedience by the promise of a new name: "Neither shall thy name be called any more Abram, but thou shalt be called Abraham." So Christ honoured Simon, saying, "Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas; thou shalt be called Cephas." §

No sooner had God unfolded the dignity shadowed forth in the promised name, and bestowed that dignity on Abraham, than He required of him a signal instance of faith and love:

* Passaglia, p. 52.

† Gen. xii. 1; Mark i. 16, 17; Luke v. 10.

‡ Gen. xii. 4; Mark i. 18.

§ Gen. xvii. 5; John i. 42.

“God tempted Abraham, and said to him, Take thy son, thine only begotten, whom thou lovest, and offer him for a holocaust.” So Christ required of Simon a proof of faith and of superior love before He either unfolded the excellence of the promised name, or adorned him with that excellency: “He saith to them, Whom say ye that I am?” “Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these?” *

And both were no less ready to show the fortitude of their faith and love than they had been ready to follow the divine calling. For, “Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the sword to sacrifice his son;” and “Simon Peter answering, said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;” and again, “Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee.” †

Then, as the bestowal of the new name was the reward of the obedience with which each had followed his vocation, so God, moved by their remarkable ensuing faith and charity, explained the dignity contained in that name, and bestowed it when so explained. The following refers to the explanation: “By Myself have I sworn, because thou hast done this thing,” and “Because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father who is in heaven. And I say unto thee.”

But as to the dignity bestowed, it should be remarked that it is divine, and communicated to each with this resemblance: *First*, that Abraham thereby becomes the source and parent of all the faithful, and Peter their base and foundation; the one, the author of a seed which should equal in number the stars of the heaven and the sand of the sea; the other, the Rock of the Church, which should embrace all nations, tribes, and languages. God says to Abraham, “And multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven and as the sand which is on the sea-shore.” But Christ to Peter, “And upon this rock I will build My Church.” *Secondly*, the blessing thus bestowed from above upon each was not one which should rest in their single persons, but from them and through

* Gen. xxii. 1; Matt. xvi. 15; John xxi. 15.

† Gen. xxii. 10; Matt. xvi. 16; John xxi. 15.

them should be extended to the universal posterity and society of the faithful; so that all who should believe, to the consummation of time, should gain through them blessing, stability, and victory over the assault of enemies and the gates of hell. The promise to Abraham is clear: "Thy seed shall possess the gate of their enemies, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;" nor less so to Peter, "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

But the high excellence of this dignity, embracing, as it does, the whole company of the faithful, was presignified in the very meaning of the name imposed. For of Abraham's name we read, "And thy name shall be Abraham, for a father of many nations have I made thee." Exactly resembling is what is said of Peter's appellation, "Thou art Peter, the Rock, and upon this rock I will build My Church."

Nay, we may put in parallel columns the two promises, thus—

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Thy name shall be Abraham, | 1. Thou art Peter, |
| 2. For a father of many nations
have I made thee: | 2. And upon this rock I will
build My Church. |

and just as in the former the second clause contains the reason of the first, so in the latter likewise the two clauses cohere, as the name and its explanation. Again, the dignity of the one is expressed as that of the Father; of the other as that of the Rock. Further, those alone can share the blessing of Abraham, who are born of his spirit; and those alone the stability divinely granted to Peter, who refuse by any violence, or at any cost, to be separated from him.

But Abraham was thus raised to be the friend of God, associated in the divine Fatherhood, and made the teacher of posterity; and therefore, as being such, God would show him His counsels, that through him they might descend to his children. "And the Lord said, Can I hide from Abraham what I am about to do? for I know that he will command his children and his household after him to keep the way of the Lord." In a precisely similar way, when God would call

the Gentiles to the light of the Gospel, He showed it by a special revelation to Peter alone: "There came upon him an ecstasy of mind; and he saw the heaven opened; and this was done thrice." And the reason of so preferring Peter was God's decree, that through him other Christians, even the Apostles themselves, might be informed, and convinced. "You know that in former days God made choice among us that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe." "And thou, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren."*

Finally, as God pronounces Abraham blest, so Christ pronounces Peter; and as He made Abraham the source and fountain-head of blessing and strength to all others, so no less did Christ make Peter. Of the first we read, "I will bless thee, and will make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing;" of the second, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar Jona;—and upon this rock I will build My Church."

In one word, the parallel is as follows between Abraham and Peter. Both receive a remarkable call, and follow it; both are promised and receive a new, and that a prophetic name; of both signal instances of faith and love are required; both furnish these, and therefore do not lose the increase of their reward; to Abraham his prophetic name is explained, and to Peter likewise; Abraham understands his destination to be the Father of all nations, and Peter that he is made the Rock of the universal Church; Abraham is called blest, and so Peter; to Abraham it is revealed that no one, save from him, and through him, shall share the heavenly blessing; to Peter that all, from him, and through him, shall gain strength and stability; it is only through Abraham that his posterity can promise itself victory over the enemy, and only through being built on Peter, the Rock, that the Church will triumph over the gates of hell; in fine, if Abraham, as the teacher of the faithful, is instructed in the divine counsels

* Gen. xviii. 17; Acts x. 10; xv. 7; Luke xxii. 32.

with singular care, not less is shown to Peter, whom Christ has made the doctor and teacher of all believers.

The gifts thus bestowed on Abraham and Peter are *peculiar*, for they are read of no one else in the Holy Scriptures; they are not only *gifts*, but a *reward* for singular merit; and in their own nature they cannot be *general*. As by them Abraham is put into a relation of *Fathership*, so that all the faithful become his children, so Peter being called and made the Rock and *Foundation* of the Church, all its members have a dependence on him.

And if these gifts are *peculiar*, no less do they convey a singular *dignity* and *pre-eminence*. For it follows that, as St. Paul says, all the faithful are children of Abraham,* being heirs not of his flesh, but of his spirit and faith; so no one is, or can be, a part of the Church's building, who rests not on Peter as the foundation. For the same God who said to Abraham, "Thy name shall no longer be called Abram, but Abraham shall be thy name," said also to Simon, "Thou shalt not be called Simon, but Cephas;" the same God who said to the former, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed," said to the latter, "Upon this Rock I will build My Church."

What is the source of this pre-eminence in both? To both the same objection may be made, and for both the same defence.

How should blessing and adoption be propagated from Abraham, as a sort of head, into the whole body of the faithful? Because Abraham is considered as joined with that mighty Seed his offspring, whence *in chief* and *primarily* the salvation of all depends; because Abraham is made by *participation* partner of that dignity which *naturally* and *substantially* belongs to the Seed that was to Spring from him. God Himself has told us this, and His Apostle St. Paul explained it. For as we read that it was said to Abraham, "In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed," so God Himself has

* Gal. iii. 7.

told us that *in thee, by thee*, means *in, by thy seed*. Hence St. Paul: "To Abraham were the promises made, and to his seed. He saith not, seeds, as of many, but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."* So that the divine words, "In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed," give this meaning: "As thou shalt give flesh to My only begotten Son whom I cherish in My bosom, whence He shall be called at once 'the Son of God and the Son of Abraham,' † so He makes thee a partner of His dignity and excellence, whence, if not the source and origin, yet thou shalt be a broad stream of blessing to be poured out on all nations."

Now, just in the same manner is Peter the Rock of the Church, and the cause next to Christ of that firmness with which the Church shall remain impregnable to the end. For therefore is he the Rock and Foundation of the Church, because he has been called into a sort of unity with Him of whom it is said, "Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious, and he that believeth on it shall not be ashamed:" and in whom, as Paul explains, "the whole building fitly framed together increaseth unto a holy temple in the Lord." ‡ Therefore is he the Church's Rock, because as he, by his own confession, declared the Godhead of the Foundation in chief, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," so from Him, who is the chief and substantial Foundation, he received the gift of being made partner in one and the same property: "And I too say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church;" one with Me by communication of My office and charge, My dignity and excellency. Hence the stability of Peter is that of Christ, as the splendour of the ray is that of the sun; Peter's dignity that of Christ, as the river's abundance is the abundance of the fountain. Those who diminish Peter's dignity may well be charged with violating the majesty of Christ; those who are hostile to Peter, and divorced from him, stand in the like opposition to Christ.

* Gal. iii. 16.

† Matt. i. 1.

‡ Isa. xxviii. 16; Eph. ii. 21.

Now, this parallel is an answer* to those who object to Peter's supereminence as the Foundation, that this dignity is entirely divine, surpassing by an almost infinite degree the capacity of man. For is not that a divine dignity which consists in the paternity of all the faithful? Is not that prerogative beyond man's capacity by which one becomes the author of a blessing diffused through all nations? Yet no one denies that such a dignity and such a prerogative were granted to Abraham. In divine endowments, therefore, their *full and natural possession* must be carefully distinguished from their *limited and analogous participation*. The one, as inherent, cannot fall to the creature's lot; the other, as transferable, may be granted as God pleases. For what further removed from man than the Godhead? Yet it is written, "I have said, Ye are Gods." †

Not weightier is the other objection, that the office of being the Foundation is too important to be entrusted to human care. Was there less difficulty in blessing being diffused from one man among all nations? Rather we must look on man not as he is by, and of, himself, apart from God, and left to his own weakness, but as upborne by divine power, according to the promise, "Behold, I am with you all days, until the consummation of the world." Who can doubt that man, in union with God, may serve for a foundation, and discharge those offices in which the unity of a structure consists? It is confidently and constantly objected, that "other foundation no man can lay besides that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." ‡ As if what has been laid by Christ Himself, and consists in the virtue of Christ alone, can be thought other than Christ; or as if it were unusual, or unscriptural, for things proper to Christ to be participated by men. Therefore the chief difficulties against Peter's pre-eminence, and character as the Foundation, seem to spring from the mind failing to realize the supernatural order in-

* Passaglia, p. 58.

† Ps. lxxxii. 6, with John x. 34.

‡ 1 Cor. iii. 11.

stituted by God, and the perpetual presence of Christ watching over His Church.

Thus it is no derogation to Abraham's being the Father of the faithful, or to the hierarchy of the Church instituted by Christ Himself, that our Lord says, "Call none your father upon earth, for one is your Father who is in heaven;"* inasmuch as Scripture abundantly proves that divine gifts are richly conferred upon men. What more divine than the Holy Spirit? Yet it is written, "And I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you for ever."† What a higher privilege than filial adoption? Yet it is said, "Ye have received the spirit of filial adoption, by which we cry, Abba, Father."‡ What a greater treasure than co-inheritance with Christ? Yet we read, "But if children, also heirs: heirs of God, but joint heirs with Christ."§ What higher than the vision of God? Yet St. Paul bears witness, "We see now through a glass darkly, but then face to face."|| What more wonderful than the power of remitting sins? Yet this very power is granted to the Apostles: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them."¶ What further from human weakness than the power of working miracles? Yet Christ establishes this, "Amen, amen, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me, the works which I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do."** Indeed, the participation and communion of heavenly gifts have the closest coherence with that supernatural order, which God in creating man chose, and to which He called fallen man back through His only begotten Son; with that dispensation of Christ by which He loved the Apostles as He Himself was loved by the Father, by which He called them, "not servants, but friends," †† and gave them that glory which He had Himself received from the Father. And the tone of mind which denies Peter's prerogative as the Foundation of

* Matt. xxiii. 9.

† John xiv. 16.

‡ Rom. viii. 15.

§ Rom. viii. 17.

|| 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

¶ John xx. 23.

** John xiv. 12.

†† John xv. 9, 15.

the Church, under pretence that it is a usurpation of divine power, tends to deny some one or all of the privileges just cited, and, as a fact, does deny some of them. It is wonderful to see how only common and vulgar things are discerned by modern eyes, where the Fathers saw celestial and divine gifts.* Those without the Church have fallen away as well from the several parts and privileges, from what may be called the standing order of the Incarnation, as from its final purpose and scope; and it is much if they would not charge with blasphemy that glorious saying put forth by the greatest of the Eastern, as by the greatest of the Western Fathers, "that God became man, in order that man might become God." †

Was, then, St. Chrysostom wrong when he said that our Lord, in that passage of Matthew, showed a power equal to God the Father by the gifts which He bestowed on a poor fisherman? "He who gave to him the keys of the heavens, and made him Lord of such power, and needed not prayer for this, for He did not then say, I prayed, but, with authority, I will build My Church, and I will give to thee the keys of heaven." ‡ Was he wrong when he called him "the chosen of the Apostles, the mouth-piece of the disciples, the head of the band, the ruler over the brethren"? § or where he saw these prerogatives in the very name of Peter, observing, "When I say Peter, I mean the impregnable rock, the immovable foundation, the great Apostle, the first of the disciples"? ||

To sum up, then, what has been hitherto said, we have advanced so far as this; first the promise, and then the bestowal of a new name, expressing a singular pre-eminence, and in its *proper* sense befitting Christ alone, have distinguished Simon from the rest of the Apostles. But much more the power signified by that name, and explained by the Lord

* Passaglia, p. 442, n. 28

† Ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος ἐνηνθρώπησεν ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν. St. Athan. de Incarn. Factus est Deus homo, ut homo fieret deus St. Aug. Serm. 13, de Temp.

‡ St. Chrys. tom. vii. 786. Hom. 82, in Matt.

§ Tom. viii. 525. Hom. 88 in Joan.

|| Hom. 3, de Pœnitentia. Tom. ii. 300.

Himself, carries far higher Peter's privilege, and indicates him to be the possessor of authority over the Apostles. For if Simon is the Rock of the Church, and if the property of Foundation, on which the structure of the Church rests, belongs to him immediately after Christ, and analogously with Christ, there arises this relation between Christ and Simon, that as He is first, and chiefly, and by inherent power, so Simon is secondarily, by participation and analogy, that which underlies, holds together, and supports the Apostles and the whole fabric of the Church.

Now, such a relation carries with it not merely precedency of honour, but superior authority. The strength of the Apostles lay in their union with Christ, and subordination to Him. The like necessity of adhering to Peter is expressed in his new name. Take away that subordination, and you destroy the very image by which the Lord chose to express Peter's dignity; and you remove, likewise, Peter's participation in that property which the Lord communicated to him in the name of the Rock. For if the Apostles needed not to be joined with him, he had no title to be called the Foundation; and if he had no co-active power over the Apostles, he did not share the property by which Christ is the Rock and Foundation. Thus the name, and the dignity expressed by the name, show Peter to have been singly invested by the Lord with both honour and power superior to the Apostles.*

* Passaglia, pp. 48, 49.

CHAPTER II.

EDUCATION AND FINAL DESIGNATION OF PETER TO BE THE
RULER WHO SHOULD CONFIRM HIS BRETHREN.

HAVING promised * and bestowed on Simon a new name, prophetic of the peculiar position which he was to occupy in the Church, and having set forth the meaning contained in that name in terms so large and magnificent, that, as we have seen, the greatest Saints and Fathers have felt it impossible to exhaust their force, our Lord proceeded to *educate* Peter, so to say, for his especial charge of supreme ruler. He bestowed upon him, in the course of His ministry, tokens of preference which agree with the title thus solemnly conferred; and He instructed him with all the care which we should expect to be given to one who was to become the chief doctor of Christians. Such instruction may be said to consist in two things: a more complete knowledge of the Christian revelation, and a singular apprehension of its divine proofs.

Now, innumerable as are the particulars in which the Christian revelation consists, they may yet be gathered up mainly in two points, which meet in the Person of our Lord, and are termed by the ancient Fathers who have followed this division, the *Theology*, and the *Economy*. There is the Divine Nature, that "*form of God*," which our Lord had from the beginning in the bosom of the Father; and there is the human nature, that "*form of a servant*," which "in the economy or dispensation of the fulness of times" He assumed, in order that He might purchase the Church with His blood, and

* Passaglia, p. 68.

“re-establish all things in heaven and on earth.”* All, therefore, in the Christian faith which concerns “the form of God” is termed the Theology; all which contemplates “*the form of a servant,*” the Economy.

But the heavenly origin and certain truth of both these parts of Christian faith are proved partly by the fulfilment of prophecy, and partly by the working of miracles. To both our Lord perpetually appealed, and His Apostles after Him, and those who have followed them. One, then, who was to be the chief ruler and doctor of Christians, needed especial instruction in the Theology, and Economy, especial assurance of the fulfilment of prophecy, and the working of miraculous power. Now, Peter was specially selected for this instruction and that assurance.

The whole teaching of our Lord, indeed, and the innumerable acts of power and words of grace with which it was fraught, were calculated to convey these to all the Apostles. But while they were witnesses in common of that teaching in general, some parts of it were disclosed only to Peter and the two sons of Zebedy. Perhaps there is no incident in the Gospel history, which set forth in so lively a manner, and so convincingly proved, the mysteries concerning the union of “the form of God” and “the form of a servant,” as the Transfiguration. The retreat to the “high mountain apart,” and in the midst of that solitary prayer, “the face shining as the sun,” and “the robes white as light,” the presence of Moses and Elias, conversing with Him on the great sacrifice for sin, “the bright cloud which encompassed them,” and the voice from out of it, proclaiming “This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear Him;” so impressed themselves on the great Apostle, that after long years he appealed to them in proof that he and his brethren had not taught “cunningly devised fables, when they made known the power and presence of the Lord Jesus Christ, but had been eyewitnesses of His majesty, when He received from God the Father honour and

* Eph. i. 10.

glory, this voice coming down to Him from the excellent glory, 'This is My beloved Son, in whom I have pleased Myself: hear ye Him.' And this voice we heard brought from heaven, when we were with Him in the holy mount." Among all the Apostle's experience of the three years' ministry, by the shore and on the waves of the lake of Galilee, in the cornfields or on the mountain side, in the noonday heat or midnight storm, even in the throng which cried "Hosannah!" and "Crucify Him!" this stood out, until "the laying aside of his fleshly tabernacle," as "the Lord had signified to him." * For † what indeed was not there?—the plurality of Persons in the Godhead, the Father and the Son, the true, and not adopted, Sonship of the latter, His divine mission unto men; the new order of things resulting from it, and the summing up under one head of all things in heaven and in earth; the sealing up and accomplishing of the law and the prophets, by the presence of their representatives, Moses and Elias, a most wonderful and transporting miracle; and the command implicitly to obey Him in whom the Father was well pleased. Thus the Transfiguration may be termed the summing up of the whole Christian revelation.

But now of this we read that "after six days Jesus taketh unto Him *Peter*, and James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart." These three alone of the twelve. Yet does He not associate the sons of Zebedy with Peter in this privilege? Needful no doubt it was that so splendid an act should have a suitable number of witnesses, and that as His future glory should have three witnesses from heaven, and as many from earth, ‡ so this, its rudimental beginning, should be attested by three as from heaven, God the Father, Moses, and Elias, and by three from earth, Peter, James, and John. Dear to Him likewise, next to Peter, and most privileged after Peter, were the sons of Zebedy; yet a distinction is seen in the mode in which they are treated even when joined together in so great a privilege. For in all

* 2 Pet. i. 14.

† Passaglia, p. 69.

‡ 1 John v. 6, 7.

the three accounts Peter is named first: "He taketh to Him Peter, and James, and John." They likewise are called by their birth-name, he by his prophetic appellation of the Rock; they are silent, but he speaks: "Peter answering, said;" nor only speaks, but in the name of all: "It is good *for us* to be here," as if their leader. And, fifthly, he is named specially, they as his companions: "but Peter, *and they that were with him*, were heavy with sleep."* Thus even when three are associated in a special privilege above the twelve, Peter is distinguished among the three.

But if there was one other occasion on which above all "the form of the servant" was to be set forth in the most awful, and the most endearing light, it was on that evening, "the hour" of evil men and "the power of darkness," when "the righteous Servant who should justify many" was about to perform the great, central, crowning act of His mediation. Then we read that "He said to His disciples, Sit you here, till I go yonder and pray." † And then immediately "taking with Him Peter, and the two sons of Zebedy, He began to grow sorrowful and to be sad." Yet here again, even in the association with the sons of Zebedy, Simon is distinguished, for he is named first; and by the illustrious name of Peter, the Rock; and as the leader of the others, for, says Matthew, Christ after His first prayer, "comes to His disciples, and finds them sleeping, and *says to Peter*, What, could *ye* not watch with Me one hour?" Why the change of number, Peter in the singular, *ye* in the plural? Why the blame of Peter, involving the blame of the rest? Because the members are censured in the head.

In these two signal instances our Lord, while preferring Peter and the two sons of Zebedy to the rest of the Twelve, yet marks a gradation likewise between them and Peter. And these two set forth the Theology and Economy, in the most emphatic manner.

And as the supreme preceptor must not only be acquainted

* Luke ix. 32.

† Matt. xxviii. 36.

with the truth which he has to deliver, but with the evidence on which it rests, so is Peter specially made a witness of his Lord's "power and presence" and "the works which no other man did." In that remarkable miracle of raising to life the ruler of the synagogue's daughter we read, "He admitted not any man to follow Him, but Peter, and James, and John the brother of James;"* where, as before, and always, Peter is mentioned first, and by the prophetic name of his Primacy.

From † all which we gather four points: 1. Several things are mentioned in the Gospels which Christ gave to Peter, and not to the rest of the Apostles; 2. But nothing which He gave to them together, and not to Peter with them. 3. What He seemed to give to them in common, yet accrue to Peter in a special manner, who appears among the Apostles not as one out of the number, but their destined head, by the name, that is, of Peter, so markedly promised, bestowed, and so wonderfully explained by our Lord, of which, as we have seen, St. Chrysostom, an Eastern Patriarch, as well as a great Saint and Father, observed, "When I say Peter, I mean the impregnable Rock, the immovable foundation, the great Apostle, the first of the disciples." 4. Either we are not to take Christ's dealing as the standard of Peter's dignity, and destination, or we must admit that he was preferred to the rest, and made the supreme teacher of the faithful.

St. Matthew records the incidents of the officers asking for the payment of the didrachma which all the children of Israel were bound to contribute to the Temple; and his words show us a fresh instance of honour done to Peter, and a fresh note of his superiority. "When they were come to Capharnaum, they that received the didrachma came to Peter, and said to him, Doth not your Master pay the didrachma?"‡ But why should they come to *him*, and ask, not if *his* Master, but "your" Master, the Master of all the Apostles, paid the census, save that it was apparent, even to strangers, that Peter was the first and most prominent of the company? Why use

* Mark v. 35.

† Passaglia, p. 72.

‡ Matt. xvii. 23.

him rather than any of the others, for the purpose of approaching Christ? "As Peter seemed to be the first of the disciples," says St. Chrysostom, on the text, "they go to him." The context naturally suggests this reason, and the ancient commentators remarked it. But what follows is much more striking. Peter answered, Yes, that is, that his Master observed all the laws of Moses, and this among the number. As he went home he purposed, no doubt, to ask our Lord about this payment, but "when he was come into the house Jesus prevented him," having in His omniscience seen and heard all that had passed, and He proceeded to speak words involving His own high dignity, followed by a singular trial of Peter's faith, and as marked a reward of it when tried. "What thinkest thou, Simon? The kings of the earth, of whom do they receive tribute or custom? of their own children or of strangers? And he said, Of strangers. Jesus said to him, Then the children are free." Slight words in seeming, yet declaring in fact that most wonderful truth which had formed so shortly before Peter's confession, and drawn down upon him the yet unexhausted promise; for they expressed, I am as truly the natural Son of that God, the Sovereign of the temple, for whom this tribute is paid, as the children of earthly sovereigns, who take tribute, are their sons by nature. Therefore by right I am free. "But that we may not scandalize them, go to the sea and cast in a hook; and that fish which shall first come up, take; and when thou hast opened its mouth, thou shalt find a stater; take that, and give it to them for Me and thee." Declaring to His favoured disciple afresh that He is the true, and not the adopted, Son of God, answering his thoughts by anticipation, and expressing His knowledge of absent things by the power of the Son of God, He tries his faith by the promise of a fresh miracle, which involved a like exercise of divine power. Peter, in proceeding to execute His command, must make that confession afresh by deed, which he had made before by word, and which his Lord had just repeated with His own mouth. How else

could he go to the lake expecting to draw at the first cast a fish in whose mouth he should find a coin containing the exact amount due to the Temple for two persons? But what followed? What but a most remarkable reward for the faith which he should show? "Take that, and give it to them for Me and thee." There are looks, there are tones of the voice, which convey to us more than language. So, too, there are acts so exceedingly suggestive, that without in any *formal* way proving, they carry with them the force of the strongest proof. And so, perhaps, never did our Lord in a more marked manner *associate* Peter with Himself than here. It was a singular distinction which could not fail to strike every one who heard it. Thus St. Chrysostom exclaims, "You see the exceeding greatness of the honour;"* and he adds, "wherefore, too, in reward for his faith He connected him with Himself in the payment of the tribute;" and he remarks on Peter's modesty, "for Mark, the disciple of Peter, seems not to have recorded this incident, because it pointed out the great honour bestowed on him; but he did record his denial, while he was silent as to the points which made him conspicuous, his Master perhaps begging him not to say great things about him." Indeed, *how* could one of the disciples be more signally pointed out than by this incident, as "the faithful and wise steward, whom the Lord would set over His household, to give them their portion of food in due time"?

Other Fathers, as well as St. Chrysostom, did not fail to see such a meaning in this passage; but let us take the words of Origen as pointing out the connection of this incident with the important question following. His words are: "It seems to me that (the disciples) considering this a very great honour which had been done to Peter by Jesus, in having put him higher than the rest of His disciples, they wished to make sure of what they suspected by asking Jesus, and hearing His answer, whether, as they conceived, He judged Peter to be greater than them; and they also hoped to learn the cause

* On Matt. Hom. 58, n. 2.

for which Peter was preferred to the rest of the disciples. Matthew, then, wishing to signify this by these words, "take that, and give it to them for Me and thee," added, "on that day the disciples came to Jesus, saying, Who, thinkest thou, is the greater in the kingdom of heaven?" *

For, indeed, why should they immediately ask this question? The preceding incident furnishes a natural and sufficient cause. The Apostles, it seems, were urged by the plainness of Christ's words and acts to inquire who among them should have the chief authority. Who will not agree with St. Chrysostom: "The Apostles were touched with a human infirmity, which the Evangelist too signifies in the words, 'in that hour,' when He had honoured him (Peter) before them all. For though of James and John one of the two was the first-born" (alluding to an opinion that the tax was paid by the first-born), "He did nothing like it for them. Hence, being ashamed, they confessed their excitement of mind, and do not say plainly, Why hast thou preferred Peter to us? Is he greater than we are? For this they did not dare; but they ask indefinitely, Who is the greater? For when they saw three preferred to the rest, they felt nothing like this; but when one received so great an honour, they were pained. Nor were they kindled by this alone, but by putting together many other things. For He had said to him, 'I will give to thee the keys,' and 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona,' and here, 'Give it to them for Me and for thee;' and also they were pricked at seeing his confidence and freedom of speech." †

Thus their question, if it did not express, at least suggested this meaning, "Speak more plainly and distinctly whether Peter is to be the greater and the chief in the Church, and accordingly among us," and so they seem to have drawn from our Lord's act a conclusion which they did not see in the promising or bestowing the prophetic name of Peter, nor even in the promises conveyed in explaining that name, and were vexed at the preference shown to him.

* Origen on the text, in *Matt.*, tom. xiii. 14.

† St. Chrysostom on the text, *Hom.* 58, tom. vii. p. 587.

And if* any be inclined to conclude from hence that our Lord's words and acts to Peter had not been of any marked significancy, they should be reminded that the very clearest and plainest things were sometimes not understood by the Apostles, before the descent of the Holy Spirit on them. This was specially the case with the things which they were disinclined to believe. Thus our Lord again and again foretold to them His passion in express terms, but we are told, "they understood none of these things."† He foretold, too, His resurrection, yet they did not in the least expect it, and they became at length fully assured of the fact before they remembered the prediction. Strange as these things seem, yet probably every one's private experience will furnish him with similar instances of a veil being cast upon his eyes, which prevented his discerning the most evident things, towards which there was generally some secret disinclination.

But ‡ how did our Lord answer their question? Did He remove at once the ground of their jealousy by declaring that in the kingdom of heaven no one should have pre-eminence of dignity, but the condition of all be equal? On the contrary, He condemns ambition and enjoins humility, but likewise gives such a turn to His discourse as to insinuate that there would be one pre-eminent over the rest. "Jesus calling unto Him a little child, set him in the midst of them, and said, Amen I say unto you, unless you be converted and become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."§ Then He adds, "Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, he is the greater in the kingdom of heaven." Thus He did not exclude the pre-eminence of that "greater one," about which they asked, but pointed out what his character ought to be. But this will be much clearer from a like inquiry, and the answer to it, recorded by St. Luke.

For even at the Last Supper, our Lord having told them that He should be betrayed, and was going to leave them in

* Passaglia, p. 77, note 38.

† Passaglia, p. 78.

‡ Luke xviii. 34.

§ Matt. xviii. 2.

the way determined for Him, there was not only an inquiry among them which of them should do that thing, but also, so keenly were their minds as yet, before the coming down of the Holy Spirit, alive to the desire of pre-eminence, and so strongly were they persuaded that such a superior had not been excluded by Christ, but rather marked out and ordained, "there was a strife among them which of them should seem to be greater." Now, our Lord meets their contention thus: "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them, and they that have power over them are called beneficent. But you not so; but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that serveth. For which is greater, he that sitteth at table, or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at table? But I am in the midst of you as he that serveth. And you are they who have continued with Me in My temptations; and I dispose to you, as My Father hath disposed to Me, a kingdom; that you may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom; and may sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." *

Now † in this speech of our Lord we may remark four points:—

1. What is omitted, though it would seem most apposite to be said;
2. What is affirmed, if not expressly, yet by plain consequence;
3. What comparison is used in illustration;
4. What meets with censure and rejection.

1. First, then, though the Apostles had twice before contended about pre-eminence, yet our Lord neither there, nor here, said openly that He would not prefer any one over the rest, nor appoint any one to be their leader. Yet the importance of the subject, His own wisdom, and His love towards His disciples, as well as His usual mode of acting, seemed to demand, that had it been His will for no one of them to be set over the rest, He should plainly declare it, and thus extinguish

* Luke xxii. 25.

† Passaglia, p. 77.

all strife. No less a matter was at issue than the harmony of the Apostles with each other, the peace of the Church, and the success of the divine counsel for its government. Moreover, the Gospels represent Him to us as continually removing doubts, clearing up perplexities, and correcting wrong judgments among His disciples. Let us recall to mind a very similar occasion, when the mother of the sons of Zebedy with her children came before Him, asking "that these my two sons may sit the one on Thy right hand and the other on Thy left, in Thy kingdom." He rejected their prayer at once, saying, "To sit on My right or My left hand is not Mine to give to you, but to them for whom it is prepared by My Father."* The silence, therefore, of Christ here, under such circumstances, is a proof that it was not the divine will that all the Apostles should be in such a sense equal that no one of them should hold a superior authority over the rest.

2. But eloquent as this silence is, we are not left to trust to it alone, for our Lord's words point out, besides, the institution of one superior. "The kings of the Gentiles," He says, "lord it over them; and they that have power over them are called benefactors. But you not so: but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that serveth." *A greater and a leader, then, there was to be.* Our Lord's words contain two parallel propositions repeated. 1. There is among you one who is the greater, let him, then, be as the younger. 2. There is among you one who is the leader, let him be as he that serveth. Thus our Lord's meaning is most distinct that they should have a superior.

But in the very similar passage about the sons of Zebedy, lest any should conclude that no one of the Apostles was to be superior to the rest, He called them to Him, and said, "You know that the princes of the Gentiles lord it over them, and they that are the greater exercise power upon them. It shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be the greater among you, let him be your minister; and he that will be the first

* Matt. xx. 20.

among you shall be your servant. Even as the Son of Man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a redemption for many." Where He tells them His will, not that no one of the Apostles should be "great" and "first," but what the type and model should be which that "great" and "first" one should imitate, even the Son of Man who came to minister.

3. For to make this quite certain, there, and here too, He directs us to a particular comparison, by which He explains and concludes His discourse, "For who is greater, he that sitteth at table, or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at table? But I am among you as he that serveth. . . . And I dispose unto you as My Father disposed unto Me, a kingdom." Here our Lord sets Himself before His Apostles as the exemplar both of the rule which the superior was to exercise, and of the temper and character which he was to show. As He had been speaking of the kingdoms of the Gentiles, so He now points out to them in contrast the true kingdom which He was disposing unto them. The Church as it had been from the beginning, was to be the model of what it should be to the end. Now all confess that in that Church Christ had held the place of "the First," "the Great One," "the Ruler." And now He explains that one of His Apostles should occupy that place of His, and occupying it should be of a like temper with Himself, who had been the minister and servant of all. And it may be remarked that the same word is here applied to him who should *rule* among the disciples, which expresses the dignity of Christ Himself in the prophecy of Micah, quoted in Matt. ii. 6, "Out of thee shall go forth * *the ruler*, who shall be shepherd over my people Israel." For Christ says, "He that is the greater among you, let him be as the younger; and *he that ruleth*, as he that serveth. For who is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he who serveth? But *I* am among you as he that serveth." "I dispose to you a kingdom, as My Father disposed to Me:" let him who follows Me in place, follow Me in character.

* ἡγούμενος.

But, 4, what does our Lord censure and reject from His Church? It is plain that He compares kingdom with kingdom, and the kingdom of heaven, which is the Church, with human kingdoms, and, moreover, that the negative quality as to which, in the clause, "But you not so," the two are compared, is, *not* the fact that there is pre-eminence and rule in both, but a certain *mode* of exercising them. This is the pomp and ambition expressed in the words, "lording it," "exercising authority," "are called beneficent." As again is shown in the repeated declaration that what had been most alien from the spirit of His own ministry, should not appear in the ministry that He would establish after Him. Now, He had shown no pomp and pride of dominion, but yet He had shown the dominion itself in the fullest sense, the power of passing laws, enjoining precepts, defining rites, threatening punishments, governing, in fine, His Church, so that He had been pre-eminently "the Lord." Lastly, this is shown in the words recorded by St. John, as said shortly after on this same occasion. "You call Me Master and Lord, and you say well, for so I am. If I, then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet: *for I have given you an example, that as I have done unto you, so you also may do.*" *

Now, nothing can show more strongly than this discourse the pre-eminence and authority which our Lord was going to establish in one of His Apostles over the rest. For here we have His intention disclosed that in His kingdom, which is the Church, some one there should be "the Great," "the First," and "the Ruler," who should discharge, in due proportion and analogy, the office which He Himself, before He returned to the Father, had held. But before we consider further who this one was, let us look at the subject from a somewhat different point of view.

And † here we must lay down three points, the *first* of which is, that our Lord, during His life on earth, had acted in two capacities, the one as the Author and Founder, the other

* John xiii. 15.

† Passaglia, p. 82.

as the Head and Supreme Ruler of His Church. His functions in the former capacity are too plain to need enlarging upon. He disclosed the objects of our faith; He instituted rites and sacraments; He provided by the establishment of a ministry for the perpetual growth and duration of the Church. It was in this sense that He spoke of Himself to His Apostles, as "the Master," who could share His prerogatives with no one: "But be not you called Rabbi, for one is your Master, and all you are brethren." * Thus is He, "the Teacher," "the Master," throughout the Gospel.

But He likewise acted as the Head of His Church, with the dignity and authority of the chief visible Ruler. He was the living bond of His disciples; the person around whom they grouped; whose presence wrought harmony; whose voice terminated contention among them; who was ever at hand to solve emergent difficulties. Thus it is that prophecy distinguished Him as "the Lord," "the King," "the Shepherd;" "on whose shoulders is the government," "who should *rule* His people Israel." And His Church answers to Him in this capacity, as the family, the house, the city, the fold, and the kingdom.

Thus His relation to the Church was twofold: as Founder, and as Supreme Pastor.

Secondly, the Church shares her Lord's prerogative of unchangeableness, and as He is "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," so She, His mystical Body, in her proportion, remains like herself from the beginning to the end. The Church and Christianity are bound to each other in a mutual relation; the Church is Christianity embodied; Christianity is the Church in conception; the consistency and identity which belong to Christianity belong likewise to her; neither can change their nature, nor put on another form.

But, *thirdly*, the Church would be unlike herself, if, having been from her very cradle visibly administered by the rule of One, she fell subsequently, either under no rule at all, according

* Matt. xxiii. 8.

to the doctrine of the Independents, or under the rule of the multitude, according to the Calvinists, or under the rule of an aristocracy, as Episcopalians imagine. A change of government superinduces a change of that substantial form which constitutes a society. But this holds in her case especially, above all other societies, as she came forth from the creative hand of her Lord, her whole organization instinct with inward life, her government *directly* instituted by God Himself, in which lies her point of distinction from all temporal polities.

For imagine, that upon our Lord's departure, no one had been deputed to take the visible headship and rule over the Church. How, without ever fresh revelations, and an abiding miraculous power, could that complex unity of faith, of worship, and of polity, have been maintained, which the Lord has set forth as the very sign and token of His Church? * A multitude scattered throughout the most distant regions, and naturally differing in race, in habits, in temperament, how could it possibly be joined in one, and remain one, without a powerful bond of unity? Hence, in the fourth century, St. Jerome observed, "The safety of the Church depends on the dignity of the supreme Priest, in whom, if all do not recognize a peculiar and supereminent power, there will arise as many schisms in the Church as there are Priests." † And the repentant confessors out of Novatian's schism, in the middle of the third century, "We know that Cornelius (the Pope) has been elected Bishop of the most holy Catholic Church, by Almighty God, and Christ our Lord.—We are not ignorant that there is one God, one Christ the Lord, whom we confessed, one Holy Spirit, and that there ought to be one Bishop in the Catholic Church." ‡ And these words, both of St. Jerome, and of the confessors, if they primarily apply to the diocesan Bishop among his Priests and people, so do they with far greater force apply to the chief Bishop among his brethren in the whole Church. Now, as our Lord willed that His Church should do without fresh revela-

* John, chaps. x., xiii., xvii.

† Dialog. cont. Lucif. n. 9.

‡ St. Cyprian, Ep. 46.

tions, and new miracles, such as at first accredited it, and that it should preserve unity; and as, when it was a little flock, which could be assembled in a single room, it had yet one visible Ruler, how can we doubt that He willed this form of government to remain, and that there should be one perpetually to rule it in His name, and preserve it in unity, since it was to become co-extensive with the earth?

Again, we may ask, was the condition of fold, house, family, city, and kingdom, so repeatedly set forth in Holy Scripture, to belong to the Church only while Christ was yet on earth, or to be the visible evidence of its truth for ever? Do these terms exhibit a temporary, or a perpetual state? Each one of these symbols by itself, and all together, involve one visible Ruler; therefore, so long as the Church can be called with truth the one house, the one family, the one city, the one fold, the one kingdom, so long must it have one visible and supreme Ruler.

But once grant that such a one there was after our Lord's departure, and no one can doubt that one to have been Peter. It is easier to deny the supreme Ruler altogether, than to make him any one but Peter. The whole course of the Gospels shows none other marked out by so many distinctions. Thus, even those who wish to refuse a real power to his Primacy, are compelled by the force of evidence to allow him a Primacy of order and honour.

But nothing did our Lord more pointedly reject than the vain pomp of titles and honours. In nothing is His own example more marked than in that He exercised real power and supreme authority without pomp or show. Nothing did He enjoin more emphatically on the disciple who should be the "Great One," and "the Ruler," among his brethren, than that he must follow his Master in being the servant of all. A Primacy, then, consisting in titles and mere precedency, is of all things most opposed to the spirit and the precepts of our Lord. And so the Primacy which He designated must be one of real power and pre-eminent authority.

And this brings us back to the passage of St. Luke which

we were considering, where four things prove that Christ had such a headship in view. First, the occasion, for the Apostles were contending for a place of real authority. The sons of Zebedy expressed it by sitting on His right hand and on His left, that is, holding the second and the third place of dignity in the kingdom.

Secondly, the double comparison which our Lord used, the one negative, the other affirmative: in the former, contrasting the Church's ruler with the kings of the Gentiles, He excluded pomp and splendour, lordship and ambition; in the latter, referring him to His own example, who had the most real and true power and superiority, He taught him to unite these with a meekness and an attention to the wants of his brethren, of which His own life had been the model.

Thirdly, the words "the First," "the Greater," and "the Ruler," indicate the pre-eminence of the future head, for as they appear in the context, and according to their Scriptural force, they indicate not a vain and honorary, but a real authority, one of them being even the very title given to our Lord.

And, fourthly, this is proved by the object in view, which is, maintaining the identity of the Church, and the form which it had from the beginning, and preserving its manifold unity. As to its identity, and original form, it is needless to observe that Christ exercised in it not an honorary but a real supremacy, so that under Him its government was really in the hands of one, the Ruler. As to the preservation of its unity—and especially a unity so complex—the very analogy of human society will sufficiently teach us that it is impossible to be preserved without a strong central authority. Contentions can neither be checked as they arise, nor terminated when they come to a head, without the interference of a power to which all yield obedience. And the living example of those religious societies which have not this power is an argument whose force none can resist. Where Peter is not, there is neither unity of faith, nor of charity, nor of external regimen.

No sooner * then had our Lord in this manner pointed out that there should be one hereafter to take His place on earth and to be the Ruler of his brethren, expressing at the same time the toilsome nature of the trust, and the duty of exercising it with the spirit which He, the great model, had shown, than turning His discourse from the Apostles, whom hitherto He had addressed in common, to Peter singly, He proceeded to designate Peter as that one, to assure him of a singular privilege, and to enforce upon him a proportionate duty.

And first, a break in the hitherto continuous discourse is ushered in by the words, "And the Lord said," and what follows is fixed to Peter specially, by the reiteration of his name, "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat:" to have *you*, that is, not Peter alone, but all the Apostles, the same you, whom in the preceding verses He had so often repeated, "you not so," "but I am in the midst of you," "but you are they that have continued with Me," "and I dispose to you a kingdom," "that you may eat and drink with Me;" and what follows? What was the resource provided by the Lord against this attack of the great enemy on all His fold? "But I have prayed for *thee*, that *thy* faith fail not: and thou being once converted confirm thy brethren." Not "I have prayed for *you*," where all were assaulted, "that *your* faith fail not," but I have prayed for *thee*, Peter, that *thy* faith fail not! Nothing can be more emphatic than this change of number, when our Lord throughout all His previous discourse had used the plural, and now continuing the plural to designate the persons attacked, uses the singular to specify the person for whom He has prayed, and to whom He assures a singular privilege, the fruit of that prayer. Nothing could more strongly prove that this address was special to Peter.

Nor less evident is the singular dignity of what is here promised to him. First of all, it is the fruit of the prayer of Christ. Of what importance must that be which was solicited

* Passaglia, p. 89.

by our Lord of His Father, and at a moment when the redemption of the world was being accomplished, and when His passion may be said to have begun? Of what importance that which was to be the defence of not Peter only, but all the disciples, against the most formidable assault of the great enemy, who had demanded * them as it were to deliver them over to punishment? And this was "that thy faith fail not." How is it possible to draw any other conclusion here than what St. Leo in the fifth century expressed so clearly before all the Bishops of Italy? "The danger from the temptation of fear was common to all the Apostles, and all equally needed the help of the Divine protection, since the devil desired to dismay all, to crush all; and yet a special care of Peter is undertaken by our Lord, and He prays peculiarly for the faith of Peter, as if the state of the rest would be more sure, if the mind of their chief were not conquered. In Peter, therefore, the fortitude of all is protected, and the help of Divine grace is so ordered, that the firmness which through Christ is given to Peter, through Peter is conferred on the Apostles." † And if such is the importance of the help secured, no less is the charge following: "And thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren." To confirm others, is to be put in an office of dignity and authority over them. And his brethren were those whom our Lord till now had been addressing in common with him; to whom He had just disclosed "a Greater" and "a Ruler" "among" them; that is, the Apostles themselves. Among these, then, when our Lord's visible presence was withdrawn, Peter was to be the principle of stability, binding and moulding them into one building. For one cannot fail to see how this great promise and prophecy answers to those in Matthew. There our Lord, as Architect, promised to lay Peter as the foundation of the Church, against which the gates of hell should not prevail: here, being about to leave the world, when His own work was finished, to ascend unto His Father,

* ἐξήγησατο. The word in classic Greek has this force.

† Serm. 4, c. 3.

and to assume His great power and reign, He makes Peter as it were the Architect to carry on the work which was to be completed by *His* grace and authority, but by human co-operation. So exact is the resemblance, that we may put the two promises in parallel columns to illustrate each other:—

Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock
I will build My Church; and the gates
of hell shall not prevail against it.

But I have prayed for thee,
that thy faith fail not; and thou,
being once converted, confirm thy
brethren.

But light is thrown on the greatness of this pre-eminence thus bestowed on Peter of confirming his brethren, if we consider that the term is applied to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as bestowing by inherent power what is here granted by participation. Of the Father it is said, "To Him that is able to *establish* you according to my Gospel—the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, be honour and glory." And again, "Now He that *confirmeth us* with you in Christ, and that hath anointed us, is God;" and again, "The God of all grace, who hath called us unto His eternal glory in Christ Jesus, after you have suffered a little, will Himself perfect you, *confirm*, establish you."* Of Christ likewise: "As therefore you have received Jesus Christ the Lord, walk ye in Him, rooted and built up in Him, and *confirmed* in the faith." And "waiting for the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ, who also will *confirm* you unto the end without crime." And again: "Now our Lord Jesus Christ Himself exhort your hearts, and *confirm* you in every good word and work."† And the Holy Spirit is continually mentioned as the author of this gift, when, for instance, to Him is ascribed "the teaching all truth," "the leading into all truth," "the bringing to mind" all things which Christ had said. And St. Paul prays "that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be *strengthened* by His Spirit with might unto the inward man."‡

* Rom. xvi. 25; 2 Cor. i. 21; 1 Pet. v. 10.

† Col. ii. 6; 1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. ii. 16.

‡ John xvi. 13; xiv. 16, 26; Eph. iii. 16.

What, therefore, is proper to the most Holy Trinity, and given in the highest sense by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, it was the will of Christ should be shared by Peter, according as man is capable of it. That is, it was His pleasure that the same man, whom He had intimately associated with Himself by communicating to him His prerogative to be the Rock, should be closely joined with the Blessed Trinity by participating in that privilege, whereby, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, He is the confirmation and stability of the faithful. But if any rule there can be whereby to measure pre-eminence and dignity, it is surely that which is derived from participation of divine properties and offices. And the closer that by these Peter is shown to have approached to God, the higher his exaltation above the rest of his brethren, who, as it has been observed, are the Apostles. To them he is the Rock, and them he is to confirm. Thus Theophylact, in the eleventh century, commenting on this text, says, "The plain meaning of this is, that, since I hold thee as the ruler of My disciples, after thou shalt have wept over thy denial and repented, confirm the rest. For this belongs to thee as being after Me the rock and support" (literally, confirmation) "of the Church. Now, one may see that this is said not only of the Apostles, that they are confirmed by Peter, but also concerning all the faithful until the consummation of the world."

But looking more closely into the nature of this dignity, since Christ, by the bestowal of heavenly gifts, caused Peter to be conspicuous through the firmness of his own faith, and through the charge of confirming the faith of his brethren, we can call it by no fitter name than a Primacy of faith. For it has these two qualities: it cannot fail itself; and it confirms others. And for the authority which it carries, such a Primacy of faith cannot even be imagined without at the same time imagining the office by which Peter was bound to watch over the firmness and integrity of the common faith. In this office two things are involved: first, the right to, and therefore the possession of, all things necessary for its fulfilment; and secondly, the duty

by which all were bound to agree in the profession of one faith with Peter. So that Peter's dignity, rightly termed the Primacy of faith, mainly consists in the supreme right of demanding from all an agreement in faith with him.

It * remains to explain the proper force of the word *confirm*. Now, this is a term of architecture, and as such is joined with other terms relating to that art, as by St. Peter, "the God of all grace . . . Himself fit you together" (as living spiritual stones), "confirm, strengthen, ground you." † It means, to make anything fit so firmly that it cannot be shaken. Thus in Holy Writ it frequently bears metaphorically a moral signification, such as encouraging, supporting, as we say, confirming the resolution, as in the passage just quoted; and again, "Be watchful, and *confirm* the things that remain, which are ready to die." ‡ Now, it cannot be doubted that the phrase "confirm thy brethren," carries a moral sense very like that in which the word *confirm*, when applied to the spiritual building of the Church, is used of God and of Christ, § from whom the Church has both its being and its perseverance to the end, and again of the Apostles, who strengthen the flock entrusted to them by the imparting spiritual gifts, as St. Paul says, "I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual grace to strengthen you;" || or, again, of Bishops, who, as sent by the Apostles, and charged by the Holy Spirit with the government of the Church, are bid to be watchful and see that those who stand do not fall, and those who are in danger do not perish. ¶ Accordingly, when it is said to Peter, "And thou, in thy turn, one day confirm thy brethren," *the charge and office are laid upon him, as an architect divinely chosen, of holding together, strengthening, and keeping in their place, the several parts of the ecclesiastical structure.*

But what are these *parts* to be confirmed, and what is the *nature* of the confirmation?

* Passaglia, p. 563.

† 1 Pet. v. 10.

‡ Apoc. iii. 2.

§ Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Thess. iii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 17; 1 Pet. v. 10.

|| Rom. i. 11.

¶ Apoc. iii. 2.

As to the first question there can be no controversy, it being determined by the words, "confirm *thy brethren*:" and it is plain, from what is said above, that by brethren are meant the Apostles. He had, therefore, the Apostles committed to his charge *immediately*; but likewise, the rest of all the faithful, *mediately*. When a person has been named by Christ to confirm the Apostles expressly, the nature of the case does not allow that the whole congregation of believers be not in their persons committed to him. The care of the flock is manifestly involved in the care of the shepherds; and no one in his senses can doubt that the man who is charged to support the pillars, is charged to keep in their place the inferior stones.

And as to the *nature* of the confirmation, it is for protection against the fraud of the great enemy. And the danger lay in losing the faith. Peter, then, is charged to confirm, in such sense that neither the pillars of the Church, nor its inferior parts, may, by the loss of faith, be moved from their place, and so severed from the Church's structure. No charge can be higher than such an office of confirmation; nor for anything need we to be more thankful to our Saviour; but, particularly, nothing can more distinctly show the divinely appointed relation between Peter on the one hand, and on the other, the rest of the Apostles, and the whole company of the faithful; nothing define more clearly the special authority of Peter; that is, to protect and strengthen the unity of the faith, and to possess all powers needed for such protection.

This charge was given after that by the prayer of Christ the privilege had been gained for Peter's faith, *that it should never fail*. Hence, that faith is become, in virtue of such prayer, the infallible standard of evangelical truth; as St. Cyprian expressed it of old, "that faith of the Romans, which perfidly *cannot* approach."* It follows that all the faithful owe to it obedience. And Peter's authority rests on a double title, *external* of mission, *internal* of spiritual gift: the former con-

* St. Cyprian, Ep. 55.

tained in the words of Christ the legislator, "And thou,* in thy turn, one day confirm thy brethren;" the latter, in the words of Christ, the bestower of all gifts, "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not."

More than a thousand years ago two Easterns seem to have expressed all this, one the Bishop Stephen, suppliantly approaching Pope Martin I., in the Lateran Synod of A.D. 649, and speaking of "the blessed Peter, in a manner special and peculiar to himself, having above all a firm and immutable faith in our Lord God, to consider with compassion, and confirm his spiritual partners and brethren when tossed by doubt: inasmuch as he has received power and sacerdotal authority, according to the dispensation, over all, from the very God for our sakes incarnate." † And Theodore, Abbot of the Studium, at Constantinople, addressing Pope Paschal I., A.D. 817, in the midst of persecution from the state, as if he were Peter himself: "Hear, O Apostolic Head, O shepherd of the sheep of Christ, set over them by God, O doorkeeper of the kingdom of heaven, O rock of the faith upon which the Catholic Church is built. For Peter art thou, who adornest

* As far as the *words* by themselves go, it is the opinion of the best commentators that they may be equally well rendered, "And thou, when thou art converted," or "And thou, in thy turn, one day," etc. But as it is impossible to bring a discussion turning on a Hebrew idiom conveyed in a Greek word before the English reader, we must here restrict ourselves to the proof arising from the *sense* and *context*. And here one thing alone, among several which may be urged, is sufficient to prove that the sense preferred in the text, "And thou, in thy turn, one day confirm thy brethren," is the true one. For the other rendering supposes that the time of Peter's conversion would also be the time of his confirming his brethren; whereas this was far otherwise. He was converted by our Lord looking on him that same night shortly after his denial, and "immediately went out and wept bitterly." But he did not succeed to the charge of confirming his brethren till after our Lord's ascension. It must be added that the collocation of the original words *καὶ σὺ ποτὲ ἐπιστρέψας στήριξον* is such as absolutely to require that the joint action indicated by them should belong to the same time, and that an *indefinite* time expressed by *ποτέ*. Now this would be false according to the rendering, "And thou, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren," for the conversion was immediate and definite, the confirmation distant and indefinite; whereas it exactly agrees with the rendering, "And thou, in thy turn, one day confirm thy brethren."

Those who wish to see the whole controversy admirably drawn out, may find it in Passaglia, b. ii. ch. 13.

† Mansi, Concilia, x. 894.

and governest the See of Peter. To thee, said Christ our God, 'And thou, in thy turn, one day confirm thy brethren.' Behold the time, behold the place, help us, thou who art ordained by God for this. Stretch forth thy hand as far as may be: power thou hast from God, because thou art the chief of all." *

Now let us † view in its connection the whole scope of our Lord's discourse. We shall see how naturally the contest of the Apostles arose out of what He had told them, and how well the former and the latter part of His answer harmonize together, and terminate that contest. We learn from St. John's record of this divine conversation, that our Lord besought His Father, saying, "While I was with them in the world, I kept them in Thy name . . . but now I come to Thee:" that is, so long as I was with them visibly in the world (for invisibly I will always be with them, and nurture them with the spiritual influx of the Vine), I kept them united in Thy name; "but now I come to Thee," I leave the world, I relinquish the office of visible head. It remains, that by the appointment of another visible head, Thou shouldst entrust him with My office, provide for the conspicuous unity of all, and preserve them joined to each other and to Us. So St. Luke tells us, that no sooner had our Lord declared to the Apostles, "the Son of Man indeed goeth according to that which is determined," than they began to have a strife among them, "which of them should seem to be the greater." For they had heard that Christ would withdraw His visible presence, and they had heard Him also earnestly entreating of the Father to provide for their visible unity. Accordingly, the time seemed at hand when another was to take this office of visible head; hence their questioning, who should be the greater among them. Now, our Lord does not reprove this inference of theirs, but He does reprove the temper in which they were coveting pre-eminence. For, engaged as they were in the strife, He warned them that the person who should be "the Greater and the Ruler" among them, must follow in the discharge of his

* Baronius, *Annal.* A.D. 817, xxi.

† Passaglia, p. 545.

office the rule and the standard which *He* had set up in His own conduct, and not that which the kings of the Gentiles follow. Thus, setting these in sharp contrast, He proceeds: "The kings, indeed, of the nations lord it over their subjects, and love high titles, and to be called benefactors; but I, though Lord and Master amongst you, have dealt otherwise, as you know. For I have exercised, not a lordship, but a servitude; I have not sat at table, but waited; I have not cared for titles, but called you friends and brethren. Let this example then be before you all, but specially before him who is to be the greater and the ruler among you. For I appoint unto you, and dispose of you, as My Father hath disposed of Me; of Me He hath disposed that through humiliation, emptying of Myself, ignominy, and manifold temptations, I should gain the kingdom, reach the joys of heaven, and obtain all power in heaven and on earth. So likewise dispose I of you, that through humility, sufferings, reproaches, hunger, thirst, and all manner of temptations, you may reach whither I have come, being worthy, after your hunger and your thirst, to eat and drink at My table in My kingdom; after being despised and dishonoured, to sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Now, hitherto you have trodden with Me this royal way full of sorrows, and have continued with Me in My temptations. But little will it profit to begin, if you persevere not to the end. None shall be crowned, save he who has contended lawfully; none be saved, but he who perseveres to the end. Will you remain with Me still in your temptations to come, and when I am no longer present with you visibly, to protect and exhort, will you preserve your steadfastness? Simon, Simon, behold! I see Satan exerting all his force to overcome your purpose, and to destroy the fidelity which you have hitherto shown Me. I see the danger to your faith and your salvation approaching. But I, who, when visibly present with you, left nothing undone to guard, protect, and strengthen you visibly, so, too, when separated from your bodily sight, will yet not leave you without a visible support.

Wherefore, Peter, I have prayed for thee, that thou fail not, and thou, in thy turn, one day confirm thy brethren. Remember that thou hast to discharge that part visibly towards thy brethren, which I, while yet mortal, and visible, discharged; remember that I therefore had special care of thee, because it was My will that thou, confirmed by My prayers, shouldst confirm thy brethren, My disciples, and My friends." *

Now, from † what has been said, it appears that Peter in Holy Scripture is set forth as the source and principle of ecclesiastical unity under a double but cognate image, as Foundation, and as Confirmer. Of the former we will here say nothing further, but a few consequences of the latter it is desirable here to group together.

I. The unity, then, which consists in the profession of one and the same faith, is conspicuous among those ‡ modes of unity by which Christ has willed that His Church should be distinguished. Now, first, St. Paul declares that the whole ministerial hierarchy, from the Apostolate downwards, was instituted by our Lord, for the sake of obtaining and preserving this unity. "He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting" (literally, the fitting in together, the same word in which St. Peter had used in his prayer, ch. v. 10), "of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; until we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ." § To this living hierarchy he expressly attributes preservation from doctrinal error, proceeding thus: "That henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive." And, secondly, this hierarchy itself was knitted and gathered up into a monarchy, and its whole force and solidity made to depend on

* Passaglia, p. 547.

† For which see hereafter, ch. 7.

‡ Ibid. p. 571.

§ Eph. iv. 11.

association with Peter, to whom *alone* was said, "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not;" to whom alone was enjoined, "And thou, in thy turn, one day confirm thy brethren."

II. Accordingly the pre-eminence of Peter is well expressed by the words,* "Primacy of faith," "chiefship of faith," "chiefship in the episcopate of faith," meaning thereby a peculiar authority to prescribe the faith, and determine its profession, and so protect its unity and purity. This is conveyed in the words of Christ, Confirm thy brethren. Thus St. Bernard † addressed Innocent II., "All emergent dangers and scandals in the kingdom of God, specially those which concern the faith, are to be referred to your Apostolate. For I conceive that we should look especially for reparation of the faith to the spot where faith *cannot* ‡ fail. That indeed is the prerogative of his see. For to whom else was it once said, 'I have prayed, for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not'? Therefore what follows is required of Peter's successor: 'And thou, in thy turn, one day confirm thy brethren.' And this is now necessary. It is time for you, most loving father, to recognize your chiefship, to approve your zeal, and so make your ministry honoured. In that you clearly fulfil the part of Peter, whose seat you occupy, if by your admonition you confirm hearts fluctuating in faith, if by your authority you crush those who corrupt it."

III. All who have received the ministry of the word, and the charge of defending the faith and preserving unity, and are "ambassadors in Christ's name," have a claim to be listened to, but he above all who holds the chiefship of faith, and who received the charge, "Confirm thy brethren." He therefore must be the supreme standard of faith, which is just what St. Peter Chrysologus, in the fifth century, wrote to Eutyches: "We exhort you in all things, honourable brother, to pay

* *Petrus uti audivit, vos autem quid me dicitis? Statim loci non immemor sui, primatum egit; primatum confessionis utique, non honoris; primatum fidei, non ordinis.*—Ambros. de Incarn. c. 4, n. 32, tom. 2, p. 710.

† Ep. 190, vol. 1, p. 649.

‡ Observe the exact identity with St. Cyprian's expression nine hundred years earlier, Ep. 55, quoted p. 60.

obedience to what is written by the most blessed Pope of the Roman city ; for St. Peter, who both lives and rules in his own see, grants to those who ask for it the truth of faith."*

IV. And in this prerogative of Peter, to be heard above all others, we find the meaning of certain ancient expressions. Thus Prudentius calls him, "the first disciple of God;" † St. Augustine, "the figure of the Church;" ‡ St. Chrysostom, "the mouthpiece of the disciples, and teacher of the world;" § St. Ephrem Syrus, "the candle, the tongue of the disciples, and the voice of preachers;" || St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "the prince of the Apostles, and the highest preacher of the Church." ¶ In these and such-like continually recurring expressions we recognize his chiefship in the episcopate of faith, his being the standard of faith, and his representing the Catholic faith, as the branches are gathered up in the root, and the streamlets in the fountain.

V. Our Lord ** has most solemnly declared, and St. Paul repeated, that no one shall be saved without maintaining the true and uncorrupt faith. Of this Peter's faith is the standard and exemplar. Accordingly, by the law of Christ unity with the faith of Peter is necessary to salvation. This law our Lord set forth in the words, "Confirm thy brethren." And to this the Fathers in their expressions above quoted allude.

VI. The true faith and the true Church are so indivisibly united, that they cannot even be conceived apart from each other, faith being to the Church as light to the sun. But the true faith neither is, nor can be, other than that which Peter "the first disciple of God," "the teacher of the world," "the mouthpiece of the disciples," and "the confirmer of his brethren," holds and proposes to others. No communion, therefore, called after Christ, which yet differs from that faith, can claim either the name or dignity of the true Church.

VII. If any knowledge have a special value, it is surely

* Twenty-fifth letter among those of St. Leo.

† Con. Symmachum, lib. 2, v. 1.

‡ Sermon 76.

§ Hom. 88, on John.

|| Encom. in Petrum et ceteros Apostolos.

¶ Cat. xi. n. 3: 'Ο πρωτοστάτης τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας κορυφαῖος κήρυξ.

** Mark. xvi. 16; John iii. 18; Rom. iii. 3, etc.

that by which we have a safe and ready test of the true faith and the true Church. It is of the utmost necessity to know and embrace both, and the means of reaching them are proportionably valuable. Now that test abides in Peter, by keeping which before us we can neither miss the true faith nor the true Church. For no other true faith can there be than that which he delivers, who received the charge of confirming his brethren, nor other true Church than what Christ built, and is building still. Hence the expression of St. Ambrose, "Where Peter is, there is the Church;" * and of Stephen of Larissa, to Pope Boniface II. (A.D. 530), "that all the Churches of the world rest in the confession of Peter." †

VIII. With all these agrees that famous and most early testimony of St. Cyprian, that men "fall away from the Church into heresy and schism so long as there is no regard to the source of truth, no looking to the head, nor keeping to the doctrine of our heavenly Master. If any one consider and weigh this, he will not need length of comment or argument. It is easy to offer proofs to a faithful mind, because in that case the truth may be quickly stated." ‡ And then he quotes our Lord's words to Peter, Matt. xvi. 16, and John xxi. 17, adding, "upon him being one He builds His Church." Therefore that Church can neither be torn from the one on whom she is built, nor profess any other faith, save what that one who is Peter, proposes.

* Ambros. in Ps. I. n. 30.

† Mansi, tom. viii. 746.

‡ De Unitate Ecclesie, 3.

CHAPTER III.

THE INVESTITURE OF PETER.

OUR Lord has hitherto, while on earth,* ruled as its visible head that body of disciples which He had chosen out of the world, and which His Father had given Him. And this body He for the first time called the Church in that famous prophecy † wherein He named the person, who, by virtue of an intimate association with Himself, the Rock, should be its foundation, and the duration of which until the consummation of the world, He pronounced at the same time, in spite of all the rage of "spiritual wickedness in high places" against it, because it should be founded upon the rock which He should lay.

Secondly, He had, at that period of His ministry when He thought it meet, the second year, selected out of the rest of His disciples, after ascending into a mountain and continuing the night long in prayer, twelve whom He named Apostles—as before and above all sent by Him—for "He called whom He would Himself, and they came to Him," to whom "He gave authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal every disease and every weakness," whom He chose also "to be with Him," His personal attendants, "and to send them to preach;" to whom, moreover, He subsequently made a promise that whatever they should bind on earth, should be bound in heaven, and whatever they should loose on earth should be loosed in heaven.‡

Thirdly, as at a certain time in His ministry, that is the second year, He had selected twelve to be nearer His person

* Passaglia, p. 93.

† Matt. xvi. 16.

‡ Matt. x. 1; Mark iii. 13-15; Luke vi. 12, 13; Matt. xviii. 18.

than the rest of His disciples, so at a yet later time, the third year of His ministry, He had set apart one out of the twelve, to whom from the very first, and before either he, or any one, had been called to be an Apostle, or even, as it would seem, a disciple, He had given a prophetic name; whom by word and deed, in correspondence with that name, He designated to be the future rock of His Church, to be the Bearer of the keys, which opened or shut the entrance to His mystical Holy City, to be endued with power *singly* to bind and to loose; and whom at last, on the very eve of His being taken away from His disciples, He pointed out as the future "First one," "Greater one," or "Ruler," among them, having, as such, had given to him a *special* and *singular* charge, after the departure of the Head, to "confirm his brethren."

It is manifest that this was all which, before His offering Himself up for the sin of the world, and the withdrawal of His visible presence thereupon ensuing, He could do for the government of His Church. For as long as He was there, the Son of Man among men, seen, felt, touched, and handled, the sacred voice in their ears, and the divine eyes gazing bodily upon them, He was not only the fountain of all headship and rule, but He exercised in His own person the highest functions of that headship and visible rule. He daily encouraged, warned, corrected, taught, united them; in short, to use His own words, "while He was with them, He kept them in His Father's name."*

But now another time, and other dangers were approaching. The sword was drawn which should "strike the shepherd," there was a fear that "the sheep would be scattered," not only for a moment, but for ever. To meet this the care of the Divine Guardian was necessary in a further disposition of those powers which He received at His resurrection from the dead. For henceforth His visits, as of a risen King, were to be few and sudden, when He pleased, and at times they expected not, "for forty days appearing to them and speaking

* John xvii. 12.

of the kingdom of God," and as soon as His final injunctions had been thus royally given, "the heavens were to receive Him till the time of the restoration of all things." The Apostles could no longer "be with Him," as before, nor He "keep them," as in the days of His flesh.

How, then, does He complete the ministerial hierarchy which sprung from His own Divine Person on earth, and which is to rule His Church and represent that person from His first to His second coming?

Now, first, we must remark, that while great care is taken to make known to all the Apostles the resurrection of the Lord, yet a special solicitude is shown with regard to that one who was to be "the Ruler." Thus the angels, announcing the fact to the holy women at the sepulchre, "He is risen, He is not here, behold the place where they laid Him," add, "but go, tell His disciples *and Peter*, that He goeth before you into Galilee."* The expression indicates his superior place, as when Peter, himself delivered from prison, recounted to the disciples at the house of Mark his escape, and added, "Tell these things to James and to the brethren," where no one fails to see the pre-eminence given to James, by such a mention of him, that Apostle being the Bishop of Jerusalem, and so put over the brethren, and, with himself, one of those who "seemed to be pillars." Again, to Peter our Lord appeared first among the Apostles. St. Paul, exhibiting a sort of sum of Christian doctrine, as he says "the Gospel which I preached unto you," begins, "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures; and that He was seen by Cephas, and after that by the eleven." By him alone, first, then by them in conjunction with him. And further, St. Paul's words seem to express a sort of descending ratio, "Then was He seen by more than five hundred brethren at once, of whom many remain until

* Mark xvi. 6.

this present, and some are fallen asleep. After that He was seen by James, then by all the Apostles. And last of all he was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time. For I am the least of the Apostles."* And while they were yet in doubt, and for joy could not receive the marvellous tidings, when brought by the women, as soon as our Lord appeared to Peter; their hesitation was removed, and the two disciples returning from Emmaus—themselves full of His wonderful conversation with them—"found the eleven gathered together and those that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon," as the Church in her exultation repeats, where philologists tell us that the Greek *and* bears what is often the Hebrew meaning, and signifies "for," as if no doubt could remain any longer of their happiness, when Peter had become a witness of it.

These are indications of superiority, slight perhaps in themselves, if they stood alone, but not slight as bearing tacit witness to a fact otherwise resting on its own explicit evidence. If one of the Apostles was destined to be the head of the rest, this is what we should have expected to happen to that one, and this did happen to Peter, who is elsewhere made the head of the Apostles.

But now we come to those most important injunctions which our Lord gave to His Apostles after His resurrection, concerning the government of His Church. And here it becomes necessary to mark with the utmost accuracy what He said and what He gave to all the Apostles in common, and what to Peter in particular.

First of all, then, we may remark our Lord's care to redeem the promises which He had made to the Twelve, and to convey to them their legislative, judicial, and executive powers. These are mentioned by each of the four Evangelists, in somewhat different terms, but alike involving the distinctive Apostolic powers of immediate institution by Christ, and universal mission; as Apostles they are *sent*,

* 1 Cor. xv. 1-9.

and they are sent *by Christ*. The form recorded in St. Matthew is, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."

The form of St. Mark is, "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature."

St. Luke refers specially in two passages to the descent of the Holy Ghost, as being Himself as well the Divine "Gift," and the immediate worker of all graces in man, as the principle of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. "And I send the promise of My Father upon you, but stay you in the city till you be endued with power from on high." And again, "Eating together with them, He commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but should wait for the promise of the Father, which you have heard," saith He, "by My mouth; for John, indeed, baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." "You shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses unto Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth."

The form recorded by St. John is, "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. When He had said this, He breathed on them; and He said to them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." *

Now, it may be remarked that these passages of the several Evangelists are *identical* in their force; that is, they each convey all those powers which constitute the Apostolate. These are received by all the Apostles in common, and together; and in the joint possession of them consists that *equality* which is often attributed by the ancient writers to the Apostles, as notably by St. Cyprian, "He gives to all the Apostles an equal

* Matt xxviii. 18; Mark xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4-8; John xx. 21.

power, and says, 'As the Father sent Me, I also send you.'" And again, "Certainly the other Apostles also were what Peter was, endued with an equal fellowship, both of honour and power."*

And these Apostolic powers, legislative, judicial, and executive, are afterwards referred to as exercised; as in Acts xv., where the first council passes decrees which bind the Church; nay, which go forth in the joint name of the Holy Ghost, and the Rulers of the Church, "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us;"—which are delivered by St. Paul to the cities to be kept; Acts xvi. 4—as in Acts xx. 28, where Bishops are charged to rule the Church, each over his flock, wherein the Holy Ghost has placed him—as in 1 Cor. v. 1-5, where St. Paul, "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," excommunicates—as in 2 Cor. x. 6, where he sets forth his Apostolic power—as in the Epistles to Titus and Timothy, where he sets them in authority, enjoins them to ordain Priests in every city, and commands them to "reprove," or "rebuke."

And all these powers St. Peter, of course, as one of the Twelve, had received in common with the rest. The limit to them would seem to lie in their being shared in common by twelve; as, for instance, universal mission dwelling in such a body must practically be determined and limited somehow to the different members of that body, or one would interfere with the other. But there is nothing in these powers which answers to the images of "the rock," on which the Church is built, the single "bearer of the keys," and "confirmer" of his brethren, which Christ had appropriated to one Apostle.

In like manner, then, as our Lord fulfilled His promises to the Twelve, so did He those to St. Peter, and we find written the committal of an authority to him exactly answering to these images; an authority, which expresses the full legislative, judicial, and executive power of the head, which can be executed by one alone at a time, and is of its own nature

* De Unitate Ecclesiæ, 3.

supreme, and responsible to none save God. It remained for our Lord to find an image setting forth all this as decisively as that of the Rock, the Bearer of the keys, and the Confirmer of his brethren.

Once, as He passed along the shores of the lake of Galilee, He had seen two fishermen casting their net into the sea, and had "said to them, Come after Me, and I will make you fishers of men, and immediately leaving their nets, they followed Him." Once again, too, He had gone into the ship of that same fisherman, and sitting, taught the multitudes out of it. And then He bade that fisherman, "who had laboured all the night and taken nothing, to launch out into the deep," and in faith "let down his nets for a draught," whereupon "he enclosed so great a multitude of fishes that the net brake." * And again, in after times, when the fisherman had become an Apostle, that same ship waited on His convenience, and carried Him across the lake. It was there He was asleep when the storm raged, and His disciples in little faith awoke Him, saying, "Master, save us, we perish," not yet knowing that the ship which carried the Lord might be tost, but could not sink. † From it they beheld Him walking on the sea, in the fourth watch of the night, when Peter, in his fervour, desired to join Him, and going to meet his Lord on the waves, his faith failed him, and he began to sink, till the Almighty hand supported him, and drew him with it to the ship, which "presently was at the land to which they were going. ‡ And now, Peter, and Thomas, and Nathaniel, and the sons of Zebedy, and two others, were once more on that same ship and sea, but no longer with him who had commanded the winds, and walked on the waves. Once more, too, they § toiled all the night, but "caught nothing;" when, lo, in the morning light, Jesus stood on the shore, but yet unknown to them, and bade them cast the net on the right side of the ship, "and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes." Thus He revealed

* Mark i. 16; Luke v. 3.

† John vi. 21.

‡ Mark iv. 38; Luke viii. 24.

§ John xxi. 1-14.

HIS NAME AND HIS OFFICE.

Himself to them, and invited them to eat with Him of the fishes which they had caught. "Then Simon Peter went up, and drew the net to land, full of great fishes, one hundred and fifty-three. And although they were so many, the net was not broken:" for, indeed, that draught of great fishes, gathered by Peter at Christ's command, betokened God's elect, whom the Church is to gather out of the sea of this world, who cannot break from the net, which net, therefore, Peter drew to land, even the everlasting shore whereon Christ welcomes His own. And after that marvellous banquet of the disciples with their Lord, betokening the never-ending marriage-feast, wherein "the roasted fish is Christ in His passion,"* our Lord proceeds to crown all that series of distinctions, wherewith, since imposing the prophetic name, He had marked out Simon, the son of Jonas, to be the Leader of His disciples: and thus He fulfils by the side of the lake of Galilee what He foreshadowed when He first looked upon Peter, what He promised in the quarters of Cesarea Philippi, and what He repeated on the eve of His passion.

It was His will to appoint one to take His place on earth. Now He had assumed to Himself specially a particular title, under which of old time His prophets had foretold His advent among men, and which above all others expressed His tender love for fallen man. It had been said of Him, "I will set up one shepherd over them, and He shall feed them, even My servant David: He shall feed them, and He shall be their shepherd." And again: "Say to the cities of Judah, behold your God. . . . He shall feed His flock like a shepherd: He shall gather together the lambs with His arm, and shall take them up in His bosom, and He Himself shall carry them that are with young." And, once more, in the very prophecy by which the chief priests and scribes declared to Herod that He must be born at Bethlehem, "For from thee shall go forth the Ruler, who shall feed (or shepherd) My people Israel." Appropriating

* St. Augustine's 122nd discourse on St. John, who has thus set forth this chapter: "Piscis assus Christus est passus."

these predictions to Himself, the Lord had said, "I am the good shepherd." * The good shepherd giveth His life for His sheep. And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." And now it was His pleasure to give this particular title, so specially His own, to Peter, and to Peter alone, and to Peter in most marked contrast even with the best beloved of His other disciples, and to Peter, thrice repeating the charge, and varying the expression of it so as to include the term in its utmost force. "When, therefore, they had dined, Jesus said to Simon Peter, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these? He saith to Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him, Feed My lambs. He saith to him again, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? He saith to Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him, Feed My lambs. He saith to him the third time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? Peter was grieved because He had said to him the third time, Lovest thou Me? And he said to Him, Lord, Thou knowest all things: Thou knowest that I love Thee. He said to him, Feed My sheep."

Our Lord had before addressed the seven disciples present in common, "Children, have you any meat?" "Cast the net, and you shall find." "Bring hither of the fishes which you have caught." "Come and dine." But now, turning to one in particular, He singles him out in the most special manner, by his name, by asking of him a love greater than that of any others towards Himself, by conferring on him a charge, which, as we shall see, from its extension excludes its being held in joint possession by any other, and by a prophecy concerning the manner of his death, which is wholly particular to Peter. If it is possible by any words to convey a power and a charge to a particular person, and to exclude the rest of the company from that special power and charge, it is done here.

But, secondly, it is a charge of a very high and dis-

* Ezech. xxiv. 33; Isa. xl. 9-11; Mich. v. 2; Matt. ii. 6; John x. 11, 14, 16.

tinguishing nature indeed, for our Lord before conferring it demands of Peter, as a condition, greater love towards His own person than that felt for Him by any of the Twelve—even by the sons of Zebedy, whom from their zeal He sur-named Boanerges, sons of thunder—even by the disciple whom He loved, and who lay on His breast at the last supper. What must that charge be, the preliminary condition for which is a greater love for Jesus than that of the beloved disciple? What shall be a fitting sequel to “Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me *more* than these?” What, again, the importance of that office, in bestowing which our Lord thrice repeats the condition, and thrice inculcates the charge? The words of God are not spoken at random, nor His repetitions without effect. What, again, are the *subjects* of the charge? They are “My lambs,” and “My sheep;” that is, the fold itself of the Great Shepherd. As He said, “If I wash thee not, thou shalt have no part with Me,” so those who are not either His lambs or His sheep, form no part of His fold. Others, too, in Holy Writ, are addressed as shepherds, but with a limitation, as, “Take heed to the whole flock *wherein* the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops,” or “Feed the flock of God *which is among you.*” And, more largely far it was said, “Go ye, therefore, and make disciples all nations;” and “Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.”* But they to whom this was said were yet themselves sheep of the Great Shepherd, and in committing the world to them, He did not commit *them* to each other. Whereas here, they too, as His sheep are committed to one, even Peter; and very expressly, in the persons of James and John, and the rest present, “Lovest thou Me more than these?” A particular flock is never termed absolutely and simply “the flock,” or “the flock of God,” but “the flock *which is among you,*” “*in which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops.*” And again, the Apostles are sent in common to the whole world, to preach to all nations, and to form one flock; but they are twelve, and

* Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 10; Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15.

“power given to several carries its restriction in its division, whilst power given to one alone and over all, and without exception, carries with it plenitude, and, not having to be divided with any other, it has no bounds save those which its terms convey.”* What are the terms here? “Feed,” and “be shepherd over” or “rule” “My lambs and My sheep.” The terms have no limit, save that of salvation itself. Such, then, are the *persons* indicated as subjects of this charge. But what is the nature of the charge? Two different words of unequal extent and force in the original, but both rendered “feed” in the translation, convey this. One means “to give food” simply, the other, of far higher and nobler reach, embraces every act of care and providence in the government of others, under an image the farthest removed from the spirit of pride and ambition. Such is even its heathen meaning, and the first of poets termed Agamemnon by this word, “Shepherd of the people.” By this word, St. Paul, and St. Peter † himself, express the power of the Bishop over his own flock. And so our Lord, here instituting the Bishop of Bishops, the one Shepherd of the one fold, gives to Peter over all his flock, the very word given to *Him* in the famous prophecy, “Thou, Bethlehem, the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come forth the captain that shall *rule* My people Israel:” the very word which, used of Himself in Psalm ii. to express all His power and dominion, in His revelation to St. John is spoken of His own triumphant career, as the Word of God going forth to battle, “He shall *rule* them with a rod of iron;” and again, in the same book is applied by Himself to set forth the honour which He will give “to him that shall overcome and keep My works unto the end.” ‡ Thus, just as in the *persons* pointed out, the *subject* of this charge is *universal*, so in the *terms* by which it is expressed, the *nature* of the power is *supreme*. What the

* Bossuet, Sermon on Unity.

† Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 10; Ps. ii. 9; Apoc. xix. 15; ii. 27.

‡ Πρωταγωνιστην used in the text of John, and in all these.

Bishop is to his own flock, Peter is made to "the flock of God:" and this at once, in the most simple, as well as in the most absolute and emphatic manner, by institution from the Chief Shepherd Himself, at the close of His ministry, and by associating Peter singly with Himself in His most distinctive title. If the fold of Christ is equivalent to "the Church of Christ," and "the kingdom of heaven," so to feed and to rule the lambs and the sheep of that fold is equivalent to being "the Rock" of that Church, and "the Bearer of the keys," as well as *the First, the Greater one, and the Ruler* in that kingdom of heaven.

Again, looking at the circumstances under which this charge is received by Peter, it either conveys that special and singular honour and power which we have here set forth, or *none at all*. For Peter had *already* received the full Apostolic authority: he had heard together with the rest of the Apostles those words of power, "As My Father sent Me, I also send you," and the charge following, to bind and to loose. It could not therefore be this power which was here given him, for he had it already. All which James and John, the sons of thunder, ever had given them, he also had before these words were uttered. Besides, a power which was to be shared by James and John, and the rest of the Apostles, could not be given in terms which distinguished him from them, "Lovest thou Me *more than these?*" It could not be the mere forgiveness of his denial, for not only did the Apostolate, since conferred, carry that, but when our Lord appeared to him first of all the Apostles after His resurrection, it was a token of such forgiveness. There remained nothing else to give him, but a presidency over the Apostles themselves, the reward of superior love, as was prophesied and promised to him in reward for superior faith. For these two oracles of our Lord exactly correspond to each other as promise and performance. Their conditions and their terms shed a reciprocal light on each other. In the one there is the great confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" in the other as

singular a declaration, "Lovest thou Me more than these? Yea, Lord." In the one there follows the reward, "And I say to thee, that thou art Peter," etc.; and in the other a like reward, "Feed My lambs, be shepherd over My sheep." The one is future, "I will build, I will give, thou shalt bind, thou shalt loose:" the other present, "Feed, and be shepherd." What concerns "the Church and the kingdom of heaven" in the one, concerns "the fold" in the other. And the promise and performance are singularly restricted to Peter—"I say unto thee, thou art Peter"—"Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these?"

As then Peter received the promise of the supreme episcopate *before all* and *by himself*, under the terms that he should be the Rock, by being built on which the Church should never fall, that he should be the Bearer of the keys in the kingdom of heaven, and that *singly* he should bind and loose in heaven and in earth; so *after* his own Apostolate and that of the rest had been completed, *by himself*, and as the crown of the divine work, he received the fulfilment of that supreme episcopate, under the terms, "Feed My lambs, be shepherd over My sheep." And as a part out of that magnificent promise made to him *singly*, was afterwards taken and made to the Apostles *jointly* with him, for so "it was the design of Jesus Christ to put first in one alone what afterwards He meant to put in several; but the sequel does not reverse the beginning, nor the first lose his place. That first word, 'whatsoever thou shalt bind,' said to one alone, has already ranged under his power each one of those to whom shall be said, 'Whatsoever ye shall remit;' for the promises of Jesus Christ, as well as His gifts, are without repentance; and what is once given indefinitely and universally is irrevocable:"* so when Peter and the rest already possessed the whole Apostolate, the commission to go and preach to the whole world, and to make disciples of all nations, a power was added to Peter to make up what was promised to him originally; the Apostles them-

* Bossuet, Sermon on Unity.

selves, with the whole fold, were put under his charge; he represented the person of the Great Shepherd; and the divine work was complete.

Thus the powers of the Apostolate and the Primacy are not antagonistic, but fit into and harmonize with each other. In the college of the Twelve, as before inaugurated, and sent forth into the whole world, something had been wanting, save that, "by the appointment of a head, the occasion of schism was taken away:"* and Satan would have shaken the whole fabric, but that there was one divinely set to "confirm the brethren." He who "kept them" once, when "with them," by His personal presence, now kept them for evermore by the word of His power, issued on the shore of the lake of Galilee, but resounding through every age, clear and decisive, amid the fall of empires, and the change of races, and heard by all His flock to the utmost of the isles of the sea, till the day of the Son of Man comes,—“Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these? Feed My lambs: Feed My sheep.”

And that the universal and supreme authority over the Church of Christ was in these words committed to Peter by the Lord, is the belief of antiquity. Thus, St. Ambrose, in the West: “It is not doubtful that Peter believed, and believed because he loved, and loved because he believed. Whence, too, he is grieved at being asked a third time, Lovest thou Me? For we ask those of whom we doubt. But the Lord does not doubt, but asks not to learn, but to teach him whom, on the point of ascending into heaven, He was leaving, *as it were, the successor and representative of His love.*† It is because he alone out of all makes a profession, that *he is preferred to all.* Lastly, for the third time, the Lord asks him, no longer, *hast thou a regard* (diligis me) for Me, but *lovest* (amas) thou Me: and now he is ordered to feed, not the lambs, as at first, who need a milk diet, nor the little sheep, as secondly, but the more perfect sheep, *in order that he who was the more perfect*

* St. Jerome.

† Amoris sui veluti vicarium.

might have the government."* In the East, St. Chrysostom. "Why, then, passing by the rest, does He converse with him on these things? *He was the chosen of the Apostles, and the mouthpiece of the disciples, and the head of the band.* Therefore, also Paul once went up to see him rather than the rest. It was, besides, to show him, that for the future he must be bold, as his denial was done away with, that *He puts into his hands the presidency over the brethren.* And He does not mention the denial, nor reproach him with what had past; but He says, if thou lovest Me, *rule the brethren,* and show now that warm affection which on all occasions thou didst exhibit, and in which thou didst exult, and the life which thou didst offer to lay down for Me, now spend for My sheep." Again, "Thrice He asks the question, and thrice lays on him the same command, showing at how high a price He sets *the charge of His own sheep.*" Again, "He was put in charge with the direction of his brethren." "He made him great promises, *and put the world into his hands.*" Thus John and James, and the rest of the Apostles, were committed to Peter, but never Peter to them: and he adds, "But if any one asks, How then did James receive the throne of Jerusalem? I would reply that He elected Peter *not to be the teacher of this throne, but of the whole world.*" And in another place, "Why did He shed His blood to purchase those sheep *which He committed to Peter and his successors?* With reason then said Christ, 'Who is the faithful and prudent servant whom his Lord had set over His own † house?'" Theophylact repeated, seven hundred years later, the perpetual tradition of the East: "He puts into Peter's hands the headship over the sheep of the whole world, and to no other but to him gives He this; first, because he was distinguished above all, and the mouthpiece of the whole band; and secondly, showing to him that he must be confident, as his denial was put out of account." And if St. Leo, a Pope, declares that "though there be among the

* In Lucam, lib. 10, n. 175.

† St. Chrys. in Joan. Hom. 88, pp. 525-527; and De Sacerdot. lib. 2, tom. i. p. 372.

people of God many priests and many shepherds, yet Peter rules all by immediate commission, whom Christ also rules by sovereign power,"* the great Eastern, St. Basil, assigned an adequate reason for this near a century before, when he viewed all pastoral authority in the Church as included in this grant to Peter, declaring that the spiritual "ruler is none else but one who represents the person of the Saviour, and offers up to God the salvation of those who obey him, and this we learn from Christ Himself *in that He appointed Peter to be the shepherd of His Church after Himself.*" †

But especially must we quote St. Cyprian, because to that equality of the Apostles as such, before referred to by us by considering which without regard to the proportion of faith some have been led astray, he adds the full recognition of the Primacy, and urges its extreme importance. Thus quoting the promise and the fulfilment, "Thou art Peter, etc.," and "Feed My sheep," he goes on, "Upon him being one He builds His Church; and *though* He gives to all the Apostles an equal power, and says, 'As the Father sent Me, I also send you, etc.,' yet in order to manifest unity He has, by His own authority, so placed the source of the same unity as to begin from one. Certainly the other Apostles also were what Peter was, endued with an equal fellowship both of honour and power, but a commencement is made from unity, that the Church may be set before us as one." ‡ That is, the Apostles were equal as to the powers bestowed in John xx. 23-25, but as to those given in Matt. xvi. 18, 19, Luke xxii. 31-33, and John xxi. 15-18, "The Church was built upon Peter alone," and he was made the source and ever-living spring of ecclesiastical unity.

Yet clearly as our Lord in this charge associates Peter with Himself, puts him over his brethren, the other Apostles, and fulfils to him all that He ever promised, as to making him "the First," "the Greater one," and "the Ruler or Leader," by that one title of "the Shepherd," in which is summed up all

* St. Leo, Serm. 4.

† St. Basil, Constit. Monas. xxii. tom. ii. p. 573.

‡ St Cyprian, de Unit. 3.

authority over His Church, and the very purpose of His own divine mission, "to seek and to save that which was lost," still a touch of tenderness is added by the Master's hand, which brings out all this more forcibly, and must have told personally on Peter's feelings and those of his fellow-disciples, as the highest and most solemn consecration to his singular office. For when the Lord spoke that parable, "I am the good Shepherd," He added, as the token of the character, "The good shepherd giveth His life for His sheep." And so now, appointing Peter to take His place over the flock, He adds to him this token also: "Amen, amen, I say to thee, When thou wast younger thou didst gird thyself, and didst walk where thou wouldst, but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and lead thee whither thou wouldst not." "When thou wast younger, thou didst gird thyself," alluding, perhaps, to that impulse of affection with which, just before, as soon as Peter heard from John that it was the Lord standing on the shore, "He girt his coat about him and cast himself into the sea," for his love waited not for the slowness of the boat. Thus He taught Peter that the chiefship to which He was appointing him, that "care of all the Churches," as it required a different spirit to fulfil it from that which prevailed among "the kings of the nations," so it led to a different end, the last crowning act of a life-long self-sacrifice, which began by being the servant of all, ran through a thousand acts of humiliation and anxiety, and was to be completed in the martyrdom of crucifixion. And so in his death, as well as in his charge of visible head of the Church, he was to be made like his Lord, and after the manner of the Good Shepherd, whom he succeeded, should lay down his life for his sheep. For "this He said signifying by what death he should glorify God. And when He had said this, He saith to him, Follow Me;" with far deeper meaning now than when those words of power were first uttered to him beside that lake. Then it was "Follow Me, and I will make you fishers of men." Now it is, "Follow Me, and I will associate

thee with My life and with My death, with My charge and with its reward. This shall be the proof of thy great love, to be obedient even to death, and that the death of the cross." Such was the anointing which the first Primate of the Church received to the triple crown. "Follow thou Me." Like his divine Master, he was during the whole of his ministry to have the cross set before his eyes, and laid upon his heart as the certain end of his course. And thus Peter "received power and sacerdotal authority over all, from the very God for our sakes incarnate:" * thus he followed in the steps of the Good Shepherd, as he succeeded to His office. And therefore, having accomplished his mission and triumphed on the Roman hill, from Rome he speaks through the undying line of his spiritual heirs, and feeds the flock of Christ.

* Stephen of Dora, in the Lateran Synod, A.D. 649. Mansi, x. 893.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CORRESPONDENCE AND EQUIVALENCE OF THE GREAT
TEXTS CONCERNING PETER.

BEFORE we compare together more exactly what was said to the Apostles in common, and what to Peter in particular, it is desirable to consider briefly two other points, which will complete the evidence furnished by the Gospels.

1. If, then, the question * to be decided by documents is, whether several persons are to be accounted equal in rank, honour, and authority, or whether one of them is superior to the rest, it will be an unexceptionable rule to observe whether they are spoken of in the same manner. For words are signs of ideas, and set forth as in a mirror the mind's conceptions. A similarity of language, therefore, will indicate a similarity of rank; a distinction of language, especially if it be repeated and constant, will show a like distinction of rank. Let us apply this rule to the mode in which the Evangelists speak of Peter and of the other Apostles.

Now, to express one of rank and his attendants, the Evangelists often use the phrase, a person *and those with him*. Thus, Luke vi. 4, "David and *those that were with him*;" and Matt. xii. 3 with Mark ii. 25, "Have ye not read what David did when himself was a hungered and *those that were with him*?" Of our Lord and the Apostles it is said, Mark iii. 11, "And He made twelve, *that they should be with Him*:" and xvi. 10, "She went and told *them that had been with Him*." And Acts iv. 13, the chief priests "knew them," Peter and John,

* Passaglia, p. 106.

“that *they had been with Jesus.*” And Matthew xxvi. 69, Peter is reproached, “*Thou also wast with Jesus.*” Now, just so the Evangelists speak of Peter. Our Lord having on one occasion left the Apostles for solitary prayer, St. Mark writes, i. 36, “And Simon *and they that were with him* followed after Him.” Again, the woman with the issue of blood having touched the Lord, when He asked, “Who is it that touched Me?” St. Luke says, viii. 45, “all denying, Peter *and they that were with him* said,” etc. And on the occasion of the Transfiguration, “Peter *and they that were with him,*” being James and John. Just as after the resurrection Luke writes, Acts ii. 14, “Peter standing up with the eleven;” verse 37, “They said to Peter and to the rest of the Apostles;” v. 29, “Peter and the Apostles answering said.” And the angels to the holy women, Mark xvi. 7, “Go tell His disciples and Peter.”

It is then to be remarked that Peter is the *only* Apostle who is put in this relation to the rest. *Never* is it said “James,” or “John and the rest of the Apostles,” or, “and those with him.” Peter is named, and the rest are added in a mass, and this happens in his case continually, never in the case of any other Apostle.

No adequate cause can be alleged for this but the Primacy and superior rank of Peter, which was ever in the mind of the Evangelist, and is sometimes indicated by the prophetic name, for as often as Simon is called Peter, he is marked as the foundation of the Church, according to the Lord’s prophecy. And long before contentions about the prerogatives of Peter arose, the ancient Fathers attributed it to his Primacy, that he was thus named expressly and first, the others in a mass, or in the second place.

According, then, to the rule above-mentioned, Peter, by the mode in which the Evangelists speak of him, is distinguished from the other Apostles, and his position with regard to the rest is described in the very same phrase which is used to express the superiority of David over his men, and even of our Lord over the Twelve. And for this there seems no adequate

cause, but that special association of Peter with Himself indicated in the name, and the promises accompanying it in Matt. xvi.

2. Again, four* catalogues of the Apostles exist,† and in each of these Peter is placed first. And in the three which occur in the Gospels (that of Luke in the Acts being a more brief repetition of his former one), the prophetic name Peter is indicated as the reason for his being thus placed first. So Mark: "And to Simon He gave the name Peter. And James the son of Zebedy, and John the brother of James; and He named them Boanerges, which is, The sons of thunder:" for which reason, that the Lord had given them a name, though it was held in common, and not, like that of Peter, expressive of official rank, but personal qualities, Mark seems to set these two before Andrew, whom both in Matthew and in Luke they follow. Again, Luke says, "He chose twelve of them, whom also He named Apostles, Simon whom He surnamed Peter, and Andrew his brother, etc. "The *first* of all, and the chief of them, he that was illiterate and uneducated," says St. Chrysostom;‡ and Origen long before him, observing that Peter was always named first in the number of the twelve, asks, What should be thought the cause of this order? He replies, it was constantly observed because Peter was "more honoured than the rest," thus intimating that he no less excelled the rest on account of the gifts which he had received from heaven, than "Judas through his wretched disposition was truly the last of all, and worthy to be put at the end."§ But much more marked is Matthew in signifying the superior dignity of Peter, not only naming him at the head in his catalogue, but calling him simply and absolutely "the first." "And the names of the twelve Apostles are these, The first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother, James," etc. Now, that *second* and *third* do not follow, shows that "first" is not a numeral here,

* Passaglia, p. 109.

† Matt. x. 2-5; Mark iii. 16-19; Luke vi. 14-17; Acts i. 13.

‡ St. Chrysostom on Matt. Hom. 32.

§ Origen on John, tom. 32, n. 5, t. 4, p. 413.

but designates rank and pre-eminence. Thus in heathen authors this word "first" by itself indicates the most excellent in its kind: thus in the Septuagint occur, "first friend of the king," "first of the singers," "the first priest,"* *i.e.* the chief priest. So our Lord, "whichever among you will be first;" "Bring forth the first robe;" and St. Paul, "sinners, of whom I am first," † *i.e.* chief. Thus "the first of the island," Acts xxviii. 7, means the chief magistrate; and "first" generally in Latin phraseology, the superior, or prince.

Such, then, is the rank which Matthew gives to Peter, when he writes, "the first, Simon, who is called Peter."

It should also be remarked that, whenever the Evangelists have occasion to mention *some* of the Apostles, Peter being one, he is ever put first. Thus Matthew, "He taketh unto Him Peter, and James, and John his brother;" and Mark, "He admitted not any man to follow Him, but Peter, and James, and John the brother of James;" and "Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew asked Him apart;" and "He taketh Peter and James, and John with Him;" and Luke, "He suffered not any man to go in with Him, but Peter, and James, and John, and the father and mother of the maiden;" and "He sent Peter and John;" and John, "There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas, who is called Didymus, and Nathaniel, who was of Cana in Galilee, and the two sons of Zebedy, and two others of His disciples." ‡ This rule would seem to be invariable, though James and John are not always mentioned next after him.

An attempt has been made to evade the force of these testimonies, by giving as a reason for Peter being always thus named first, that he was the most aged of all the Apostles, and the first called. Even were it so, such reasons would seem most inadequate, but unfortunately they are neither of them facts. For as to age, antiquity bears witness that Andrew was

* 1 Paral. xxvii. 33; Neh. xii. 45; 2 Paral. xxvi. 20.

† Matt. xx. 27; Luke xv. 22; 1 Tim. i. 15.

‡ Matt. xvii. 1; Mark v. 37; xiii. 3; xiv. 33; Luke viii. 51; xxii. 8; John xxi. 2.

Peter's elder brother. And as to their calling, St. Augustine has observed, "In what order all the twelve Apostles were called, does not appear in the narrations of the Evangelists, since not only not the order of the calling, but not even the calling itself of all is mentioned, but only of Philip, and Peter, and Andrew, and of the sons of Zebedy, and of Matthew the publican, termed also Levi. But Peter was both the first and the only one who separately received a name from Him." * As it may be conjectured from the Gospels that Christ said to Philip first of all "Follow Me," John i. 44, he has the best right to be considered the first called.

Now the two classes of facts just mentioned, as to the mode in which the Evangelists speak of Peter in combination with the other Apostles, prove directly and plainly his *Primacy*, while they do not *directly* prove, save Matthew's title of *First*, nor are they here quoted to prove, the *nature* of that Primacy, which rests, as we have seen, on other and more decisive texts.

At length, then, we have before us the whole evidence of the Gospels, and having considered it, piece by piece, may now take a general view. It is time to gather up the several parts of this evidence, and, claiming for each its due force, to present the sum of all before the mind. For distinct and decisive as certain texts appear, and are, even by themselves, yet when they are seen to fit into a whole system, and perfectly to harmonize together, they have much greater power to convince the mind which really seeks for truth. But moral evidence generally, and especially that which results from a study of the Holy Scripture, is not intended to move a mind in a lower condition than this; a mind, that is, which loves something else better than the truth.

Thus out of the body of His disciples we see our Lord choosing Twelve, and again, out of those Twelve, distinguishing One by the most singular favours. This distinction even begins *before* the selection of the Twelve, and has its root in the very commencement of our Lord's ministry: for, as

* De Consensu Evang. lib. ii. c. xvii. n. 39.

we have seen, it was when Andrew first led his brother Simon before Christ, that He "looked upon him," and promised him the prophetic name which revealed his Primacy, and his perpetual relation to the Church of God. The name thus promised is in due time bestowed, and solemnly recorded by the three Evangelists, at the appointment of the Apostles, as the reason why he is invariably set at their head; Matthew, still more distinctly expressing it in his Primacy, "*the first, Simon, who is called Peter.*" And their whole mode of mentioning him, and exhibiting his relation to the other Apostles, shows that this Primacy was, when they wrote, ever in their minds. It comes out in the most incidental way, as when Mark writes, "Simon, and they that were with him, followed after" Christ: or Luke, "Peter, and they that were with him, said;" as naturally as they write, "David, and those that were with him;" or of our Lord Himself, and the Apostles, "those that had been with Him."* Again this preference of Peter is shown by our Lord, both at the Transfiguration and the Agony: where, even when the two next favoured of the Apostles are associated with Him as witnesses, yet there is evidence of Peter's superiority in the mode with which the Evangelists mention him. Great as the dignity was of the two sons of thunder, they are yet ranged under Peter by Luke, with that same phrase which we have just been considering. "Peter, and they that were with him, were heavy with sleep." And our Lord, at the Agony, says to Peter, "could not *you*," that is, all the three, "watch with Me one hour?"† Again, how incidentally, yet markedly, does Matthew show that this superiority of Peter over others was apparent even to strangers, when he writes, that the officers who collected the tribute for the temple, came to *him*, and said, "Does not *your* master" (the master of all the Apostles) "pay the didrachma?"‡ Much more significant is the incident immediately following, when our Lord orders

* Mark i. 36; Luke viii. 45; Matt. xii. 3; Mark ii. 25; xvi. 10.

† Luke ix. 32; Matt. xxvi. 40.

‡ Matt. xvii. 24.

him to go to the sea, to cast a hook, and to bring up a fish, which shall have a stater in his mouth, adding, "Take that, and give it to them for Me, and for thee:" a token of preference so strong, and of association so singular, that it set the Apostles on the immediate inquiry, who should be the greater among them: the answer to which we will revert to presently.

And this designation of Peter to his high and singular office becomes even more striking, if we contrast what our Lord did and said to him with what He did and said to another Apostle, who *in another way* is even in some respects preferred to Peter himself. For, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," who lay on His breast at supper, to whom was committed at the most sorrowful of all moments the domestic care of the Virgin Mother, has in the affection of our Lord his own unapproachable sphere. But as Peter does not come into competition with him here, so neither in another view he with Peter. His distinction is private, and in the nature of personal affection: Peter's is public, and in the nature of Church government. To one is committed the Mother of the Lord, the living symbol of the Church, the most blessed of all creatures, and that, when her full dignity and blessedness stood at length revealed in the full Godhead of her Son, yet whose throne was intercessory, apart from rule on earth: to the other is committed the Church herself, her championship in the time of conflict, the rudder of the vessel on the lake, till with Christ it should reach the shore. Each of these, so eminent and unapproachable in his way, has that way apart; and when Peter, on receiving his final commission, turned about and saw his best-loved friend following, and ventured to ask, "Lord, and what shall this man do?" our Lord replied with something like a reproof, "What is that to thee? Follow thou Me." These distinct preferences of the two Apostles were indicated by Tertullian, when he wrote, "Was anything concealed from Peter, who was named the rock on which the Church should be built, who received the

keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the power to bind and loose in heaven and on earth? Was anything, too, concealed from John, the most beloved of the Lord, who lay upon His breast, to whom alone the Lord foresignified the traitor Judas, whom He committed in His own place as Son to Mary?" *

But to return. Our Lord, after encompassing Peter during His whole ministry with such tokens of preference, and a preference specially belonging to his office, and designating it, appears to him first of all the Apostles after His resurrection. And yet all the proofs which we have been here summing up of Peter's pre-eminence, are but collateral and subordinate: though by themselves tenfold more than any other can claim, yet Peter's authority does not rest *mainly* on them. And this likewise is true of another class of facts concerning Peter, which yet carries with it much force, and when once remarked, never leaves the thoughtful mind. It is his great predominance in the sacred history over the rest of the Twelve. A single incident or expression distinguishing him is perhaps all that falls to the lot of another Apostle, as when "Philip saith unto Him, Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth us;" and the Lord replies, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip?" Or as Thomas, at a moment of danger, "said to his fellow-disciples, Let us also go that we may die with Him." † But Peter's name is wrought into the whole tissue of the Gospel history; he is perpetually approaching the Lord with questions: "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? until seven times?" The rest suffer the Lord in silence to wash their feet, but Peter is overcome at the sight. "Lord, dost Thou wash my feet? Thou shalt never wash my feet;" "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." ‡ Thus in the whole New Testament, John, who is yet mentioned oftener than the rest, occurs only thirty-eight times;

* De Præsc. c. 22.

† John xiv. 8; xi. 16.

‡ Matt. xviii. 21; John xiii. 6.

but in the Gospels alone, omitting the Acts and the Epistles, Peter is mentioned twenty-three times by Matthew, eighteen by Mark, twenty by Luke, and thirty by John.* More especially it is the custom of the Evangelists, when they record anything which touches all the Apostles, almost invariably to exhibit Peter as singly speaking for all, and representing all. Thus when Christ asked them all equally, "But whom say ye that I am? Simon Peter answered and said." He told them all equally "That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven," † whereupon, "Peter answering said to Him, Behold, we have left all things, and followed Thee: what therefore shall we have?" And when "Jesus said to the twelve, Will you also go away?" ‡ at once we hear "Simon Peter answered and said, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." And a very remarkable occasion occurs where our Lord had been telling to His disciples the parable of the watchful servant, upon which Peter said to Him, "Lord, dost Thou speak this parable to us, or likewise to all?" § And the reply seems by anticipation to express the very office which Peter was to hold. "Who, then, is the faithful and wise steward, whom his lord setteth over his family, to give them their measure of wheat in due season?" Now it looks not like an equal, but a superior, to anticipate the rest, to represent them, to speak and act for them. St. Chrysostom drew the conclusion long ago. "What then says Peter, the mouthpiece of the Apostles? Everywhere impetuous as he is, the leader of the band of the Apostles, when a question is asked of all, he replies." || No other cause can be assigned for the care of the Evangelists in setting before us so continually his words and acts, in bringing him out, as the second object, after Christ. But though his future place in the Church is a reason for this, and this, again, a token of that singular pre-eminence, its decisive proof rests on declarations from our Lord's own mouth, expressly circum-

* Passaglia, p. 134.

† Matt. xix. 23.

‡ John vi. 67.

§ Luke xii. 41.

|| In Matt. Hom. 54.

scribed to him, of singular lucidity, and of force which nothing can evade; declarations which set forth, under different but coincident images, a power supreme and without equal, and of its own nature belonging to but one at a time. The proofs which we have hitherto mentioned take away all abruptness from these declarations, and show that they embody a great design which runs all through the Gospel; but the office itself rests upon these, and by these is most clearly and absolutely defined.

Thus, when our Lord, in answer to a great confession of His Apostle, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," replies, "And I too say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church:" every one must feel how it adds to the cogency of the reply, that the name, which He is explaining, was not the person's natural name, but first promised, and then given, by that same Lord, who now attaches other promises and prophecies to it. This fact serves, among others, to fix the whole which follows to Peter individually, and to introduce what follows as part of a design which before had been intimated: for what follows no more belongs to the other Apostles, than the name Peter belongs to them: and a name, on the other hand, so promised, and so given, naturally looks, as it were, to such a result. To say solemnly of a man, when first seen, "Thou art called Simon, but thou shalt be called The Rock," and to make nothing of him when so called, would be, if ascribed to any one, a dull and pointless thing; but what shall we say, when the speaker is God. It is a new thing for God the Word to speak with little meaning, or to speak, and not to do: and so now He does what He had long designed. And what is it that He does? He sets up a governor who is never to be put down. He inaugurates a Church against which Hell shall rage, but in vain: He establishes a government at which the nations shall rage, the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, for ever, but to their own confusion. He does what He alone could do, and so the answer is worthy of

the confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

"Blessed * art thou, Simon Bar-Jonas, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father who is in heaven. *And I too say unto thee*, in return for what thou hast said to Me, and to show, like My Father, My good will towards thee, and what I say, as the Almighty Word of the Father, by My power I fulfil, *that thou art Peter*, the Rock, and so partaker with Me of that honour whereby I am the chief Rock and Foundation; *and upon this Rock*, which I have called thee, *I will build My Church*, which, therefore, with Me for its architect, shall rest on thee, to thee adhere, and from thee derive its conspicuous unity: *and the gates of hell*, even all the powers of the enemy, *shall not prevail against it*, nor take that, which, by My Godhead, is established upon thee, but rather yield to it the victory. *And to thee*, whom, as Supreme Architect, I have marked out for the Rock and Foundation of My Church, as King and Lord *I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven*, and the supreme authority over My Church, and will make thee sharer with Me in that dignity, by which I hold the keys of heaven and of earth, *and whatsoever*, in virtue of that authority and as associated in My dignity, *thou shalt bind upon earth*, shall be bound in heaven, and there shall be no matter relating to My Church, and the kingdom of heaven, but shall be subject to thy legislative and judicial power, which shall reach the heaven itself: for it is a power at once human and divine; human, as entrusted to a man, and administered by a man; divine, as a participation of that right by which I am, in heaven and on earth, Supreme Lawgiver and Judge; *and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven.*"

Thus it is that the most famous Fathers and Bishops, the most distinguished Councils, the most various nations, have understood our Lord's words, and this is their meaning, according to the fixed laws of grammar, of rhetoric, of philo-

* Passaglia, p. 510.

sophy, and of logic, as well as by the testimony of history, and in accordance with the principles of theology. Let us mention certain consequences which follow from them.

These words * of Christ are, in the most marked manner, addressed to Peter *only* among the Apostles, and are, therefore, with their meaning, *peculiar* to him. And they designate pre-eminence in the government of the Church. They have, therefore, the two qualities which render them a suitable testimony to establish his Primacy among the Apostles.

Now, if persons differ in rank and pre-eminence, they must be considered not equals, but absolutely unequal. And such pre-eminence Peter had, deriving from Christ, the Founder, a superior rank in the Church's ministry. Therefore, the college of the Apostles must be termed absolutely unequal and all the Apostles, compared with Peter, absolutely unequal.

But as inequality may be manifold, as of age, calling, honour, order, jurisdiction, and power, its nature and its degree must be sought in that property which belongs to one over the rest. So that we must determine, by the authority of the Scriptures, from those gifts which were promised to Peter alone, the nature and the degree of that inequality which subsisted between him and the other Apostles.

The gifts promised to Peter alone, are contained in these words of Christ, recorded by Matthew: and therefore, from their nature and inherent qualities, we must judge of the sort and the extent of inequality put by Christ between Peter and the rest.

These are summed up in the four following: I. That Peter is the rock, on which the Church was to be built by Christ, the Chief Architect. II. That the impregnable strength which the Church was to have against the gates of hell, depended on its union with Peter, as the divinely laid foundation. III. That by Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, Peter is marked out as next to Him, and after Him, the Bearer of the keys in the Church's heavenly kingdom. IV. And that, accord-

* Passaglia, p. 518.

ingly, universal power of binding and loosing is promised to him, leaving him responsible to Christ alone, the supreme Lawgiver and Judge. Therefore the nature of the prerogatives expressed in these four terms must be our standard both of the character and degree of inequality between the Apostles and Peter, and of the power of the Primacy promised to Peter.

But these terms mark authority, and plainly express jurisdiction and power; the inequality, therefore, is one relating to jurisdiction and power; and Peter's pre-eminence likewise such.

That these terms, which contains Peter's prerogatives, really do express jurisdiction and authority, may be thus very briefly shown. The first, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church," is drawn from architecture, exhibiting between Peter and the Church, which includes also the Apostles, the relation which exists between the foundation and the superstructure. This is one of dependence, by which accordingly the Apostles must maintain an indivisible union with Peter. Which relation of dependence, again, cannot be understood without the notion of superior jurisdiction in Peter, for these are correlative. The second term corroborates this; for it is a plain duty, and undoubted moral obligation, to be united to him, if severed from whom, the words of Christ do not entitle you to expect stability or victory over the gates of hell. Now, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," most plainly express that perseverance and victory are promised to no one by Christ, who does not remain joined with Peter. So much for the *duty* which binds all Christians, and the Apostles among them, to avoid separation from Peter as their destruction. But such duty involves the faculty and authority on Peter's part of enjoining on all without exception the maintenance of unity, and of keeping from the whole body the sin of schism, which, again, expresses his superior jurisdiction. Yet plainer and more striking is the *third*; for in the words, "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," it is foretold that Peter, in regard to the kingdom

of heaven, and therefore to all Christians, whether teachers or taught, subjects or prelates, shall discharge the office of the bearer of the keys; with which jurisdiction and authority are indivisibly united. But in the *fourth*, there is no matter relating to the heavenly kingdom, which is not subjected by this promise to Peter's authority. "Whatsoever thou shalt bind," "whatsoever thou shalt loose;" but this is in its own kind without limit, a full legislative and judicial power. Thus these four terms exactly agree with each other, and express, severally and collectively, prerogatives by which Peter is admitted to a singular and close association with Christ; and therefore is pre-eminent among the Apostles by his Primacy, and his superior authority over the whole Church.

They also show, with no less clearness, that Christ in bestowing these prerogatives and Primacy on Peter, designed to produce the visible unity of His kingdom and Church; and this in two ways, the first *typically prefiguring* the Church's own unity in Peter, the single Foundation, Bearer of the keys, and supreme Legislator and Judge; the second *efficiently*, as by a principle and cause, *forming, holding together, and protecting*, visible unity in that same Peter, as he discharged these functions. For just as the building is based on the foundation, and by virtue of it all the parts are held together, so a kingdom's unity and harmonious administration are first *moulded out*, and then *preserved*, in the unity of its supreme authority.

And this Primacy may be regarded from three different points of view; as it *is in itself*, and as it regards its *efficient* and its *final* cause. As to the first, it consists in superior jurisdiction and authority; as to the second, it springs from Christ Himself, who said to Peter alone, "And I too say unto thee," etc.; as to the third, it *prefigures, forms, and protects* the Church's visible unity.

But to prefigure, to form, and to protect the Church's unity, being distinct functions, care must be taken not to confuse them, the former concerning the Primacy as a type,

the two latter as the origin and efficient cause; and also not to concede the former while the latter are denied, which latter make up the Primacy as jurisdictional, and the instrument effecting unity. Now, Peter is both the type of unity, its origin, and its efficient cause.

A long line* of Fathers, from the most ancient downwards, regards Peter as at once the type, and the origin, and efficient cause of unity; setting it forth as a prerogative of his headship that no one, whether Apostle, or Prophet, or Evangelist, or Doctor, or Teacher, might separate from him without the crime of schism. In this consists his Primacy, and in this the famous phrase of St. Cyprian find its solution, that "the Episcopate is one, of which a part is held by each without division of the whole."

And, what is like to the proceeding, they hold that Peter is the *continuous* source of all power in the Church, and that while its plenitude dwells in his person, a portion of it is derived to the various prelates under him. No one has set this forth more fully than St. Leo, in the middle of the fifth century, as where he says, that "if Christ willed that other rulers should enjoy aught together with him (that is, Peter), yet never did He give, *save through him*, what He denied not to others." †

There is no one of these consequences but seems to result from the words of our Lord here solemnly addressed to Peter.

But, recurring to our general view, we find our Lord three several ‡ times appealed to by the Apostles to declare who should be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven; and while on neither of these occasions does He declare to them that there should be no "greater one" among them, though such a declaration would have terminated their rivalry, on the last and most urgent, at the very eve of His departure from them, He sets

* These testimonies have been set forth at length in another work, "The See of St. Peter, the Rock of the Church," etc., pp. 97-118.

† Serm. 4.

‡ Matt. xviii. 1: xx. 20; Luke xxii. 24.

forth in vivid words what ought to be the character and deportment of the one so to be placed over them; and then turning His conversation from them in a body to Peter in particular, He charges him, at a future time, when He shall obtain for him the gift of a faith that could not fail, to "confirm his brethren." Having before dwelt on the full meaning of these words, we need only remark how marvellously they coincide in force with the prophecy which we have just been considering, while they differ from it in expression. They convey as absolutely a supreme authority as the former; and an authority independent of others, and exclusive of participation; and one which is given for the maintenance of the faith, and of visible unity in that faith. Nor can we imagine a more fitting termination to the whole of our Lord's dealing with His disciples before His passion, than that, when about to be taken from them, He should designate, in words so full of affection and provident care, one who was presently to take His own place among them. "Simon, Simon, I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and thou in thy turn one day confirm thy brethren."

But if our Lord's preference of Peter, as to rank and dignity in the Church, was during His lifetime consistent and uniform; if, moreover, He made to him, twice, promises so large as to include and go far beyond all that He said to the Apostles in common; and if He took out, as it were, of what He had first promised to Peter a portion which He afterwards promised as their common inheritance to the rest; His dealing with Peter and the Apostles after His resurrection is the exact counterpart to this. The fulfilment is equivalent to the promise. In the fourfold prophecy to Peter, in Matt. xvi., the last member is, "And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." That this is a grant of full legislative and judicial power, given to one, we have seen. Now on a later occasion it is repeated to the twelve together, Matt. xviii. 18. *But the other three members of the prophecy*

made to Peter are never repeated to the twelve. In the fulfilment the same distinction takes place. To the twelve in common our Lord communicates the power contained in the fourth member of His original promise, saying, John xx. 21, "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained:" to which the other forms contained in Matt. xxviii. 18, Mark xvi. 15, Luke xxiv. 49, Acts i. 4, 8, of preaching the Gospel to every creature, of waiting for the power of the Holy Ghost wherewith they should be endued, of teaching men to observe all things which He had commanded, are equivalent, though less definite. *But nowhere are the powers contained in the first three members of the prophecy to Peter communicated to the twelve.* As the promises were made to Peter alone originally, so to Peter alone are they, as we shall see, fulfilled. Indeed, it could not be otherwise, for the promises to be the rock of the Church, by coherence with which the Church should be impregnable, and the bearer of the keys, are in their own nature confined to one, and exclusive of participants, and once made by the very Truth Himself to one man, they ranged under his power all his brethren: "For the promises of Jesus Christ, as well as His gifts, are without repentance; and what is once given indefinitely and universally is irrevocable."* Besides that another indisputable principle must be taken into account, viz. "that power given to several carries its restriction in its division:" just as if a king before his death bequeaths the whole administration of his sovereignty to a board of twelve councillors, though the sum of authority so conveyed be sovereign, yet the share of each individual in the college will be restricted by the equal right of his colleagues. Whereas "power given to one alone, and over all, and without exception, carries with it plenitude, and, not having to be divided with any other, it has no bounds save those which its terms convey." Such was the power originally promised to Peter; and such,

* Bossuet, Sermon on Unity.

no less, that which was ultimately conveyed. He stands apart and alone no less in the fulfilment than in the promise. And under another image, but one equally expressive with the first, the Lord conveys an authority as absolute and as exclusive. The "bounds which its terms convey" are the whole fold of Christ: "the sheep" no less than "the lambs:" "to govern" no less than "to feed." * As the great Architect of the heavenly city said to Peter, "Thou art the Rock;" as "the King of kings," who "hath the key of David," and "on whose shoulder is the government," said to Peter, "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven;" as He "who upholdeth all things by the word of His power," and "in whom all things consist," said to Peter, "Confirm thy brethren:" so to the same Peter, the same "Great Shepherd of the sheep," said, "Feed My lambs, be shepherd over My sheep," thus committing to him the chief Apostles themselves who heard this charge, and causing there to be for ever "one fold and one shepherd," on earth as in heaven.

It remains briefly to consider these three palmary texts in their reciprocal relations to each other, by which the fullest light is thrown upon the Scriptural prerogatives of St. Peter.

1. First, then, all these texts are in the most marked manner circumscribed to Peter *alone*. In all he is addressed by name; in all he is distinguished by other circumstances from his brethren at the time present with him; in all a special condition is attached belonging to him; in the first, superior faith—in the second, faith, which, by a particular gift, the fruit of Christ's own prayer, should never fail—in the third, superior love. So that, without an utter disregard of the meaning of words, and the force of the context, and every law of grammar and philology, no one of these texts can be extended from its

* Ποιμαίνειν, gubernare, to govern, the particular word which our Lord employs to convey His powers to Peter, is also the particular word which gives such offence to temporal governments, when acted on by Peter: βόσκειν, pascere, to feed, they find more endurable, and probably they would all be content, from the heathen Roman emperors to the present day, to allow *the Church to feed*, so long as *they* are allowed to *govern* the faithful. The objection on the *part* of the Church is, that our Lord gave *both* to Peter.

application to Peter alone, and made common to the other Apostles.

2. Secondly, the note of *priority in time* is secured to Peter by the first text, to which the other two correspond. Even if the promise in Matt. xviii. 18, made to all the Apostles, were of equal latitude with that previously made to Peter, which it is so very far from being that it contains one point only out of four, yet, the fact that they had been already ranged by the former under him, and that he had been promised *singly* what they afterwards were promised *in common*, would make a vast difference between them; indeed, the difference of the Primacy. But, as it is, the very first mention of the Church is connected with a promise made to Peter of the highest authority in that Church, and a perpetual relationship, entering into its inmost constitutions between it and his person. Before the Church is formed, it is foretold that Peter shall rule her; before she is set up against the gates of hell, that, by virtue of her coherence with him, she should prevail over them. And the germ of her Episcopate, on which she is to grow, is sown in his person; just as, in the last act of our Lord, that Episcopate is delivered over to him, universal and complete.

3. Thirdly, these three texts are exactly *equivalent* to each other; they each involve and express the other. They could not have been said of different persons without contradiction and confusion. He who has one of them must have the rest. There is variation of image, but identity of meaning. Thus, the relation between Peter and the Church is in the first, that of Foundation and Superstructure; of the heaven-built city, and of him who holds its keys: in the second, it is that of the Architect, who, by skill and authority, won for him, and given to him, by the Supreme Builder, the Word and Wisdom of God, maintains every living stone of the structure in its due place; in the third, it is that of the supreme and universal Pastor and his whole flock. In all of these there is the habit of dependence between the superior and that over which he is set: in all the need of close coherence with him. Observe in

particular the identity of the second and third. The special office of the Shepherd of souls* is to lead his flock into suitable pastures; that is, duly to instruct them in the Divine Word and Will: the pastoral office is identical with that of teaching: "He gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Teachers;" the former are distinguished, the last united together: where the Apostle observes, that the whole ministry, from the highest to the lowest, is organized "to edify the body of Christ into the unity of faith," and to preserve men from being "carried about by every wind of doctrine." But if this was the design of Christ as to the whole ministry, and as to each individual teacher, most of all was it in instituting one supreme and universal Pastor: in him most of all would be seen the perfect *fitting in together* † of each individual member: he was set up especially for the compacting of each spiritual joint, the harmony and cohesion of the whole. Here, then, the office of the universal Pastor or Teacher is precisely equivalent to him who, by another image, confirms, strengthens, consolidates his brethren. Thus, in the second text, Christ foretold the third. But the more we contemplate all the three in their mutual relations, the more a certain thought suggests itself to the mind. There is a special doctrine concerning the most Holy Trinity, the most distinctive of that great mystery, which expresses the reciprocal indwelling of the Three Persons. Now, something analogous may be said of the way in which these three texts impermeate and include each other, of their exact equivalence, and distinct, but inseparable force: of whom one is said, of the same must all.

4. Fourthly, they all indicate a *sovereign* authority, *independent* itself, but on which all others depend; symbolizing power from above, but claiming obedience from below; immutable in itself, but by which all the rest are made proof against change; for it is not to the sheep that the shepherd is responsible, but to their owner. It has been said throughout

* Passaglia, p. 591.

† Ὁ καταρτισμὸς τῶν ἁγίων, Eph. iv. 12.

that the one special mark of Peter's distinction was a peculiar association with Christ. It is not therefore by any infringement of equal rights that this authority is set up, but as the representative, the vicegerent, of Him in whom all power dwells: who bore this authority in His own body, and who committed to another what was first His own, both by creation and by purchase—"Feed *My* sheep." In all these texts the immediate transference of authority from the Person of the God-man is most striking; in Peter He inaugurates His great theandric dispensation, and forms the Body which He was to leave on earth. Thus these texts most clearly express that important doctrine of antiquity, the keystone of the Church's liberty from the world, which is the reason why the world so hates it: "The first See is judged by no man." So entirely have political ideas and jealousies infected our mode of judging of spiritual things—to such a degree is our peculiar civil liberty made the standard of Church government—that it is necessary to insist again and again on what to Christians ought to be a first principle, viz. that "all power and jurisdiction in the Church, like the Church herself, ought to rest not upon natural and human authority, but on the divine authority of Christ. This is the reason why we may pronounce no otherwise concerning such jurisdiction, than we know has been handed down from Christ, its proper Author and Founder. Now, it is certain that at the same moment at which Christ instituted the community called the Church, such a power was introduced, and entrusted as well to Peter singly as the head, as to the Apostles under him. Nay, that power was fixed and constituted, and its Ministers and Bishops marked out, *before* the Church, that is, the whole body and commonwealth, had grown into coherence. And so ecclesiastical jurisdiction did not first dwell in the community itself, and was then translated by a sort of popular suffrage and consent to its magistrates; but from the very first origin Peter was destined to be single chief of the future body, and next to him the other Apostles." *

* Potavius, de Ecc. Hier. lib. iii. c. 14.

5. Fifthly, it must be observed that there is a *definiteness* about these texts which belongs in a far less degree to those forms in which the co-ordinate and co-equal authority of the Apostles, as such, is expressed. This last is left to be harmonized and brought into operation by the superior power of the chief. They are indeed sent into all the world, they are immediately instituted by our Lord, they have the promise that His power shall be with them, and that their sentence shall stand good in heaven and on earth; but this promise, which is the most distinct made to them, has been already gathered up into the hands of one, and in its practical issue is limited by the necessity of co-operating with that one; that is, the authority of Peter includes and embraces theirs, but theirs is ranged under his. Theirs is modified not only by being shared, but by having his set over them. Now observe how distinct and clear, how definite in their meaning, while universal in their range, are the things said of him alone; 1. That he should be the rock on which Christ would build His Church; 2. That permanence and victory should belong to that Church for ever through him; 3. That he should bear the keys in the kingdom of heaven; 4. That whatever *singly* he should bind and loose, should be bound and loosed in heaven as well as on earth; 5. That he should confirm his brethren, the Apostles themselves being the very first so called; 6. That he should be the shepherd of the fold. What can constitute inequality between two parties, if such a series of promises given to one, and not to the other, does not?

6. Sixthly, these promises cannot be contemplated without seeing that the ordinary and regular government of the Church springs from the person whom they designate, and in whom they are concentrated. To take the last, all spiritual care is summed up in the word Pastorship, the office of Priest, Bishop, Metropolitan, Patriarch, and Pope, rising in degree, and extending in range, but in its nature the same. On the contrary, Apostles (with this one exception, in virtue of the Primacy), Prophets, and Evangelists, are extraordinary officers, attending

the opening of the dispensation, but afterwards dropping off. But the Church, as it was to endure for ever, and the orderly arrangement of the divine ministry, were summed up in the Primacy, and flowed forth from it as the full receptacle of the virtue of God the Word Incarnate. And so it is the head of the ministerial body. All which is set forth as in a picture to the mind, in that scene upon the shore of the lake of Galilee, when the Lord said to Peter, "Feed My sheep."

7. And, again, Peter was thus made the beginning and principle of spiritual power, as it left the Person of God the Word, not for once, but for ever. Long as the structure should endure, its principle of cohesion must bind it. As the law of gravitation binds all worlds together in the natural kingdom, and is a *continuous* source of strength and harmony, so should be in the spiritual kingdom that force which the same Wisdom of God established; it goes on with power undiminished; it is the full fountain-head from which all streams emanate; it is the highest image of God's power as the centre and source of all things. This idea is dwelt upon by St. Cyprian and St. Augustine, as well as by Pope St. Innocent,* the contemporary of the latter, and was afresh expressed in a synodical letter of the three provinces of Africa to Pope Theodore, in A.D. 646, "No one can doubt there is in the Apostolic See a great unfailing fountain, pouring forth waters for all Christians, whence rich streams proceed, bountifully irrigating the whole Christian world.' †

8. And, lastly, in these great promises Peter is specially set forth as the type and the efficient cause of visible unity in the Church. Such was the very purpose of Christ, that His disciples might be one, as He and the Father are one. For this end, in the words of St. Augustine, "He entrusted His sheep to Peter, as to another self, He willed to make him one with Himself;" and in the words of St. Leo, "He assumed him

* St. Cyprian de Unitate, c. 3. St. Aug. to Pope Innocent, Ep. 177, n. 19. Pope Innocent to the Councils of Carthage and Numidia.

† Mansi, x. 919.

into the participation of His indivisible unity."* But this is seen no less plainly in the words of Christ, than in the Fathers; for He made *one* Rock, *one* Bearer of the keys, *one* Confirmer of the brethren, and *one* Shepherd. The union of millions of naturally conflicting wills in the profession and belief of one doctrine is almost the very highest work of divine power; and as grace, that is, the Holy Spirit diffused in the heart, is the inward efficient of this, so the outward, both symbol and instrument, is the Primacy, that "other self" which the Lord left in the world. And as the Church of God through every succeeding age grows and expands, the need of this power becomes greater and not less, and reverence to that "single chair in which unity was to be observed by all," † a more imperative virtue, or rather an ever-deepening instinct, of the Christian mind.

But antiquity itself drew no other conclusions from the concentration of these great privileges in the person of Peter. We have but to go back to a time before the present nationalities of Europe, those jealous foes of Peter's authority, had come into existence, and we find the chief men of France, and Spain, and Italy, interpreting the above texts as we have done. Take one whose testimony from the circumstances of his life ought to be above suspicion. John Cassian was by birth a Scythian, was educated in a monastery at Bethlehem, travelled through Egypt, and made himself acquainted with its most distinguished religious men, went to Constantinople, and was ordained deacon by St. Chrysostom, and afterwards at Rome priest by Pope Innocent I. On the capture of Rome by Alaric, he settled at Marseilles, about the year 410, and there founded two monasteries. In his work on the Incarnation he says, ‡ "Let us ask him, who is supreme, both as disciple among disciples, and as a teacher among teachers, who, steering the course of the Roman Church, held the supremacy as well of

* St. Aug. Serm. 46. St. Leo, Epistle 10.

† St. Optatus, cont. Parm. lib. ii. c. 6.

‡ Lib. iii. c. 12.

the faith as of the priesthood. Tell us, therefore, tell us, we pray, O Peter, Prince of the Apostles, tell us how the Churches ought to believe. For just it is that thou, who wast taught of the Lord, shouldst teach us, and open to us the door whose key thou hast received. Shut out all who undermine the heavenly house, and turn away those who attempt to make an entry through treacherous caverns and illicit approaches; because it is certain that no one shall be able to enter the door of the kingdom, save he to whom the key placed by thee in the Church shall open it. Tell us, therefore, how we ought to believe that Jesus is the Christ, and to confess our common Lord." Again, fourteen hundred years ago, Maximus, Bishop of Turin in that day, confessed by his words, what his successor of the present day bears witness to by his sufferings; for he writes of Peter, "As * the Good Shepherd he received the defence of the flock, so that he, who before had been weak in his own case, might become the confirmation to all: and he who had been shaken by the temptation of the question asked him, might be a foundation to the rest by the stability of his faith. In fine, for the firmness of his devotion he is called the Rock of the Churches, as the Lord says, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church.' For he is called the Rock, because he was the first to lay the foundations of the faith among the nations, *and because, as an immovable stone, he holds together the framework and the mass of the whole Christian structure.* Peter, therefore, for his devotion is called the Rock, and the Lord is named the Rock by His inherent power, as the Apostle says, 'And they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ.' *Rightly does he merit to share the name, who, likewise, merits to share the work.*" Again, far and wide has the lying story been spread by false-hearted men, who above all things hate the spiritual kingdom which God has set up in the world, that Peter's power has been the growth of gradual encroachment on the secular authority. Now, long before

* De Petro Apostolo, Hom. 4.

Pelayo renewed the Spanish monarchy in the mountains of the Asturias, and while Augustine, sent by Pope Gregory, was laying the foundation of the English Church, St. Isidore, Bishop of Seville, from 598 to 636, the very highest of the ancient Spanish doctors, wrote thus explicitly to his colleague at Toledo: * "But as to the question of the equality of the Apostles, Peter is pre-eminent over the rest, who merited to hear from the Lord, 'Thou shalt be called Cephas. . . Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church.' And not from any one else, but from the very Son of God and the Virgin, he was the first to receive the honour of the pontificate in the Church of Christ, to whom also, after the resurrection of the Son of God, was said by the same, 'Feed My lambs, noting by the name of lambs the prelates of the Churches: And although the dignity of this power is derived to all Catholic Bishops, yet in a more special manner it remains for ever in the Roman Bishop, who is by a certain singular privilege set as the head over the other limbs. Whoso, therefore, renders not reverently to him due obedience, involves himself, as being severed from the head, in the schism of the Acephali."

It would be easy to multiply such authorities of a period prior to the formation of all the existing European states. It was the will of God, providing for His Church, that before the old Roman society was utterly upheaved from its foundations by the deluge of the Northern tribes, reverence for St. Peter's throne should be fixed as an immovable rock, on which a new Christian civilization might be founded. Thus Pope Gregory II., writing to the Emperor Leo the Isaurian, about the year 717, only sums up the force and effect of all preceding tradition, when he says, "The whole West turns its eyes upon us, and, unworthy though we be, puts complete trust in us, and in that blessed Peter, whose image you threaten to overturn, but whom all the kingdoms of the West count for a God upon earth." †

* Ad Eugenium Toletanum.

† Mansi, Concil. tom. xii. 972.

CHAPTER V.

ST. PETER'S PRIMACY AS EXHIBITED IN THE ACTS.

THE purpose * of St. Luke in writing the Acts seems to have been to set before us the labours and sufferings of the Apostles in planting and propagating the Church. But he has divided the book very distinctly into two portions; the latter, from the thirteenth chapter to the end, with one short exception, is wholly occupied with the labours of St. Paul, "the vessel of election," in spreading the faith among the Gentiles, and so contains the particular history of that Apostle, and the Churches founded by him. The former, from the beginning to the end of the twelfth chapter, embraces the history of the Apostles in common, and of the whole Church, as it rose at Jerusalem, and was spread first in Judea, then in Samaria, and finally extended to the Gentiles. The former history, then, is universal; the latter, particular.

Moreover, to use the words of St. Chrysostom, "We may here see the promises which Christ made in the Gospels carried into execution, and the bright light of truth shining in the very actions, and a great change in the disciples, arising from the Spirit that had entered into them. . . . You will see here Apostles speeding on the wing over land and sea, and men once timid and unskilled, suddenly changed into despisers of wealth, and conquerors of glory and all other passions; you will see them united in the utmost harmony, without jealousy, which once they had, without contention for the higher place."

* Passaglia, p. 138.

† Ibid. p. 140. St. Chrys. in Acta, Hom. 1.

We may say, then, in a word, that the Gospels are a history of the Head, and the Acts of the mystical Body. Hence both issue forth from one and the same fountain and source. The history of the Head begins with that descent of the Holy Ghost, whereby Christ was conceived, and “the race* of God and of man became one. For just as the union of man with woman joins two families, so, upon Christ assuming flesh, by that flesh the whole Church became of kin with Christ, Paul became Christ’s kinsman, and Peter, each one of the faithful, all we, every holy person. Therefore, says Paul, † ‘being the offspring of God,’ and again, ‘we are the body of Christ and members in particular,’ that is, through the flesh, which He has assumed, we are His kinsmen.” Now the history of the Body, proceeding from the same fountain-head, sets before us the Holy Spirit, who, by descending first on the teachers, and afterwards on the disciples, exalts and advances all, and by imparting Himself, imparts “the proportional deification of man,” that is, “the utmost possible assimilation and union with God.” ‡ For “the Spirit works in us by His proper power, truly sanctifying and uniting us to Himself into one frame, and making us partakers of the divine nature:” § “becoming as it were a quality of the God-head in us, and dwelling in the saints, and abiding for ever.”

Now it is || manifest that if the first twelve chapters of the Acts contain the history of the Church from its beginning, and what the Apostles did for its first formation, its growth, and its form of government, all this has the closest connection with the question as to Peter’s prerogatives. For the historical accounts in the Acts, which exhibit the *execution* of Christ’s promises and intentions, naturally tend to set in the fullest light, and to reveal distinctly, whatever as to the administration of the Church may be less clearly *foretold* in the Gospels.

* St. Chrys. Hom. in Ascens., and on Acts, tom. iii. p. 773.

† Acts xvii. 28, 29, and compare 1 Cor. xii. 12–17 with Eph. iv. 16.

‡ Dions. de Cœl. Hier. cap. I, § 3.

§ St. Cyril. Theis. lib. xxxiv. p. 352, and lib. ix. on John, p. 810.

|| Passaglia, p. 143.

For in itself the *execution* is declaratory of the *enactment*, and supplies a safe rule for understanding and determining the words of institution. Now, if we apply this rule to the present question, it will be apparent that those expressions of the Gospel, which we assigned to the divine institution of the Primacy, cannot be otherwise received without making the *execution* in the Acts at variance with what the Gospels record.

For, take it as a still doubtful hypothesis whether there exist evangelical testimonies of Peter's *institution* to be head and chief of the Apostles. What needs it to turn this hypothesis into certainty? What should we expect of Peter, if he really had received from Christ the charge of leading the other Apostles? What but that he should never follow, but always be at the head; should close dissensions, weigh and terminate controversies, punish emergent offences, maintain the general discipline, give the support of his counsel and authority in need, and leave undone none of those functions which accompany the office of head and supreme ruler? Hence it is plain that there are two ways, the one absolute, the other hypothetical, by which a decisive judgment may be drawn from the history of the Acts, as to whether Peter's Primacy was instituted in the Gospels. Critics and philosophers are perpetually using both these tests. Thus, the former, "if a certain work—say the epistles of the martyr Ignatius—be genuine, it ought to contain certain characteristics. But it does contain these, and so is genuine." Or absolutely, "a certain work, the epistles of Ignatius, contains all which we should expect in a genuine work, therefore it is genuine." The latter infer, "If bodies be moved by the law of gravitation, they would pass through a certain space under such and such a condition. But this they do, and accordingly are moved by gravitation." Or absolutely, "Bodies left to themselves pass through space under such conditions as they would follow, if impelled by gravitation. Accordingly they are so impelled." Now, in the parallel case, "If Christ in the Gospels preordained a form of Church government, which gathered up the supreme

power and visible headship into Peter's hands, the *exercise* of such *institution* ought to be found in the Acts. But it is so found. Therefore," etc. Or again, "No one would expect certain acts from Peter, unless he were the head of all the Apostles; and all would fairly expect those acts of Peter, if they recognized him as so set over all by Christ. Now, in the general history of the Apostles we find such acts recorded of Peter, and that not partially, here and there, but in a complete series. Accordingly the history of the rising Church, exhibited in the first part of the Acts, demands Peter's Primacy for its explanation; and if we deny that Primacy, and take in another sense the words recording its institution in the Gospel, the history becomes unintelligible."

Now, this reasoning is conclusive in either way, provided only that what we have asserted be really found in the Acts. The proof of this may be either general, or piecemeal and particular. We will take both in order, beginning with the former.

1. First,* then, we must repeat, as concerns that whole portion of the Acts containing the history of the universal Church, and all the Apostles, viz. the first twelve chapters, a remark before made as to the Gospels, which is, that Peter singly is more often mentioned than all the rest put together. For Peter's name occurs more than fifty times, the others very seldom, and those who are found the oftenest, John and James, are recorded, the former seven or eight, the latter three or four times. Yet this is a history of them all: Luke is recording the common exertions of all the Apostles in building up the Church. This is the very distinction between the former and the latter portion of his book, which is confined to the labours of St. Paul, leaving aside the rest of the Church. What then is the reason that Peter, in a general history, is so often brought forward, and the rest, either singly or in conjunction, so seldom? Because after our Lord's glorious ascension Peter stood to the eleven in an analogous position to that held by our Lord, so long as He was visible, towards the whole college:

* Passaglia, p. 144.

because Peter was become the head, and the rest, as members, were ranged under him.

2. Such subordination on their part, such pre-eminence on his, Luke* shows yet more clearly, whenever he groups Peter with the rest, by assigning to him the leading place. It frequently happens to him to speak of Peter and the rest together, but on no one occasion does he give Peter any but the first place, and the leading part. Just as the evangelists do with regard to Christ, and the Apostles and disciples, so Luke prefers Peter to the rest, to mark a difference between the rank and office of Peter, and that of the others.

3. Luke seems to confirm his readers in such a conclusion by the form which he follows of mentioning Peter *directly*, and the rest *obliquely* or *in a mass*. These are instances: "In those days Peter, *rising up in the midst of the brethren*, said"—"Peter, *standing up with the eleven*, lifted up his voice"—"They said to Peter and to the rest of the Apostles"—"Peter, with John, fastening his eyes upon him, said, Look upon us."—"Peter and the Apostles answering, said." † Now, what form of writing could Luke choose to refute an opinion about the *universal* equality of the Apostles? Or to show Peter as set over the rest, and to satisfy in this even the most unreasonable? Either the form which he did choose is calculated to do this, or none such can be found.

4. Add to this that Peter is represented as speaking and answering, when the occasion would suggest that all the Apostles, equally, should disclose their mind. The reproaches of the unbelieving Jews affected not Peter singly, but all alike; but he alone stands forth, he alone lifts up his voice, and in a long speech brings them to sound reflection. The multitude, struck with compunction, asked not Peter only, but the rest likewise, "What shall we do, men and brethren?" Yet it is forthwith added, "But Peter said to them." Upon the miracle by which one who had been lame from his mother's

* Acts i. 13; ii. 14; iii. 1-3; iv. 19; viii. 14.

† Acts i. 15; ii. 14, 37; iii. 4; v. 29.

womb was healed, "all the people ran together to them," both Peter and John, but Peter alone speaks, and takes on himself the defence of the common cause: "Peter seeing, made answer to the people."* Fresh instances may be found in chaps. iv. 6, 7, and v. 2, 3. The result of the whole is that Peter is continually "the mouthpiece of the Apostles," † always takes the lead, and gives his own mind, as conveying that of the rest.

On what ground does he do this? Was it from natural fervour of disposition? But it was the same after he was filled with the Holy Spirit as before. Was it the result of superior age, or first calling? but the facts refute this. What other cause can be suggested save that Primacy which the Gospels record, and the Acts confirm?

5. To this we must likewise refer it that Luke, while he amply describes actions which belong to Peter, rather hints at than narrates what concerns the other Apostles. Thus he leaves it to be understood that the others spoke, while he gives Peter's discourses entire, and seems to have chosen them as the principal material of his history. He simply suggests that miracles were wrought by the rest, but records particularly what Peter did for the establishment of the faith. He relates but very little of those who became Christians by the exertion of others, but notes at large the abundant fruit of Peter's teaching. Take an ancient author's summary of the Acts, "this whole volume is about the ascension of Christ after the resurrection, and about the descent of the Holy Spirit on the holy Apostles, and how and where the disciples announced Christ's religion, and all the wondrous deeds which they did by prayer and faith in Him, and about Paul's divine calling from heaven, his apostleship, and fruitful preaching, and in a word about those many great dangers which the Apostles underwent for Christ:" ‡ follow, out of this, all which concerns the universal Church in the first twelve chapters, and Peter will be found

* Acts ii. 13, 37, 38; iii. 11, 12.

† St. Chrysostom.

‡ Euthalius, apud Zaccagnium, p. 410.

not only the principal, but well-nigh the only, figure in the foreground.

6. Hence as the Gospels may be called the history of Christ, so this first part of the Acts may be called the history of Peter; for as Christ occupies each page of the Gospels, so Peter here. Nothing can be more emphatic or more just than St. Chrysostom's words: "Behold him making his rounds on every side, and the first to be found; when an Apostle was to be chosen, he was the first; when the Jews were to be told that they were not drunken; when the lame man was to be healed; when the multitude was to be addressed, he is before the rest; when they had to do with the rulers, it is he; when with Ananias, when healings took place from the shadow, still it is he. Where there was danger, it is he, and where there was dispensation; but when all is tranquil, they act in common. He sought not the greater honour. But again, when miracles are to be worked, he comes forth before the rest." * What can prove Peter's pre-eminence if this does not? But his words on another occasion deserve mention. Alluding to the title "Acts of the Apostles," which seems to promise their common history, he observes, "Yet if you search accurately, the first part of the book exhibits Peter's miracles and teaching, but little on the part of the other Apostles; and after this the whole account is spent on Paul." But he adds, "How are they the Acts of all the Apostles? Because, according to Paul, when one member is glorified, all the members are glorified with it; the historian did not entitle them, the Acts of Peter and of Paul, but the Acts of the Apostles; the promise of the writer includes them all." † Now, every one must feel the very high distinction given to Paul in the latter part of the book, when the historian turns away from the general history of the Church to record his particular labours, in which, no doubt, the object was to show the progress of the Church among the Gentiles; but with regard to the part which is common to the whole Church, another thought is suggested. The history of what Peter

* On Acts, Hom. 21, n. 2. † Hom. on beginning of Acts, n. 8, tom. iii. 764.

taught and did, to build up and extend the Church, is considered the common history of the Apostles, and so inscribed as their Acts. But can this be called an *accurate* expression, unless Peter had been the head of the Apostles? It is very plain that the acts of a head are imputed to the whole body; to a college of brethren, what its chief executes; to a city or kingdom, the deeds of its prince. But it is not plain how this can be, if the actor be one of a number, and do not exceed his brethren in honour or dignity. Therefore the Acts of Peter could be called, generally, the Acts of the Apostles, only because they were considered the Acts of their head.

Now let us pass from the general view to that in detail.

I. After* the Lord's ascension a most important point immediately arose, whether, that is, the number of the Twelve was to be filled up by the election of a new Apostle to take the place of Judas. The will of Christ on this matter was to be learnt; a witness was to be chosen who should participate in the mission of Christ Himself, according to the words, "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you," and carry the light of the Gospel to the ends of the world; and one was to be elected to the dignity of the Apostolate, the highest rank in the Church. It was, therefore, so important a matter, that no one could undertake it save he who had received the vicarious headship of our Lord Himself. Now, the history in the Acts tells us that Peter alone spoke on the subject of substituting a fresh Apostle for Judas; Peter alone proved from Scripture the necessity of the election, defined the conditions of eligibility, and appointed the mode of election, and presided over and directed the whole transaction.

For Luke begins thus: "In those days," the interval between the Ascension and Pentecost, "Peter rising up in the midst of the brethren, said." Here the important prerogative of *initiation* is shown to belong to Peter, and by the phrase, "in the midst of the brethren," or "disciples,"—which is often used of Christ in respect of the Apostles—his pre-eminence

* Passaglia, p. 148.

over the disciples is shown. "Brethren, it behoved that the Scripture should be fulfilled which the Holy Ghost spoke before by the mouth of David, concerning Judas, who was the leader of them that apprehended Jesus, who was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry," that is, of the Apostolate. Then having mentioned the miserable end of the traitor, he applies to him the prophecy: "For it is written in the Book of Psalms, 'Let his habitation become desolate, and let there be none to dwell therein : ' and," adding another prophecy from another Psalm, "'his bishopric let another take.' " * Whence he concludes, "Wherefore of these men who have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus came in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, until the day wherein He was taken up from us, one of these *must* be made a witness with us of His resurrection." In these words Peter plainly points out the *necessity* of the matter in question, confirms it by the Holy Scriptures, speaking in the character of their highest interpreter, and as the appointed teacher of all; and, while proposing it to their deliberation, yet requires their consent; for the phrase, "wherefore, one *must*," means, "I am not proposing what may be done or left undone, but declaring and prescribing what is to be done." So he determines the conditions of eligibility, and the form of election. Whereupon his hearers—"the number of persons together about an hundred and twenty"—instantly agree unanimously to Peter's proposition, follow its conditions, and complete the election.

No one can reflect on the above without concluding, that if Peter presided over the rest by the authority of a divinely chosen headship, no course could be more becoming, both for Peter and for the disciples, than this; and if, on the contrary, Peter was only one out of many, not having yet even received the Pentecostal gifts of the Holy Spirit, and had been entrusted by Christ with no pre-eminent office in the ministry, nothing

* Ps. lxxix. 26; eviii. 8.

could be more unfitting for both. We have therefore to infer that Peter "stood in the midst of his disciples," as a superior among inferiors, not as an equal among equals, and conceived that the charge of supplying an Apostle, and filling up the Apostolic college, belonged in chief to himself, because he and they alike were conscious that he was the steward set in chief over the Lord's family.

But, clear as this is on the face of the narration itself, fresh light is shed on it by the fact that St. Chrysostom observed and recorded this very conclusion. For why did Peter alone arise? Why was he the first and the only one to speak? "Both* as fervent, and as one entrusted by Christ with the flock, and as the first of the choir, he ever first begins to speak." Why does he allege prophecy? First, that he might not seem with human counsel "to attempt a great matter, and one fitted for Christ:" next to imitate his Master, "he always reasons from the Scriptures." "Why did he not singly ask of Christ to give him some one in the place of Judas?" Because "Peter had now improved," and overcome his natural disposition. But "*might not Peter by himself have elected?* Certainly: but he does not so, that he may not seem partial." "Why does he communicate this to them," the whole number of the names? That the matter may not be contested, nor they fall into strife: "for (he alludes to the contention of the Apostles for the primacy) "if this had happened to themselves, much more would it to the others," that is, the candidates to succeed Judas. Then he points out to our admiration "Peter doing this with common consent, nothing with authority,† nothing with lordship," where we must note that the *abuse* of a power is only to be feared from one who really has that power. For again he says, "he first acts on authority ‡ in the matter, as having himself all put into his hands, for to him Christ said, 'And thou, in thy turn, one day confirm thy brethren.'"

The college of the Apostles completed, it followed that the

* Hom. 3, in Act. n. 1-2.

† Αἰθεντικῶς.

‡ Αἰθενται.

head, if such there were, would, on every occasion of danger, be the first to protect it, and to defend its reputation. Now there ensues the miracle of the Holy Spirit's descent, and the gift of tongues, whereupon Luke describes the various opinions of the astonished multitude, some of whom "mocking,* said, These men are full of new wine." That is, they blasphemed the working of the Spirit, and by the most monstrous calumny were destroying the good name of the Apostles. Whereupon, "Peter, standing up with the Eleven, lifted up his voice and spoke to them: Ye men of Judea, and all you that dwell in Jerusalem, be this known to you, and with your ears receive my words. For these are not drunk as you suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day: but this is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel." Now here, both the *form of the words*, and the *matter*, establish Peter's primacy. For the phrase, "Peter standing up with the Eleven, lifted up his voice and spoke to them," portrays Peter as the leader of the band, the master of the family. So St. Chrysostom,† "What means *with the Eleven*? They uttered a common voice, and he was the mouthpiece of all. And the Eleven stand beside him, bearing witness to his words." And as to the *matter*, Peter alone fulfils the part of teacher, by interpreting Scripture, and declaring the agreement of both covenants: Peter alone maintains the common cause; Peter alone, representing all, addresses the multitude in the name of all. "Observe, too, the harmony of the Apostles: they give up to him the office of speaking:"‡ that is, they yielded to him who was the head, and who, as he says, showed here "the courage," as before "the providential care" of the Head.

After refuting the calumny, Peter goes on in a noble discourse to explain prophecies, and then coming to the dispensation of Jesus, gives the strongest proofs of His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and finally sums up with great force and authority. "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know most certainly, that God hath

* Acts ii. † On the Acts, Hom. 4, n. 3. ‡ St. Chrysostom, as before.

made both Lord and Christ this same Jesus whom you have crucified."

Now, what * is here to our purpose? It is this, that Luke seems only to dwell on what concerns Peter: that Peter, first of all, and in the name of all, performs the office of a witness, laid both on himself and the rest, ("ye shall be witnesses to me;" "and you shall give witness,"†) saying, "This Jesus hath God raised up, of which we all are witnesses:" that first of all, he publicly and solemnly discharges the duty of instruction with authority: that, first of all, he fulfils the charge set by Christ on all the Apostles, "make disciples—teach:" that, first of all, he promulgates the necessity of believing in Jesus as the divinely appointed Lord and Christ. Now these are things which, so far from allowing an equality between Peter and the rest of the Apostles, point out in him a headship over them.

Thereupon, the hearers, struck with compunction for having crucified, not merely a just man, but the Anointed of the Lord, "said to Peter and the rest of the Apostles"—here again he alone is singly named—but of all alike they asked, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Whereupon, St. Chrysostom notes, ‡ "Here again, where all are asked, he alone replies." For, as Luke goes on, "Peter said to them:" as the leader, he performs what belongs to all: he alone sets forth the law of Christ. "Do penance, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins:" he alone encourages them with the promised gifts of the Holy Spirit, "and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost:" he alone continues at length the instruction of the hearers, "and with very many other words did he testify and exhort them:" he alone declares the fruit of Christian profession, "save yourselves from this perverse generation," and he alone it is, of whose ministry Luke adds, "They, therefore, that gladly received his word

* Passaglia p. 153.

† Acts i. 8; John xv. 27.

‡ On Acts, Hom. 7, n. 1.

were baptized, and there were added, in that day, about three thousand souls."

And here we see how fitting it was that Peter, whom Christ had set as the foundation and rock of the Church, should labour with all his might, as the chief architect after Him, to build up the structure. But what, in the mean time, of the other Apostles? Were not they also architects? Yes, but *with* Peter, and *under* Peter, whom accordingly they attend and support. The subsequent additions to the Church's structure, and the course consistently pursued by Peter, will bring this out yet more clearly. For, of fresh accretions, Luke writes, "Many of them who had heard the word, believed, and the number of the men was made five thousand." * Now, whose word was this? Still the word of Peter, who speaks for the third † and fourth time, as he had for the first and second.

For, as to the third ‡ occasion, Luke, after mentioning Peter and John together, introduces Peter alone as urging the children of Abraham to embrace the faith of Christ, and persuading them that Jesus is the Prophet, promised by God through Moses in Deuteronomy. And as to the fourth, § he writes, "Then Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said to them——" But was he alone present? not so, for the council "setting them," not him, but John as well as Peter, "in the midst, they asked," on which Chrysostom || observes, "See how John is on every occasion silent, while Peter defends him likewise." That is, John was silent, as knowing that the lead belonged to Peter, and Peter spoke, because the Head defends not himself only, but the members committed to him.

Now, reviewing these first four chapters of the Acts, let us ask these questions. Had Peter held the authority of head among the Apostles, what would he have done? He would have filled up the Apostolic college, carefully watched over it,

* Acts iv. 4. † Acts iii. 12-26; iv. 8-19. ‡ Acts iii. 11, 12-26.

§ Acts iv. 7, 8.

|| On Acts, IIom. 8, n. 2.

protected its several members. But this is just what he did. Again, had Christ made him the supreme teacher and doctor, what would he have done? He would have disclosed, first to the Apostles themselves, and to the disciples, and then to the multitude, who were to be converted, the secrets of the divine will laid up in the Scriptures; he would have shown the agreement between the dispensation of Christ, and the oracles of the Old Testament, and so have proved that Jesus was the Messiah. But this he repeatedly did. Once more, had Christ made him the chief among the builders of the Church, what would have been his office? He would have been the very first to set his hand to the work, and to construct the building with living stones; he would have held the other workmen under his control, so that the edifice might rise worthy of Christ, and exactly answering to His promises. But does not the history give precisely this picture of him, and does not the Church which Peter raised answer exactly to the archetype prescribed by the Lord? "All they that believed were together, and had all things common:" "the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul:" what is this but the counterpart of that divine prayer, "that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me"?*

II. To take another point. The office † of authoritative teaching is in the New Testament closely connected with the power of working miracles, so that Christ not only said of Himself, "If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin:" but likewise added, "If I had not done among them the works that no other man hath done, they would not have sin; but now they have both seen and hated both Me and My Father:" ‡ to show that, while faith depended on preaching and authoritative instruction, these also needed the power of

* Acts ii. 44; iv. 32; John xvii. 21.

† Passaglia, p. 157.

‡ John xv. 22-24.

works to conciliate conviction. In accordance with which, when He first sent out His Twelve to preach, He not only charged them what to say, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," * but added the fullest miraculous power, "heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils." And when more solemnly sending them, not to one people, but to all nations, "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," He adds their warrant, "these signs shall follow them that believe. In My name they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents:" and the Evangelist subjoins, "They going forth preached everywhere, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed."†

Remembering, then, this very close connection between the authority of Apostolic teaching and the power of working miracles, we may fix a criterion for recognizing the exercise of the supreme office in teaching. Suppose any one of the Apostles to have been invested at the commencement of the Church with this office, how may he be ascertained? If any one is found invariably the first to announce the word of truth, and likewise to confirm it with miracles, you may suppose him to be that one. Suppose, again, that Luke intended to represent one of the Apostles as the supreme teacher. How may it be safely inferred? If, in the course of his narration, he continually exhibits one as eminent above all the rest in preaching the Gospel and guaranteeing it by signs. These are not tests arbitrarily chosen, but naturally suggested. And both exactly fit to Peter, and to Peter alone. For he, in this history of the universal Church, is the first, nay, well-nigh the only one, both to preach and to support his preaching by miracles. And Luke takes pains to relate no less his miracles than his discourses, and scarcely describes with any detail either the one or the other, of any but Peter.

Nay, his mode of writing suggests a parallel between himself and St. John in his Gospel, as if it were no less Luke's

* Matt. x. 7.

† Mark xvi. 15-17.

intention to show Peter invested with the supreme office, than John's to set forth Christ as the head and teacher of the Apostolic college; and no less Luke's purpose to accredit the Church by Peter's miracles, than John's* by the miracles of Christ to establish faith in Him as the true Son of God. For the circumstances of each narration point to this similarity of design. As St. John subordinates the group of Apostles entirely to the figure of Christ, so Luke, very slightly sketching the rest, is profuse in detail of what concerns Peter, and marks him as set over all. As John in recording the miracles of Christ dwells on the points which prove His divine mission and origin from the Father, so Luke directs his narration to exhibit the beginning, the growth, and the authority of the Church, as due to Peter's miracles. We will mark two further resemblances. *First*, the miracles which Luke records of Peter seem cast in the same type as those of Christ. Compare the first one with that told by John, ch. v.

John v. 5-9. "There was a certain man there that had been eight and thirty years under his infirmity. Him when Jesus had seen lying, and knew that he had been now a long time, He saith to him, Wilt thou be made whole? The infirm man answered Him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pond. For whilst I am coming another goeth down before me. Jesus said to him, Arise, take up thy bed, and walk. And immediately the man was made whole, and he took up his bed and walked."

Acts iii. 2-8. "And a certain man, who was lame from his mother's womb, was carried, whom they laid every day at the gate of the temple, which is called Beautiful. He, when he had seen Peter and John about to go into the temple, asked to receive an alms. But Peter, with John, fastening his eyes upon him, said, Look upon us. But he looked earnestly upon them, hoping that he should receive something of them. Peter said, Silver and gold I have none, but what I have, I give thee. In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, arise and walk. And taking him by the right hand, he lifted him up, and forthwith his feet and soles received strength, and he, leaping up, stood, and walked."

How often had the hand of the Lord—as here that of Peter—healed the sick, given the blind sight, cured the leper, and

* John xx. 21.

raised the dead! But if Peter's miracle in healing Æneas of the palsy carries * one back immediately to the poor man let down through the roof before our Lord, there is a yet more exact identity between the great miracle of Christ raising Jairus' daughter, and Peter raising Dorcas. In the one case, the Lord "having put them all out, taketh the father and the mother of the damsel, and them that were with Him, and entereth in where the damsel was lying, and taking the damsel by the hand, He said to her, Talitha cumi, which is, Damsel, arise, and immediately the damsel rose up and walked." In the other case, Peter came into the upper chamber, "and all the widows stood about him weeping—and they being all put forth, Peter, kneeling down, prayed, and turning to the body, he said, Tabitha, arise. And she opened her eyes, and seeing Peter, she sat up,† and giving her his hand he lifted her up." But how perfect the resemblance of the following.

Luke iv. 40. "And when the sun was down, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them to Him. But He, laying His hands on every one of them, healed them. And devils went out from many."

Acts v. 15. "Inasmuch that they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that, when Peter came, his shadow, at the least, might overshadow any of them, and they might be delivered from their infirmities. And there came also together to Jerusalem a multitude out of the neighbouring cities, bringing sick persons, and such as were troubled with unclean spirits, who were all healed."

The *second* point of resemblance is, that the multitude regarded Peter among the Apostles as before they had regarded Christ: for, putting the rest of the Apostles in the second place, they flocked to him, and besought his aid. So that Luke, briefly saying of them, that "by the hands of the Apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people," ‡ goes on to Peter, and of him relates the unheard-of

* Compare Acts ix. 33, with Mark ii. 3-11.

† Mark v. 40; Acts ix. 39.

‡ Acts v. 12-14.

wonders just described, assigning to the miracles wrought by him, "that the multitude of men and women who believed in the Lord was more increased." It is just as when "there came to Jesus great multitudes, having with them the dumb, the blind, the lame, the maimed, and many others; and they cast them down at His feet, and He healed them."* And the fuller the resemblance these incidents show between Peter and Christ, the more evident their proof that Peter's ministry must be considered a continuation of that which Christ began.

III. We proceed † to the order predetermined by our Lord in the propagation of His Church.

Of Himself He had said, though the Redeemer of all, that He was not sent, that is, as an Apostle, actually to preach, "save to the lost sheep of the house of Israel:" and on first sending His Apostles, He gave them this commission, "Go ye not into the way of the Gentiles, and into the city of the Samaritans enter ye not, but go ye rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." But when about to ascend to the Father, He tells them, "You shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses unto Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth:" ‡ that is, that they should set up His kingdom through all the world, proceeding by gradual steps, from Jerusalem to Judea, thence to Samaria, and at length "to every creature" in the whole world.

Now, the history of the Acts shows the exact accomplishment of this order, and it likewise shows that Simon Peter was the one elected chief instrument for carrying out these successive propagations of the Church. What we have said already shows this as to the mother Church of Jerusalem, and, before proceeding to the Gentile Churches, we will trace the same instrumentality as used to bring the Samaritans into the universal kingdom.

The persecution ensuing on the proto-martyr Stephen's death caused, by our Lord's providence, the dissemination of

* Matt. xv. 30. † Passaglia, p. 163. ‡ Matt. xv. 24; x. 5; Acts i. 8.

many believers through Judea and Samaria, while the Apostles alone remained at Jerusalem. Amongst those who thus "went about preaching the word of God," Philip the deacon came to Samaria, and many of the people, hearing his words and seeing his miracles, were converted and baptized. But the Church thus commenced by the preaching of the deacon would have dried up without hope of progress, had it not received the assistance of those whom Christ had set in the place of fathers, and who could bestow the gifts of the Holy Ghost. For "the Church is in the bishop,"* and, as St. Jerome said of a faction which had a deacon for its author, "With the man the sect also perished, because a deacon could ordain no clerk after him. But it is not a Church which has no priest." Accordingly when "the Apostles, who were in Jerusalem, had heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John,"† who "laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost." The providence of Christ, then, so ordered the propagation of His kingdom as to choose Peter and John to complete and perfect the Samaritan Church. But was this on equal terms, or is no superior dignity and authority apparent in Peter over John? A regard to the words of Luke, and the series of acts recorded, will prevent such a misconception. For he mentions Peter and John, but he sets Peter first; and in his record of what happened to Simon, John acts the second part, and it is Peter alone who teaches, commands, judges, and condemns, with authority, as the head and supreme ruler. Simon Magus, tempted by beholding the gifts of the Holy Spirit visibly bestowed on imposition of the Apostles' hands, "offered them money," to both Peter and John. But Peter alone replies, and not only so, but condemns his profaneness, enlarges on his guilt, and solemnly declares that the gifts of God are not purchasable with money. "Keep thy money to thyself to perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of

* St. Cyprian, Ep. 69. St. Jerome, Dialogue con. Luciferianos.

† Acts viii. 14.

God may be purchased with money;" he discloses Simon's secret thoughts, "for thy heart is not right in the sight of God;" he inflicts on him excommunication, "thou hast no part nor lot in this matter;" he exhorts him to repent, "do penance therefore from this thy wickedness, and pray to God, if perhaps this thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee." Now here John, the next of the Apostles in rank, is with Peter, yet he does not speak, teach, or enjoin: Peter does all this singly. He answers Simon's question, lances and probes the most secret wound of his conscience, declares how divine gifts are given, proscribes the plague of simony, orders penance, and inflicts excommunication on a scandalous public offender. Thus the twenty-second of the Apostolic Canons runs, "If any bishop, priest or deacon, hath obtained this dignity by money, let him and his ordainer be deposed, and altogether be deprived of communion, as Simon Magus was by Peter." Nothing but an inequality of rank between Peter and John will account for Luke's narration here. But if John was inferior to Peter, much more the rest.

But there is another proof of his superiority here, in that God caused Simon Peter to engage Simon Magus. Thus, by His providence, "reaching from end to end mightily, and ordering all things sweetly," the first-born of Christ is brought to conflict with the "first-born of the devil," the chief of teachers with the earliest of heretics, and prime of that long brood of the evil one, who are to persecute "the seed of the woman." Thus ancient writers record that Peter afterwards went to Rome on purpose to expose the acts of this same Simon. Thus they mention his engaging with the famous Alexandrine Apion, the enemy of the Jewish and the Christian faith alike. And hence, too, probably the very ancient writer (whoever he was) of the Epistle of Clement to St. James, begins it by recording how "Simon, for his true faith and his firm grounding in doctrine, was appointed to be the foundation of the Church, and for this very reason by Jesus Himself with most true augury had his name changed to Peter, the first-

fruits of our Lord, the first of the Apostles, to whom first the Father revealed the Son, whom Christ with reason blessed, the called and the elect His guest and comrade, the good and the proved disciple, *he who, as the most able of all, was commanded to illuminate the West, the darker quarter of the world, and who was enabled to succeed.*"

But as to what is said, that "the Apostles who were in Jerusalem sent to the Samaritans Peter and John," it must be remembered, that at the head of those thus *sending* was Peter himself, and that next to him John was the most distinguished of the Apostolic college. And since it is evident from all that we have hitherto seen, that in whatever concerned the Apostles equally, Peter took the leading part, and in their common deliberations exercised the initiative, it must be concluded that he was likewise the first author of this resolution, to send himself and John to the Samaritans. And this is confirmed by our seeing that in the fulfilment of this mission he discharges the offices, and acts with the authority, of head. To none else could the execution of a fresh advance in the propagation of the Church be committed; and so great, besides, were the jealousies between the Jews and Samaritans, that it needed no less than Peter's authority to induce the Jewish converts to receive them into the bond of the same society.

IV. But now we * draw nigh to the revelation of that great "mystery which in other generations was not known to the sons of men—that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and co-partners of His promise in Christ Jesus by the Gospel," whereby was brought to pass the prophecy, "from the rising of the sun even to the going down My Name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My Name a clean oblation." † The hour was come "when the true adorers were to adore the Father in spirit and in truth" throughout every region of the world purchased with the blood of the Son of God, and of this event, expected during four thousand years, God, by an

* Passaglia, p. 174.

† Eph. iii. 5; Mal. i. 11.

unexampled honour, disclosed to Peter, and through Peter, the time and the manner. This greatest of purposes, after His own ascension, Christ left to be revealed through him to whom He had committed the feeding of His sheep.

While Peter * was "passing through all," that is, exercising his general supervision as primate of the Church, God sent His angel "in a vision manifestly" to "a certain man in Cesarea named Cornelius, a centurion of that which is called the Italian band, a religious man, and fearing God with all his house, giving much alms to the people, and always praying to God." And the angel says to him: "Thy prayers and thine alms are ascended for a memorial in the sight of God, and now send men to Joppa, and call hither one Simon, who is surnamed Peter; he will tell thee what thou must do." Though God then sends an angel, it is left to *Simon, who is surnamed Peter*, to declare His counsel, in what affected the salvation of innumerable souls. Other Apostles there were to whom had been said equally, "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature," and "Ye shall be witnesses to Me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth;" and "as the Father hath sent Me, I also send you." Yet putting aside all these, as on so many other occasions, Peter is preferred, and that because to him alone was said, "on this rock I will build My Church," and again, "Feed My lambs, be shepherd over My sheep." Fitting it was that, when the wall between the Jews and Gentiles should be taken away, by him specially all should be collected into one, on whom, as the divinely laid foundation, all were to rest. Fitting, again, that the Lord's prophecy, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; those also I must bring; and they shall hear My voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd," should be fulfilled chiefly by his ministry to whom the Lord had committed His own office of universal visible pastor. For the Church, in her very birth, and in the whole process of her growth, bore this upon her

* Acts ix. 32.

forehead, that *universality* as well as *unity* belonged substantially to Peter, and that it was no less his function to gather up all nations into the mould of unity by his ministration as the one chief shepherd, than to embrace them all in the wide circuit of his love. Therefore it is a marvellous agreement in which the *institution* of the Primacy has a corresponding *execution*; and as the latter confirms the former, so from the former you might anticipate the latter before it was recorded in the sacred history.

But in the mean time, while the messengers of Cornelius were approaching the house in which Peter was a guest, "there came upon him an ecstasy of mind, and he saw the heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending, as it were a great linen sheet let down by the four corners from heaven to the earth, wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts, and creeping things of the earth, and fowls of the air;" and while Peter is fixed in contemplation, "there came a voice to him, Arise, Peter, kill and eat," that he might understand how "by his preaching he was to make a sacrifice to the Lord of those who were represented by these animals, bringing them into the divine service through the mysteries of the Lord's passion,"* which he not yet understanding, replies, "Far be it from me, for I never did eat anything that is common or unclean." Then the heavenly "voice spoke to him again the second time, That which God hath cleansed, do not thou call common. And this having been done thrice, presently the vessel was taken up into heaven."

Here three things are set forth: first, that as the ark of Noah contained all sorts of animals, clean and unclean, so the fold of Christ was to gather from Jews and Greeks and barbarians "a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations and tribes and peoples, and tongues;" † secondly, that the blessings of Christ concerned all who did not reject the proffered grace; thirdly, that the elaborate system of Mosaic ordinances concerning meats, rites, and ceremonies, had

* Bede on this text.

† Apoc. vii. 9.

fallen to the ground. But to whom is disclosed, first and immediately, this whole dispensation of the first principles on which the Church was to be propagated? To none other but Peter, "To me hath God shown to call no man common or unclean." Now, the undoubted knowledge of this dispensation must appear of the greatest moment, whether in itself, or as concerns the Jews, of whom the earliest Church consisted, or the Apostles, by whose ministry it was to be extended. And yet, by that providence which is ever over His Church, the wisdom of God so ruled it, that through Peter alone the Apostles should be taught when they were first to approach the Gentiles, and discharge their office of witnesses before all nations without distinction. And that because He had made Peter "the Greater one" and "the Leader" of all, and put him in His own place, and constituted him supreme teacher in these words, "Confirm thy brethren." Thus Epiphanius,* in the fourth century, says that the charge of bringing the Gentiles into the Church was laid upon all the Apostles, "but most of all on holy Peter." Why this *most of all*? Because, while he had heard with the rest, "Make disciples of all nations," he had singly and peculiarly received the charge of the whole fold, and of the Apostles, as part of it.

But Peter, still pondering on the vision, hears a fresh voice from the Spirit, "Behold, three men seek thee. Arise, therefore, get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing, for I have sent them." He accompanies the messengers and finds Cornelius, "his kinsmen and his special friends;" he asks why they have sent for him, whereupon Cornelius informs him of what had passed, and concludes, "Now therefore all we are present in thy sight, to hear all things whatsoever are commanded thee by the Lord." Peter in reply sets forth to them the heads of Christian doctrine, and as he comes to the words "to Him all the prophets give testimony, that by His name all receive remission of sins, who believe in Him," "the Holy Ghost fell upon all them that heard the word" of life and

* Hær. 28, s. 3.

truth from his lips. And the Jewish Christians who were with him, being astonished at this reception of Gentiles into the Church by the Holy Spirit's visible descent, Peter cries, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" "Words," says St. Chrysostom,* "of one almost assaulting any that would forbid, and say that should not be," and so "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus;" for Peter also, like his Lord,† preached in person, but baptized by the hands of others.

Are not then the prerogatives of Peter written legibly on this whole narration? First, among all the Apostles he alone is chosen to consecrate to God the first-fruits of the Gentiles. Again, through him, as the teacher of all, God makes known to the Apostles themselves when the door was to be opened to the Gentiles. Thirdly, without advising with the rest, he enlarges the fold of Christ, which in Christ's place he ruled, with the accession of the Gentiles. Fourthly, the building of the Church is thus referred to him alone. Further, he gathers up to himself the Church which is made out of Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles; as the foundation he sustains the whole; and when constructed, he binds it together. Lastly, Luke, without having recorded a single speech of any other Apostle, has given five of Peter, thus showing that Peter's words, as well as his actions, had a higher importance than theirs in the history of the Church's birth and growth; for, indeed, in the history of the head that of the body is included.

On Peter's‡ return to Jerusalem, "the Apostles and brethren who were in Judea, having heard that the Gentiles also had received the word of God,"§ "they that were of the circumcision contended with him," because he had "gone in to men uncircumcised, and ate with them." Hereupon Peter set forth to them the whole series of events, upon which "they held their peace and glorified God, saying, God then has also to

* Hom. 24 on the Acts, n. 1.

‡ Passaglia, p. 181.

† John iv. 2.

§ Acts xi. 1-4.

the Gentiles given repentance unto life." Now, some in late times have attempted to derogate from Peter's authority on the strength of this incident. On the other hand, St. Chrysostom, not satisfied with setting forth Peter's rank, and assigning his whole apology to a most gracious condescension, continues, "See how he defends himself, and *will not use his dignity as the Teacher*, for he knew that the more gently he spoke with them, the surer he was to win them." * And what expression can signify Peter's rank more markedly than *the Teacher*? And Gregory the Great sets forth Peter's distinctions, how he alone had received the keys, walked on the waters, healed with his shadow, killed with his word, and raised the dead by his prayer; then he goes on, "and because, warned by the Spirit, he had gone in to Cornelius, a Gentile, a question was raised against him by the faithful, as to wherefore he had gone in to the Gentiles, and eaten with them, and received them in baptism. And yet the same first of the Apostles, filled with so great a grace of gifts, supported by so great a power of miracles, answers the complaint of the faithful by an appeal not to authority but to reason. . . . For if, when blamed by the faithful, he had considered the authority which he held in holy Church, he might have answered, that the sheep entrusted to the shepherd should not venture to censure him. But if, in the complaint of the faithful, he had said anything of his own power, he would not have been the teacher of meekness. Therefore he quieted them with humble reason, and in the matter where he was blamed even cited witnesses. If, therefore, *the Pastor of the Church, the Prince of the Apostles*, having a *singular* power to do signs and miracles, did not disdain, when he was censured, humbly to render account, how much more ought we sinners, when blamed for anything, to disarm our censurers by a humble defence." †

Here it occurs to observe with what different eyes Holy Scripture may be read, for just where persons determined to

* On Acts, Hom. 24, n. 2.

† Lib. 9, Ep. 39.

deny Peter's authority find an excuse for their foregone conclusion, the Fathers draw arguments to praise the moderation with which he exercised that same superior authority.

V. But * founded as we have seen the Church to have hitherto been, and at each step of its course advanced, mainly by the authority of Peter, it could not hope to remain in a vigorous and united state without the continual exercise of *judicial* and *legislative* power, and diligent *inspection*. Nor is there, in fact, one of these which Peter did not exercise, and that in a manner to indicate the ruler set over all. For as to the judicial power, do we not hear him saying, "Tell † me whether you sold the land for so much ;" and "Ananias, why hath Satan tempted thy heart, that thou shouldst lie to the Holy Ghost, and by fraud keep part of the price of the land ? Whilst it remained did it not remain to thee ? And after it was sold, was it not in thy power ? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart ? Thou hast not lied to men but to God." And presently the sentence comes forth from him who binds in heaven as well as on earth. "Behold, the feet of them who have buried thy husband are at the door, and they shall carry thee out." Here, then, we have Peter, in the midst of the Apostles, yet acting singly as the supreme judge, and defender of ecclesiastical discipline, on which St. Chrysostom says, "For Peter was terrible, punishing, and convicting the thoughts, to whom they adhered the more both for the sign, and his first speech, and his second, and his third. For he it was who did the first sign, and the second, and the present, which seems to me double, one to convict the thoughts, and another to kill with his command." Then, asking why nobody had announced her husband's death to Sapphira, "This was fear of the Teacher ; this respect of the disciples ; this obedience : " ‡ where he is mentioned not as *a* teacher, but the supreme and chief one.

Yet though the other Apostles were judges, with power to bind and to loose, though they were present, and concerned,

* Passaglia, p. 188.

† Acts v. 8, 3.

‡ On Acts, Hom. 12.

for "Ananias bringing a certain part, laid it at the feet of the Apostles," not of Peter only, it was not they, but Peter, who entered on the cause of Ananias and Sapphira, passed sentence, and inflicted punishment. Why did he judge singly a cause which was brought before the common tribunal of the Apostles? Because Peter was to have the Primacy in all things; because from him the model of ecclesiastical judgments was to be taken; because the charge of maintaining ecclesiastical discipline belonged in chief to him as the head.

VI. But no less * markedly does Luke represent Peter as everywhere visiting the Churches, providing for them as universal pastor, and exercising herein the administrative Primacy. "The Churches," he says, "throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, had peace, being edified and walking in the fear of the Lord, and were multiplied by the consolation of the Holy Ghost. And it came to pass *that Peter, as he passed through, visiting all*, came to the saints who dwelt at Lydda." † In illustration of this we may remember Paul's charge to Titus: ‡ "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldst ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee." And again, what Luke writes of Paul himself: "After some days Paul said to Barnabas, Let us return and visit our brethren in all the cities wherein we have preached the word of the Lord, to see how they do." § And what Eusebius, || from St. Clement, relates of St. John, that he visited with authority the Churches of Asia, which he had either founded, or specially attended to. By these passages we see the nature of Peter's visitation, that it was pastoral, and likewise the difference between his and these others, for they were *local*, but his *universal*. Titus acted in Crete, the special sphere of his labour, to which St. Paul the founder of that Church had appointed him. Paul and Barnabas propose to visit "our brethren *in every city in which we have preached the word of the Lord,*" St. John exerts

* Passaglia, p. 190.

† Acts ix. 31.

‡ Titus i. 5.

§ Acts xv. 36.

|| Hist. Ecc. Lib. 3, ch. 23.

visitatorial power over the Churches of that province wherein he dwelt, and that too, apparently, when he was the sole survivor of the Apostolic college, yet did not go into other parts. But Peter's charge is oecumenical, and therefore his visitation universal. He inspects the labours of others, as well as his own. For he was not the only Apostle at Jerusalem, nor had he singly built up all the Churches of Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, yet he alone makes a progress from Jerusalem to all these Churches. Though not the Bishop of Jerusalem, over which the Apostle James presides, he goes everywhere, as "the Bishop of Bishops." * No other reason coherent with Scripture can we find for this universal inspection of Peter; for all the Apostles were indeed pastors, but he alone set over the whole fold; he alone not limited, like Paul, "to the brethren in every city wherein he had preached." He differs from all others as the universal from the particular, and so St. Chrysostom says of him in this very passage, "Like a general he went round surveying the ranks, seeing what portion was well massed together, what in order, what needed his presence. Behold him making his rounds in every direction." †

VII. Further, ‡ we may see the deference paid to this supreme authority of Peter by the Apostles and Ancients at Jerusalem, on occasion of that severest dissension which threatened the unity of the Church, and kindled the greatest agitation, the question whether Gentile converts should be bound to obey the Mosaic ritual law. For "the § Apostles and Ancients having assembled to consider of this matter," after "there had been much disputing, Peter, rising up, said to them." But why does Peter first rise and decide the cause? Because he was first of the Apostles, and as such supreme arbiter in controversy. But consider what he says. "Men and brethren, you know that in former days God made choice among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe." *By my mouth*, he appeals to their knowledge of

* So called by Arnobius, on Psalm cxxxviii.

† On Acts, Hom 21, n. 2.

‡ Passaglia, p. 192.

§ Acts xv. 6.

his election by God to the singular privilege of receiving the Gentiles: in virtue of that election he claims and exercises authority. "And God, who knoweth the hearts, gave testimony, giving unto them the Holy Ghost, as well as unto us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." God, therefore, has already decided this controversy, by my ministry, whom He specially called thereunto, and by the effects which He caused to accompany it. Then, using words full of force, being, indeed, very like those in which he had answered to Ananias and Sapphira, he continues, "now, therefore, why tempt you God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers, nor we, have been able to bear? But by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, we believe that we shall be saved, in like manner as they also." "How full of power are these words," is the comment of St. Chrysostom; * "he says here what Paul has said at great length in the Epistle to the Romans." And then, speaking of the heads of Paul's doctrine, he adds, "The seeds of all this lie in Peter's discourse." This, then, is a *decision*, and given in no hesitating manner, but with severe censure of those who maintained the opposite, as "tempting God," words suitable for him only to use who had authority over all. But how did the council receive them? Though "there had been much disputing before," though the keenest feelings had been excited, and the point involved the strongest prepossessions of the Jewish converts, "all the multitude held their peace." They acquiesced in Peter's judgment, and now readily "heard Barnabas and Paul telling what great signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." It follows, then, that on a capital point, and in the first council of the Church, Peter occupied a position which befits only the supreme judge of controversies, so that had we no other evidence but this place whereby to decide upon his rank and office, his pre-eminence would be evident. "See," says St. Chrysostom, "he first permits a discussion to arise in the Church, and then he speaks." †

* Hom. 32, n. 1.

† Hom. 32, tom. ix. p. 250.

But is this affected by other persons likewise speaking and voting, as Paul and Barnabas? or by St. James likewise giving his sentence, as an Apostle? or by the whole matter being settled by common consent? As little as to be *head* involves being *all*; as to preside over the rest takes from them the power of deliberation and resolution. Rather it is the office of the Head and the President to take the initiative, and point out the course which others are to follow.

For those here present were teachers, and had the prerogative of hearing and judging, as well as Peter; they were bound to weigh the matter in controversy to the best of their power, and to decide on it according to the proportion of faith. They stood to Peter in a relation, not of simple obedience, as the ordinary members of the flock, but of judges, who, though responsible to his superintendence, yet are really judges, pass sentence, and decree by inherent authority. It is no part of the idea of a judge, that he should be supreme and irresponsible: this is the *special* privilege of the one supreme judge. Objections such as these, therefore, do not take from Peter his Primacy, and quality of Head, but claim for Paul, Barnabas, James, and other Apostles, the judicial authority and office, which they undoubtedly possessed.

Nor again, that not Peter only, but all, passed the decree in common, as it is written: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us;" and as Paul and Timothy "delivered to the cities the decrees to keep that were decreed by the Apostles and Ancients."* For a decree made in common by many shows not an equality of power in each, but a competent authority to join in that decree. Such acts proceed, not only from equal, but from unequal assemblies. A question, therefore, terminated by common decision, and laws established by common consent, do indeed prove a power to deliberate and decree common to all participating, but do not prove that all and every of the judges were equal in their privileges, for who gives to the Ancients the same authority as to the Apostles?

* Acts xv. 28; xvi. 4.

This inequality is elsewhere established, and rests on its own proof, but bearing it in mind, we shall see that Peter is the first and chief author of this common decree, and that laws passed by common consent depend on him primarily as Head. Most unsuspecting witnesses of this are the ancient writers, and this is the very conclusion which they drew from the account of this council. Thus, Tertullian, in the second century, speaking of Peter's singular prerogatives, says, "On him the Church was built, that is, through him : it was he who hanelled the key. This is it. 'Ye men of Israel, hear these words. Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, etc.' He, too, first by Christian baptism opened the approach of the heavenly kingdom, by which offences, heretofore bound, are loosed, and those not loosed are bound, according to true salvation. And Ananias he bound with the chain of death : and him that was weak in his feet he delivered from his disease. But likewise, in that discussion as to maintaining the law, Peter, first of all, instinct with the Spirit, and precluding with the vocation of the Gentiles, says, 'And now why tempt ye the Lord, by imposing a yoke on the brethren, which neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear? But by the grace of Christ we believe that we shall be saved, as also they.' *This SENTENCE both loosed what was given up of the law, and kept binding what was reserved.*"* As clearly, St. Jerome, in the fourth century, writes, that Peter "used his wonted freedom, and that the Apostle James followed his sentence, and all the ancients at once acceded to it, and that the decree was drawn upon his wording." † A little later Theodoret wrote to St. Leo, thus : "If Paul, the preacher of the truth, the trumpet of the Holy Spirit, hastened to the great Peter, to carry from him the solution to those at Antioch, at issue about living under the law ; much more do we, poor and humble, run to your Apostolic throne, to receive from you healing for the wounds of the Churches." ‡ Why does he here call Peter, the *great*, or say

* De Pudicitia, c. 21. † St. Jerome, Ep. 75, inter Augustinianas, tom. ii. p. 171.

‡ Theodoret, Ep. 113, tom. iii. p. 98f.

that Paul hastened to him for solution of a grave contention? Did not Paul go to all the Apostles? But Peter was the head among them, and had a power in chief—a power above the rest, a “more special” power—of binding and loosing.

VIII. One other* instance there is of Peter’s superior dignity, and therefore importance, in the Apostolic college, which if, perhaps, less direct than some of the foregoing, is even more persuasive. For there was an Apostle associated, as we have seen, by our Lord with Peter and John in several favours not granted to the rest; one who with John received from Him the name of Boanerges; the elder brother of John, who with him had once asked to sit on the Lord’s right hand and on His left in His kingdom. Now, Luke is led in the course of his narrative to mention the martyrdom of this great and favoured Apostle; the first likewise of the Apostolic choir who drank, as he had promised, of His Lord’s chalice, and sealed his labours and trials with his blood. The occasion was a great and striking one. It is thus recorded by Luke: “And at the same time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to afflict some of the Church. And he killed James, the brother of John, with the sword.” This is the first and the last time that he is mentioned by himself in Luke’s inspired history of the universal Church. Great as he was, so eminently favoured by his Lord, the elder brother of John, nothing is said of the Church’s anxiety for his danger, her prayers for his release, her sorrow at his loss, or her exultation at his triumph by witnessing unto blood. He passed to his throne in heaven with this short record. The more emphatic is the contrast following. “And seeing that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded to take up Peter also. Now it was in the days of the azymes. And when he had apprehended him, he cast him into prison, delivering him to four files of soldiers to be kept, intending after the pasch to bring him forth to the people. Peter therefore was kept in prison. *But prayer was made without ceasing by the Church unto God for him.*” That is, by the

* Passaglia, p. 197.

instinct of self-preservation she prayed for her head. A few years later another Apostle, after glorious labours by land and sea, and missions of unrivalled success, was seized and imprisoned in this same city of Jerusalem, and in danger of his life. But we do not hear of prayers being offered up without ceasing even for Paul, the doctor of the nations. The Church's safety was not bound up with his, any more than with that of James, and therefore not even of the great preacher "in labours more abundant than all," are we told that in the hour of danger "prayer was made without ceasing by the Church unto God for him." James and Paul were most distinguished *members*, but Peter was more. This was an honour reserved for the Head alone, as the life of the Head was peculiarly precious to the whole body. Thus St. Chrysostom explains it: "The prayer is a proof of affection: they all sought for a Father, a kind Father." * And then Luke proceeds to give at length Peter's delivery out of prison by the angel, and his departure in safety to another place. But there is no other solution of such a difference in recording what happened alike to James, to Peter, and to Paul, but that Peter held the place of father in the Lord's family, of commander in His army, of steward in His household, delivering to each of His servants their measure of wheat in due season.

The result, † then, of our particular inquiry in the Acts is to demonstrate two things, that Peter discharged the office of Father and Head in the Lord's family, and that the Church received and admitted him when so acting, with a consciousness that such was the will of Christ.

Now, this office did not consist in "lording it" over his brethren, in assuming high titles, and interfering with the ministry of others when exercised in its due course, in rejecting their assistance, or impeding the unanimous exercise of their counsel. On the contrary, the Lord had before prescribed that "the greater" among them should be as the younger, and "the leader" as he that ministers, proposing to them Himself

* On Acts, Rom. 26, n. 2.

† Passaglia, p. 198.

as the great model, who had exercised the highest power with the utmost gentleness, and, being "the Lord," had become "the servant of all." What, then, did this office of Primate consist in? We must say that Peter was undoubtedly such, if he constantly exercised the power of a head in building up the Church, in maintaining discipline, in reconciling dissensions, and in general administration. Now, it would be doing Peter wrong to suppose that he usurped as peculiar to himself what equally belonged to all the Apostles; or that, having received the special power of the Holy Ghost, he did not fulfil his own advice to others, "not to lord it over the clergy, but to be made a pattern of the flock." * And the four points just mentioned may be reduced to a triple authority, a Primacy *magisterial*, *judicial*, and *legislative*. Let us take in at one glance what has been said of Peter in regard to each of these.

As to the *magisterial*, or power of authoritative teaching, and general administration, Peter is constantly taking the lead, he is the mouthpiece of the Apostles; he alone, or he first, by teaching plants the Churches; he alone, or he in chief, completes them when planted; he it is who by divine revelation given to himself, discloses to the rest the dispensation of God; and he in words full of power sets forth to these assembled in council the course which they are to pursue.

As to the *judicial*, none other judgments are found in that portion of the Acts which contains the history of the whole Church, save those of which he was either the *sole* or the *chief* author. Alone he took cognizance of Ananias and Sapphira, and alone he punished them. And Simon he censured in chief, and excommunicated.

As to the *legislative*, Peter alone promulgated the law as to receiving the Gentiles; alone he prescribed that for abrogating the Mosaic ceremonial ordinances; and he was the chief author of the decree which expressed in terms his own previous act, and was put forth in common by the Apostles and Ancients. †

* 1 Pet. v. 3.

† "Princeps hujus fuit decreti," says St. Jerome to St. Augustine, Ep. 75 n. 8, inter Augustinianas.

Again, compare the *institution* of the Primacy with its *exercise*. Its institution consisted in three things: 1. That Peter was named by Christ the foundation of the Church, with whom its whole fabric was most intimately to cohere, and from whom it should derive visible unity and impregnable strength; 2. That the authority of universal pastor, and the care of the whole fold, was committed to him; 3. That to him belonged the confirmation of his brethren, and a power of the keys to which all were subject. Now consider the execution.

As foundation of the Church, he gathers up to himself congregations from the Jews, the Samaritans, and the Gentiles.

As universal pastor, he collects from these three the flock, nourishes, defends, inspects it, and fills up one place of highest rank in the ministry forfeited by the traitor.

As confirmer of the brethren, he disclosed to them the heavenly vision signifying the universal calling of the Gentiles, and the abrogation of the Mosaic law. He acts in the Lord's household as the bearer of the keys, going to all parts, defending and inspecting all. By himself he binds and looses, calling Ananias and Sapphira to his tribunal, and excommunicating the first heretic.

So exactly, then, do the institution of the Primacy and the acts of Peter fit into each other, that from the former you may predict the latter, and from the latter prove the former. They are like cause and effect, or an *a priori* and an *a posteriori* argument. They are a reciprocal confirmation to each other; just as if by time you calculate the sun's rising, and see the diffusion of his light, from his having risen you infer his light, and from his light conclude that he has risen.

Nor in the Apostolic Church does any one appear to resist or question this office of Peter. Rather upon him all eyes are fixed, for him all are anxious; no Abiram rises up against him with the words of rebellion: "Thou takest too much upon thee, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them; wherefore then liftest thou up

thyself above the congregation of the Lord?"* No Aaron in a moment of delusion cries, "Did the Lord speak by Moses only? hath He not spoken also by us?"

Yet Peter acts not like one out of a number, and occasions of contention are not wanting, strong prepossessions and keen feelings.† He is everywhere; his pre-eminence and his control are universal: he can act with severity, and there are some impatient even of a just control. When Ananias and Sapphira fell dead at his feet, none murmured. When he exclaimed, in full council, "Now, therefore, why tempt you God?" the whole multitude was silent. When he explained the reception of the Gentiles, those who had murmured "held their peace, and glorified God."‡

But had Peter not possessed, by divine commission, the authority which he exercised, it is clear, from the conduct of Paul, that he would have met with opposition from each in proportion to his advance in Christian perfection. Paul's censure of his indulgence to the prejudices of the circumcision, proceeding as it did from charity, shows this. But what would Paul, and what would the other Apostles have done, had they seen Peter perpetually taking the lead, and exercising the power of a head, without any special title thereto? Would they not have resisted him to the face, and before all, and declared that there was no difference of authority between them? Yet, not a trace of such resistance appears, while on numberless occasions the Apostles, and the whole assembly of the faithful, yield to him the Primacy, a sign truly that they recognized in him one who had received the place of Christ as visible Head among them.

The place of Christ *as visible Head*, for infinite indeed is the distance between Christ and Peter, as to the headship of mystical influx and the source of grace. Neither he nor any creature has part with Christ as to this latter, of which Paul writes, "that God had set all things under His feet, and given Him to be Head over all to the Church, which is His body,

* Num. xvi. 3; xii. 2.

† Acts vi. 1; xv. 2; xi. 2.

‡ Acts xi. 18.

the fulness of Him who filleth all in all;” of which again, “from whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in charity;” and “the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church, and He is the Saviour of His body:” and all this “to present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing.”* In *this* sense Headship belongs to Christ, not only first and chiefly, but absolutely and solely. But as to the Headship of external government and visible unity, though here also the same Apostle calls Him, “the head of the body the Church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things He may hold the primacy,” † to this Christ Himself has in a measure associated Peter by saying to him specially, “Feed My sheep—follow thou Me.”

And observe how that divine injunction was fulfilled. For as following our Lord with loving gaze through the Gospels we see every object grouped about that heavenly figure of His; as our eyes rest ever upon Him in the synagogue, in the market-place, among the crowd, before the Pharisees, the elders, the chief priests, healing the sick, raising the dead, supporting and animating His disciples—so turning to the Acts we see a human copy indeed of that divine portrait, but still one wrought by the Holy Spirit out of our redeemed flesh and blood. We see the fervent Apostle treading in his Master’s steps, the centre and the support of his brethren, the first before the Council, and before the people, ready with his words and his deeds, uttering to the dead, as the echo of his Lord, “Arise,” and healing the sick with his shadow. With reason, then, do the inspired writers use of Peter and of Christ similar forms of speech, and as they write, “Jesus, and His disciples,” “there went with Him His disciples,” “there He abode with His disciples,” so they write, “Peter standing up with the Eleven,” “they said to Peter and to the rest of the Apostles,” “Peter

* Eph. i. 22; iv. 15; v. 23, 27.

† Col. i. 18.

and the Apostles answering." What above all is remarkable is to observe the same *proportion* between the figure of Peter and the Apostles in the first twelve chapters of the Acts, as between the figure of our Lord and the Apostles in the Gospel. Such was the power and the will of the Divine Master when He said, "Feed My sheep; follow thou Me." Such the truth of the disciple, answering, "Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love Thee."

CHAPTER VI.

TESTIMONY OF ST. PAUL TO ST. PETER'S PRIMACY.

IN leaving the Gospels and the Acts we quit those writings in which we should expect, beforehand, that divine government to be set forth, which it pleased our Lord to establish for His Church. In exact accordance with such expectation we have seen the institution of the Apostolic College, and of St. Peter's Primacy over it, described in the Gospels, and the history in the Acts of its execution and practical working. Both institution and execution have been complete in their parts, and wonderfully harmonious with each other. But in the other inspired writings of the New Testament, comprising the letters of various Apostles, and specially St. Paul, we had no reason to anticipate any detailed mention of Church government. The fourteen Epistles of St. Paul were written incidentally on different subjects, no one of them leading him to set forth, with any exact specification, that divine hierarchy under which it was the pleasure of the Lord that His Church should grow up. Moreover, it so happened that * the circumstances of St. Paul's calling to be an Apostle, and the opposition which he sometimes met with from those attached to Jewish usages, caused him to be a great defender of the Apostolic dignity, as bestowed upon himself, and continually to assert that he received it not of men, but of God. Had there, then, been no recognition at all of St. Peter's superior

* Passaglia, p. 206.

rank in the Apostolic College to be found in his writings, it would not have caused surprise to those who consider the above reasons. And proportionably strong and effective is the recognition of that rank, which, though incidental, does occur, and that several times. If, then, St. Paul, being so circumstanced, selected expressions which seem to indicate a distinction of dignity between the Apostles and St. Peter, they claim a special attention, and carry a double force. Now, on putting these together, we shall find that they show not merely a distinction of dignity, but a superior authority in Peter.

The first are four several passages in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, in all of which St. Peter holds the higher place, and in two is moreover mentioned singly, whilst the rest are mentioned only in mass. These are the following: "Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I indeed am of Paul; and I of Apollo; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ." Again: "All things are yours, whether it be Paul, or Apollo, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, for all are yours, and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's." Again: "Have we not power to carry about a woman, a sister, as well as the rest of the Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" And once more: "That He was seen by Cephas, and after that by the eleven."* First, we may remark that the place of dignity in a sentence varies † according to its nature: if it *descends*, such place is the first; but if it *ascends*, it is the farthest point from the first. Now in the first instance the discourse ascends, for what can be plainer than that it terminates in Christ, as in the supreme point? "Every one of you saith, I indeed am of Paul, and I of Apollo, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ;" so St. Chrysostom observes, "It was not to prefer himself before Peter that he set him last, but to prefer Peter even greatly before himself. For he speaks in the ascending scale:" and Theodoret, "They called themselves from different teachers: now he mentioned his own name and that of Apollo; but he adds also the name

* 1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 22; ix. 5; xv. 5.

† Passaglia, pp. 124-126.

of the chief of the Apostles.”* As plain is this in the second instance, where St. Paul, developing his thought, “all things are yours,” adds, “whether Paul, or Apollo, or Cephas,” or if that be not sufficient, “the world” itself, which, carried away in a sort of transport, he seems to divide into its parts, “or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, all,” I repeat, “are yours:” but only, you are not your own, “you are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s.” In all which, from human instruments, who plant and water, he rises up to God, the ultimate source, the beginning and the end. Stronger yet is the third passage, for being in the very act of setting forth the dignity of his own Apostolate, “have we not power,” he says, “to lead about a sister, a woman, as well as the rest of the Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?” Now, whether “the rest of the Apostles” here means, those who, in the looser signification are so called, as “the Apostles of the Churches,” and “Andronicus, and Junias—who are of note among the Apostles,”† or the original Twelve, the ascending scale is equally apparent. For why is Peter distinguished by name from all the rest? Why alone termed by his prophetic name? St. Chrysostom, again, tells us why. “Look at Paul’s wisdom. *He puts the chief the last. For there he puts that which was strongest among the principal. For it was not so remarkable to show the rest doing this, as him that was chief, and had been entrusted with the keys of heaven.* But he puts not him alone, but all, as if he would say, whether you look for inferiors, or superiors, you have examples of all. For the brethren of the Lord, being delivered from their first unbelief,‡ were among the principal, though they had not reached the height of Apostles, and, therefore, he put them in the middle, with the highest on the two sides:”§ words in which he seems to indicate that Peter was as excellent among the Apostles, as they among the rest of the disciples, and the Lord’s brethren.

* St. Chrys. in 1 Cor. Hom. 3, n. 2. Theodoret on text.

† 2 Cor. viii. 23; Rom. xvi. 7. ‡ John vii. 5. § In 1 Cor. Hom. 21, n. 2.

Of the superiority contained in the fourth passage, we have spoken above, under another head, and therefore proceed to much more remarkable testimonies of St. Paul.

In the Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul has occasion * to defend his Apostolic authority, and the agreement of the Gospel which he had preached with that of the original Apostles. After referring to his marvellous conversion, he continues, "immediately I condescended not to flesh and blood; neither went I to Jerusalem to the Apostles, who were before me, but I went into Arabia, and again I returned to Damascus. Then, after three years, I went to Jerusalem, to visit Peter, and I tarried with him fifteen days. But other of the Apostles I saw none, saving James, the brother of the Lord." At length, then, St. Paul goes to Jerusalem, and that with a fixed purpose, "to visit Peter." But why Peter only, and not the rest of the Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord? † Why speaks he of these, and of James himself, besides, as if he would intimate that he had little care of seeing them? No other answer can be given to such queries, than is shadowed out in the prophetic name of Peter, and contained in the explanation of it given by Christ Himself, "Upon this Rock I will build My Church."

For, to prove this, let us go back once more to witnesses beyond suspicion, who wrote a thousand years before the denial of Peter's Primacy began. The Greek and Latin Fathers see here a recognition of his chief authority. Thus Theodoret, "Not needing doctrines from man, as having received it from the God of all, he gives the fitting honour to the chief." Theodoret follows St. Chrysostom, who had said, "After so many great deeds, needing nothing of Peter, nor of his instruction, but being his equal in rank, for I will say no more here, still he goes up to him as to the greater and elder;" his equal in the Apostolic dignity, and the immediate reception of his authority from Christ, but yet his inferior in the range of his jurisdiction, Peter being "greater and elder." And he goes on, "He went, but for this alone, to see him and honour

* Passaglia, p. 208.

† Gal. i. 16-19.

him by his presence. He says, I went up to visit Peter. He said not to see Peter, but to visit Peter, as they say in becoming acquainted with great and illustrious cities. So much pains he thought it worth only to see the man." And he concludes, "This I repeat, and would have you remember, lest you should suspect the Apostle, on hearing anything which seems said against Peter. For it was for this that he so speaks, correcting by anticipation, that when he shall say, I resisted Peter, no one may think these words of enmity and contention. For he honours the man, and loves him more than all. For he says that he came up for none of the Apostles, save him." Elsewhere, St. Chrysostom, commenting on the charge, Feed My sheep, asks, "Why, then, passing by the rest, does He converse with him (Peter) on these things?" And he replies, Peter "was the one preferred among the Apostles, and the mouthpiece of the disciples, and the head of the band: *therefore*, too, Paul then went up to visit him *rather than the rest*." * Tertullian, the most ancient of the Latins, says, "Then, as he relates himself, he went up to Jerusalem for the purpose of becoming acquainted with Peter, that is, according to duty, and the claim of their identical faith and preaching:" † the *duty*, which Paul had to Peter; the *claim* which Peter had on Paul. In the fourth century, Marius Victorinus observes: "After three years, says he, I came to Jerusalem; then he adds the cause, to see Peter. For if the foundation of the Church was laid in Peter, as is said in the Gospel, Paul, to whom all things had been revealed, knew that he was *bound* to see Peter, as one to whom so great an authority had been given by Christ, not to learn anything from him." ‡ The writer called Ambrosiaster, as his works are attached to those of St. Ambrose, and contemporary with Pope Damasus (A.D. 366-384), remarks, "It was proper that he should desire to see Peter, because he was first among the Apostles, to whom the Saviour had committed the care of the Churches." St. Jerome, more largely,

* Theodoret and Chrysostom on the text, and on John, Hom. 88.

† De Præsc. c. 23.

‡ Comm. in Gal. i. 18. Mai nova collectio, tom. 3.

says, "Not to behold his eyes, his cheeks, or his countenance, whether he were thin or stout, with nose straight or twisted, covered with hair, or as Clement, in the *Periods*, will have it, bald. It was not, I conceive, in the gravity of an Apostle, that after so long as three years' preparation, he could wish to see anything human in Peter. But he gazed on him with those eyes with which now he is seen in his own letters. Paul saw Cephas with eyes such as those with which all wise men now look on Paul. If any one thinks otherwise, let him join all this with the sense before indicated, that the Apostles contributed nothing to each other. For even in that he seemed to go to Jerusalem, in order that he might see the Apostle, it was not to learn, as having himself too the same author of his preaching, but *to show honour to the first Apostle.*"* Our own St. Thomas sums up all these in saying, "The doctor of the Gentiles, who boasts that he had learnt the Gospel, not of man, nor through man, but instructed by Christ, went up to Jerusalem, conferred concerning the faith *with the head of the Churches*, lest perchance he might run, or had run, in vain." †

These last words lead us attentively to consider the passage which follows in St. Paul. At a subsequent period the zealots of the law had raised against him a report that the Gospel which he preached differed from that of the Twelve. At once to meet and silence such a calumny, he tells us that "after fourteen years, I went up again to Jerusalem, with Barnabas, taking Titus also with me. And I went up according to revelation, and," assigning the particular purpose, "conferred with them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but apart with them who seemed to be something; lest, perhaps, I should run, or had run, in vain." Then, having proved the identity of his doctrine with that of those who "seemed to be something," that is, Peter, James, and John, though to him they "added nothing," he specifies Peter among these, and proceeds to draw a singular parallel between, on the one hand,

* Ambrosiaster and St. Jerome on the text.

† St. Thomas Cant. Epist. lib. i. 97.

Peter, as accompanied by James and John, and himself, as working with Barnabas and Titus. If we set the clauses over against each other, this will be more apparent :—

When they had seen that to me
was committed the Gospel of the
uncircumcision,

For He who wrought in Peter,
to the Apostleship of the circum-
cision,

James,* and Cephas, and John,
who seemed to be pillars,

As to Peter was that of the cir-
cision,

Wrought in me also among the
Gentiles,

Gave to me and Barnabas the
right hands of fellowship ;

where it would appear that James and John stand in the like relation to Cephas, as Barnabas and Titus, just before mentioned, to Paul. And St. Chrysostom, who, it must be remarked, reads Cephas, and not James, first, as do some manuscripts and many Fathers, observes, "Where it was requisite to compare himself, he mentions Peter only, but where to call a testimony, he names three together, and with praise, saying, 'Cephas, and James, and John, who seemed to be pillars.'" And further, Paul "shows himself to be of the same rank with them, and matches himself not with the rest, but with the leader, showing that each of them enjoyed the same dignity," † that is, of the Apostolic commission, and the divine co-operation. And Ambrosiaster explains the parallel : "Paul names Peter only, and compares him to himself, as having received the Primacy for the founding of the Church, he being in like

* An argument has been drawn by some against St. Peter's Primacy from St. Paul here placing St. James first. Now as to this we must remark that some most ancient manuscripts, and the original Latin version, read "Peter, and James, and John," and that this is followed by Tertullian, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, Augustine, Theodoret, Jerome, Irenæus, Gregory of Nyssa, and Cassiodorus, of whom Jerome is the more important, in that he had studied so many ancient commentaries before writing his own. But supposing that the vulgar reading is the true one, Peter's being once placed by St. Paul between St. James and St. John will not counterbalance the vast positive evidence for his Primacy. Those who wish to see the probable reasons why St. James was here placed first, may consult Passaglia, b. I, c. 14, who treats of the question at length. Perhaps St. Paul, narrating historically a past incident, recalled them to his recollection *in the order of time* in which they received him : and St. James, residing constantly at Jerusalem, might very probably have seen him first.

† St. Chrys. in Gal. c. 2.

manner elected to hold a Primacy *in founding the Churches of the Gentiles*, yet so that Peter, if occasion might be, should preach to the Gentiles, and Paul to the Jews. For both are found to have done both." And presently, "By the Apostles who were the more illustrious among the rest, whom for their stability he names pillars, and who were ever in the Lord's secret council, being worthy to behold His glory on the mount" (where Ambrosiaster confuses James, the brother of the Lord, with James the brother of John), "by these he declares to have been approved the gift which he received from God, that he should be worthy to hold the Primacy in the preaching of the Gentiles, as Peter held it in the preaching of the circumcision. *And as he assigns to Peter for companions distinguished men among the Apostles, so he joins Barnabas to himself; yet he claims to himself alone the grace of the Primacy as granted by God, like as to Peter alone it was granted among the Apostles.*" *

Now, Baronius proves that the above words cannot be taken of a division of jurisdiction, and that the singular dignity of Peter is marked in them. "For as a mark of his excellence Christ Himself, who came to save all men, with whom there is no distinction of Jew and Greek, was yet called 'minister of the circumcision,' by Paul (Rom. xv. 8), a title of dignity, according to Paul's own words, for theirs was 'the adoption of children, and the glory, and the testament, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises,' while 'the Gentiles praise God for His mercy.' But just as Christ our Lord was so called minister of the circumcision, as yet to be the Pastor and Saviour of all, so Peter too was called the minister of the circumcision, in such sense as yet to be by the Lord constituted (Acts ix. 32) pastor and ruler of the whole flock. Whence St. Leo, 'out of the whole world Peter alone is chosen to preside over the calling of all the Gentiles, and over all the Apostles, and the collected Fathers of the Church, so that though there be among the people of

God many priests and many shepherds, yet Peter rules all by immediate commission, whom Christ also rules by Sovereign power.'” *

The parallel, then, drawn by Paul between himself and Peter, distinctly conveys that as he was superior to Barnabas and Titus, and used their co-operation, so was Peter among the Apostles, and specially the chief ones, James and John, as their leader and head. For what is the meaning of the words, “He who wrought in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision”? Was the Apostleship of the circumcision entrusted to Peter only? It needs no proof that it was also entrusted to James and John, nay, Paul himself immediately says so: “They gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that *we* should go unto the Gentiles, and *they* unto the circumcision.” Why, then, does Paul so express himself as to intimate that the Gospel of the circumcision was given to Peter only? For the same reason that he said that to himself “was committed the Gospel of the uncircumcision,” and that God “wrought in me also among the Gentiles.” Now Barnabas likewise had been separated † by the Holy Ghost Himself for the Gentile mission; Barnabas, too, and Titus were discharging the office of ambassadors for Christ among the Gentiles: “that *we*,” Paul says, not I, “should go to the Gentiles.” The terms, therefore, used by Paul both of himself and Peter, do not *exclude* the rest, but express the *superiority* of the one named singly before the rest, as if he alone held the charge. Their fittest interpretation, then, will be, “The Apostles saw that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was no less given to me *above* the rest, than the Gospel of the circumcision to Peter *above* the rest; for He who wrought in Peter *above* the rest in the Gospel of the circumcision, wrought also in me *above* the rest in the Gospel of the uncircumcision.” But what can set forth St. Peter’s dignity more remarkably than to exhibit him in the same light of superiority among the original Apostles,

* Baron. Ann. A.D. 51, § 29. St. Leo, Serm. 4.

† Acts xiii. 2.

as St. Paul was among St. Barnabas and his other fellow-workers ?

Further confirmation of this is given by the argument with which he refutes the calumny urged against him of disagreement with the Apostles. For while he appeals to them *in general*, and to his union with them, he likewise *specifies* the point which favoured that union. It was the parallel between himself and Peter, as we have seen ; it was the exact resemblance between his mission and that of Peter, which was the cause of their joining hands : they approve Paul's Apostleship because they see that it follows the type of Peter's.

And other words of Paul which follow, prove not only the point of his own cause, but the source of Peter's singular privileges. " But when Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed : for before that some came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles ; but when they were come he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision. And to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews consented, so that Barnabas also was led by them into that dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as the Jews ? " For why did Paul here censure Peter *only* ? By his own account not only Peter, but the rest, and Barnabas himself amongst them, set apart as he was by the Holy Ghost to preach to the Gentiles, did not defend Christian liberty, as they ought to have done. Why, then, does he single out Peter among all these, resist him to the face, and so firmly censure all, in his person ? No answer can be given but one : that by this dissembling of Peter the zealots of the law gathered double courage to press against Paul their calumny of dissension from Peter, and to infer that he had run in vain, from the indulgence which Peter showed ; that Peter's authority with all was so great that his example drew the pastors

and their flocks alike to his side, and that it was requisite to correct the members in the head. From this St. Chrysostom proves that it was really the Apostle Peter, which some, as we shall soon see, denied: "For to say, that I resisted him to the face, and to put this as a great thing, was to show that he had not revered the dignity of his person. But had he said it of another, that I resisted him to the face, he would not have put it as a great thing. Again, if it had been another Peter, his change would have not had such force as to draw the rest of the Jews with him. For he used no exhortation, nor advice, but merely dissembled, and separated himself, and that dissembling and separation had power to draw after him all the disciples, *on account of the dignity of his person.*" * Again, another writer of the fourth century tells us this: "Therefore he inveighs against Peter alone, in order that the rest might learn in the person of him who is the first." † It was, then, Peter's Primacy, and the necessity of agreeing with him thence arising, which led Paul to resist him publicly, and, disregarding the conduct of the rest, to direct an admonition to him alone. "So great," St. Jerome tells us, on these two passages, "was Peter's authority, that Paul in his epistle wrote, 'Then after three years I went to Jerusalem to see Peter, and I tarried with him fifteen days.' And again in what follows, 'After fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus also with me. And I went up according to revelation, and conferred with them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles,' *showing that he had no security in preaching the Gospel, unless it were confirmed by the sentence of Peter, and those who were with him.*" ‡

But this passage, § concerning the reprehension of St. Peter by St. Paul, has afforded so signal an instance "of the unlearned and unstable wresting Scripture to their own proper destruction," || that we must dwell a little longer upon it.

* Hom. on "I resisted him to the face," n. 15. † Ambrosiaster on Gal. ii. 14.

‡ Epist. inter Augustin. 75, n. 8. § Passaglia, p. 217. || 2 Pet. iii. 16.

First, the Gnostics and the Marcionites quoted it to accuse the Apostles of ignorance, and to favour their own claim to a progressive light. In Peter, they would have it, there was still a taint of Judaism. Next Porphyry, who "raged against Christ like a mad dog," * tried by this passage to weaken the authority of the Apostles, and to convict Paul of ambition and rashness, who censured the first of the Apostles and the leader of the band, not privately, but openly before all, as St. Chrysostom and St. Jerome tell us. Julian the Apostate succeeded these, and tried, by means of Paul's contention with Peter, to bring discredit on the religion itself. For who, he asked, could value a religion whose chief teachers were guilty of hypocrisy, ignorance, and ambition? And in complete accordance with the spirit of these, all, who, since the sixteenth century, have attempted to impugn St. Peter's prerogatives, have rested their chief effort on the exaggeration and distortion of this reprehension. "This," says Baronius, "is the stone of stumbling and rock of offence, on which a great number have dashed themselves. For those, who without any diligent consideration have superficially interpreted a difficult statement, have gone so far in their folly as either to accuse Paul of rashness for having inveighed against Peter not merely with freedom, but wantonness, or to calumniate Peter as a hypocrite, for acting with dissimulation; or to condemn both, for not agreeing in the same rule of faith." †

In most remarkable contrast with these stand out three several interpretations, which prevailed in early times, all differing from each other in points, but all equally careful to maintain the dignity of Peter, and to clear up the conduct of Paul. First, from St. Clement of Alexandria in the second century up to St. Chrysostom in the fourth, we find a number of Greek writers asserting that it was not the Apostle Peter, who was here meant, but another; St. Jerome gives their reasons thus: "There are those who think that Cephas, whom Paul here writes that he resisted to the face, was not the

* St. Jerome.

† Ad. Ann. 51, § 32.

Apostle Peter, but another of the seventy disciples so called, and they allege that Peter could not have withdrawn himself from eating with the Gentiles, for he had baptized Cornelius the centurion, and on his ascending to Jerusalem, being opposed by those of the circumcision who said, 'Why hast thou entered in to men uncircumcised, and eaten with them?' after narrating the vision, he terminates his answer thus: 'If, then, God hath given to them the same grace as to us who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I should withstand God?' On hearing which they were silent, and glorified God, saying: 'Therefore to the Gentiles, also, God hath given repentance unto life.' Especially as Luke, the writer of the history, makes no mention of this discussion, nor even says that Peter was at Antioch with Paul; and occasion would be given to Porphyry's blasphemies, *if we could believe either that Peter had erred, or that Paul had imperitously censured the prince of the Apostles*."*

But this interpretation, contrary both to internal evidence and to early tradition, and suggested only by the anxiety to defend St. Peter's dignity, did not prevail. Another succeeded, supported by St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, and the greatest Greek commentators, and for a long time by St. Jerome, even more remarkably opposed to the apparent sense of the passage, and only, as it would seem, dictated by the same desire to defend the dignity of St. Peter, and the conduct of St. Paul. Admitting that it was really Peter who was here mentioned, they maintained that it was not a real dissension between the two Apostles, but apparent only, and arranged both by the one and the other, to terminate the question more decidedly. St. Chrysostom † sets forth at great length this opinion: "Do you see," says he, "how St. Paul accounts himself the least of all saints, not of Apostles only? Now he who was so disposed with respect to all, both knew how great a prerogative Peter ought to enjoy, and

* St. Jerome on Gal., ch. ii.

† Homily on the text, "I resisted him to the face," n. 8, tom. iii. p. 368.

reverenced him most of all men, and was disposed towards him as he deserved. And this is a proof. The whole earth was looking to Paul; there rested on his spirit the solicitude for the Churches of all the world. A thousand matters engaged him every day; he was besieged with appointments, commands, corrections, counsels, exhortations, teachings, the administration of endless business; yet giving up all these, he went to Jerusalem. And there was no other occasion for this journey save to see Peter, as he says himself: 'I went up to Jerusalem to visit Peter.' Thus he honoured him, and preferred him to all men." Suspecting, too, that an accusation against Peter's unwavering faith might be brought from the words, "fearing those of the circumcision," he breaks out, "What say you? Peter fearful and unmanly? Was he not for this called Peter, that his faith was immovable? What are you doing, friend? Reverence the name given by the Lord to the disciple. Peter fearful and unmanly! Who will endure you saying such things?"

Now compare* together these two interpretations of the Greek Fathers with that of the reformers and their adherents since the sixteenth century. A more complete antagonism of feelings and principles cannot be conceived. I. There is not a Greek Father who does not infer the singular authority of Peter from the first and second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians. There is not an adherent of the reformers who does not trust that he can draw from those same chapters matter to impugn St. Peter's Primacy. II. The Greek Fathers anxiously search out every point which may conduce to Peter's praise. The adherent of the reformers suppresses all such, and seems not to see them. III. If anything in Paul's account seems at first sight to tell against Peter's special dignity, the Greek Fathers are studious carefully to remove it; the adherents of the reformers to exaggerate it. IV. The Greek Fathers prefer slightly to force the obvious meaning of the words,

* Passaglia, p. 232.

and to desert the original interpretation, rather than set Apostles at variance with each other, or admit that Peter, the chief of the Apostles, was not treated with due deference. The adherents of the reformers intensify everything, take it in the worse sense, and are the more at home the more bitterly they inveigh against Peter.

Now turn to the third interpretation, that of the Latin Fathers. They admit both that it was Peter and that it was a real dissension, but they are as anxious as the Greek to defend Peter's dignity. Thus Tertullian : * " If Peter was blamed—certainly it was a fault of *conduct*, not of *preaching*." And Cyprian : † " Not even Peter, whom first the Lord chose, and upon whom He built His Church, when afterwards Paul disagreed with him respecting circumcision, claimed aught proudly, or assumed aught arrogantly to himself, saying that he held the Primacy, and that obedience rather was due to him by those younger and later." And Augustine : " Peter himself received with the piety of a holy and benighted humility what was with advantage done by Paul in the freedom of charity. And so he gave to posterity a rarer and a holier example, that they should not disdain, if perchance they left the right track, *to be corrected even by their youngsters*, than Paul, that even *inferiors* might confidently venture to resist *superiors*, maintaining brotherly charity, in the defence of evangelical truth. For better as it is on no occasion to quit the proper path, yet much more wonderful and praiseworthy is it, willingly to accept correction, than boldly to correct deviation. Paul then has the praise of just liberty, and *Peter of holy humility*; which, so far as seems to me according to my small measure, had been a better defence against the calumnies of Porphyry, than the giving him greater occasion of finding fault : for it would be a much more stinging accusation that Christians should with deceit either write their epistles, or bear the mysteries of their God." ‡

Now, to see § the fundamental opposition between the

* De Præsc. c. 24. † Cyprian, Ep. 71. ‡ Ep. 82, n. 22. § Passaglia, p. 240.

Greek and Latin Fathers and the reformers, let us observe that, though there are three ancient interpretations of this passage, differing from each other, the first denying that Cephas, so reprehended by Paul, was the chief of the Apostles, the second affirming this, but reducing the whole contention to an arrangement of prudence between the two Apostles, and the third maintaining the reality of the reprehension, yet all three have in common the reconciling Peter's chief dignity with the reprehension of him, and the two latter, besides, are much more careful to admire his modesty, than Paul's liberty, and make the most of every point in the narration setting forth Peter's Primacy. On the other hand the reformers use this reprehension as their sharpest weapon against his authority, praise Paul's liberty to the utmost in order to depress that authority, hunt out everything against Peter, and pass over everything for him. It is equally evident that their motive in this runs counter to the faith universal in the Church during the first four centuries; and that their inference cannot be accepted without rejecting all Christian antiquity, and the very sentiments expressed by Paul himself, as we have seen, towards Peter.

But as to the reprehension itself, it would seem to have been not on a point of *doctrine* at all, but of *conduct*. St. Peter had long ago both admitted the Gentiles into the Church, and declared that they were not bound to the Jewish law. But out of regard to the feelings of the circumcised converts, he pursued a line of conduct at Antioch, which they mistook to mean an approval of their error, and which needed, therefore, to be publicly cleared up. Accordingly, Peter's fault, if any there were, amounted to this, that having, with the best intention, done what was not forbidden, he had not sufficiently foreseen what others would thence infer contrary to his own intention. Can this be esteemed either a dogmatic error, or a proof of his not holding supreme authority? But the *event* being injurious, and contrary to the truth of the Gospel, why should not

Paul admonish Peter concerning it? But very remarkable it is, that he quotes St. Peter's own example and authority, opposes the antecedent to the subsequent fact, and maintains Gospel liberty by Peter's own conduct. St. Chrysostom remarked this. "Observe his prudence. He said not to him, Thou dost wrong, in living as a Jew, but he alleges his former mode of living, that the admonition and the counsel may seem to come not from Paul's mind, but from the judgment of Peter already expressed. For had he said, Thou dost wrong to keep the law, Peter's disciples would have blamed him, but now, hearing that this admonition and correction came not from Paul's judgment, but that Peter himself so lived, and held in his mind this belief whether they would, or would not, they were obliged to be quiet." *

* Hom. on text, n. 17.

CHAPTER VII.

ST. PETER'S PRIMACY INVOLVED IN THE FOURFOLD UNITY
OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM.

THE doctrine * of St. Paul has brought us to a most interesting point of the subject, what, namely, is the principle of unity in the Church. A short consideration of this will show us how the office of St. Peter enters into and forms part of the radical idea of the Church, so that the moment we profess our belief in one holy Catholic Church, the belief is likewise involved in that Primacy of teaching and authority which makes and keeps it one.

The principle of unity, then, is no other than "the Word made flesh:" that divine Person who has for ever joined together the Godhead and the Manhood. Thus, St. Paul speaks to us of God "having made known to us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure, which He purposed in Himself, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, *to gather together under one head all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth:*" at whose resurrection, "He set all things under His feet, and gave Him to be Head over all to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all." And again, "the head of every man is Christ; . . . and the head of Christ is God." "And we being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another:" † as again he sets forth at length in the twelfth

* In this chapter I have availed myself of Passaglia, b. 1, c. 25, and b. 2, c. 11.

† Eph. i. 9, 22; 1 Cor. xi. 2; Rom. xii. 5.

chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, calling that one body by the very name of Christ.

With one voice the ancient Fathers * exult in this as the great purpose of His Incarnation. "The work," says St. Hippolytus, † "of His taking a body, is the gathering up into one head of all things unto Him." "The Word Man," says St. Irenæus, ‡ "gathering all things up into Himself, that as in super-celestial, and spiritual, and invisible things, the Word of God is the chief, so also in visible and corporeal things He may hold the chiefship, assuming the Primacy to Himself, and joining Himself as Head to the Church, may draw all things to Himself, at the fitting time." And again, "The Son of God was made Man among men, to join the end to the beginning, that is, man to God ;" or, as Tertullian says, § "that God might show that in Himself was the evolution of the beginning to the end, and the return of the end to the beginning." And Œcumenius, "Angels and men were rent asunder ; God then joined them, and made them one through Christ." St. Gregory Thaumaturgus breaks out, "Thou art He that didst bridge over heaven and earth by Thy sacred body." And Augustine, || "Far off He was from us, and very far. What, so far off as the creature and the Creator ? What, so far off as God and man ? What, so far off as justice and iniquity ? What, so far off as eternity and mortality ? See how far off was 'the Word in the beginning, God with God, by whom all things were made.' How, then, was He made nigh, that He might be as we, and we in Him ? 'The Word was made flesh.'" "Man, being assumed, was taken into the nature of the Godhead," says St. Hilary : ¶ and St. Chrysostom, ** "He puts on flesh, that He who cannot be held may be holden : " "dwelling with us," says Gregory †† of Nazianzum, "by interposing His flesh as a veil, that the incomprehensible may be comprehended."

* See Petavius, de Incarn. lib. 2, c. 7 and 8, for the following quotations.

† Hippolytus, quoted by Anastasius, p. 216.

‡ Irenæus, lib. iii. 18, and iv. 37.

|| Augustine, 21 Tract. in Joannem.

** St. Chrys. tom. 5 (Savile), Hom. 106.

§ De Monogamia, c. 5.

¶ Hilary on Psalm 68.

†† Greg. Naz. Orat. 36.

“For since,” adds St. Cyril,* “man’s nature was not capable of approaching the pure and unmixed glory of the Godhead, because of its inherent weakness, for our use the only-begotten one put on our likeness.” “In the assumption of our nature,” says St. Leo,† “He became to us the step, by which through Him we may be able to mount unto Him:” “the descent of the Creator to the creature is the advance of believers to things eternal:” and, “it is not doubtful that man’s nature has been taken into such connection by the Son of God, that, not only in that Man who is the first-born of all creation, but even in all His saints, there is one and the same Christ: and as the Head cannot be divided from the limbs, so neither the limbs from the Head. For though it belong not to this life, but to that of eternity, that God be all in all, yet even now He is the undivided inhabitant of His temple, which is the Church.” For all the above is contained in our Lord’s own words, “that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee,” on which St. Athanasius ‡ says, “that all, being carried by Me, may be all one body and one spirit, and reach the perfect man:”—“for, as the Lord having clothed Himself in a body, became man, so we men are deified by the Word, being assumed through His flesh.” St. Gregory § of Nyssa has unfolded this idea thus: “since from no other source but from our lump was the flesh which received God, which, by the resurrection, was together with the Godhead exalted; just as in our own body the action of one organ of sense communicates sympathy to all that which is united with the part, so, just as if the whole nature (of man) were one living creature, the resurrection of a part passes throughout the whole, being communicated from the part to the whole, according to the nature’s continuity and union.” And another, || interpreting the words, “that they all may be one,” “thus I will, that they being drawn into unity,

* St. Cyril, Dialog. 1, de Trin. p. 399.

† St. Leo, 5th Serm. on Nativity, c. 4 and 5, 12th Serm. on Passion, c. 3.

‡ St. Athanasias, Orat. 3, contr. Arian, tom. 1, p. 572. Oxf. Trans. p. 403.

§ Greg. Nyss. tom. 2, p. 524. Catechet. Oratio, c. 32.

|| Ephrem, Patriarch of Antioch, quoted by Photius, cod. 229.

may be blended with each other, and becoming as one body, may all be in Me, who carry all in that one temple which I have assumed; the temple, namely, of His Body." And lastly, St. Hilary * deduces this not only from the Incarnation, but from the Blessed Eucharist. "For, if the Word be really made flesh, and we really receive the Word as flesh, in the food of the Lord, how is He not to be thought to remain in us naturally, since, both in being born a man, He assumed the nature of our flesh, never to be severed from Him, and has joined the nature of His flesh to the eternal nature under the sacrament of the flesh to be communicated to us."

So deep in the junction of the divine and human natures in our Lord's adorable Person lies the root of unity for that humanity which He purchased with His blood. It is in virtue of this headship that the whole mystical body is one, and "we all members one of another." By this Headship our Lord nourishes and cherishes the Church, and communicates to her incessantly that stream of grace by which she lives. And as this Headship flows from the union of the Godhead and Manhood, so it is inseparable from His Person, and incommunicable. But He has Himself, in His parting discourse, recorded by St. John, dwelt upon the great Sacrament of unity, the result of this Headship, and set it forth as the sign and seal of His own divine mission, and the one convincing proof of His religion's superhuman origin. By following His words we shall see that this unity is not simple but fourfold, and we shall trace the mutual relation and subordination to the divine Headship of its several kinds.

1. And first, "In † that day," says He, that is, after His own resurrection, "ye shall know that I am in My Father, and you in Me, and I in you," whereby He declares that, in the completion of the dispensation, the union between Himself and the faithful shall be such as to image out the mutual indwelling of the Father and the Son. Which again is further expressed, "I am the true vine, and My Father is the husbandman.

* St. Hilary, de Trin. lib. 8, n. 13.

† John xiv. 20.

Every branch in Me that beareth not fruit He will take away : and every one that beareth fruit, He will purge it, that it may bring forth more fruit. . . . I am the vine ; you the branches : he that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit : for without Me you can do nothing. If any one abide not in Me, he shall be cast forth as a branch, and shall wither, and they shall gather him up and cast him into the fire, and he burneth. If you abide in Me, and My words abide in you, you shall ask whatever you will, and it shall be done unto you."* In these words He sets forth that union of mystical influx, by co-operation with which His disciples keep His words and abide in His love, and of which He is Himself the immediate principle.

2. But He does not stop at this interior and invisible union between His disciples and Himself : He speaks likewise of a new and special command, and of a special gift, by which their union with each other should be known. "A new command I give unto you, that you love one another : as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one to another."† And again, "This is My command, that you love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love than this hath no man, that any one lay down his life for his friends. . . . These things I command you, that you love one another."‡ But the Holy Spirit, whom our Lord was about to send forth, is the efficient principle of the love here enjoined, by His substantial indwelling, as we are told, "The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who is given to us."§ From Him, therefore, bestowed by the Head of the Church, springs that unity of charity, which, being itself internal, is shown in outward signs, and constitutes that distinctive spirit of the Christian people, the spirit characterizing it, and analogous to the national spirit in civil organization.

3. But our Lord likewise speaks of a third unity, springing

* John xv. 1, 2, 5-7.

† John xv. 12.

‡ John xiii. 34-36.

§ Rom. v. 5.

from the direction of one and the same divine Spirit. "And I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you for ever: the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, nor knoweth Him: but you shall know Him, because He shall abide with you, and shall be in you." "The Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind whatsoever I shall have said to you."* "It is expedient to you that I go: for if I go not, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send Him to you." "But when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all truth. For He shall not speak of Himself, but what things soever He shall hear, He shall speak; and the things that are to come, He shall show you. He shall glorify Me, because He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it to you."† Of the nature of this unity we may judge by the gifts and offices assigned to that Spirit and Paraclete from whom it springs. Now He is repeatedly termed, "the Spirit of truth," and His office, to *suggest*, to *announce*, to *teach*, and to *lead into all truth*. This unity, therefore, is opposed to the division produced by ignorance and error, and so is the unity of faith, or Christian profession. Thus our Lord promises, besides the unity of charity, that of faith, the efficient principle of which, as well as of the former, is contained in the communication of the Holy Spirit. But it is no less true in the supernatural order of divine gifts, than in the order of nature, that the first cause produces its effects by means of second causes. And here, as often as the Lord promises the Spirit of truth, He promises Him *to the Apostles*, and assures His perpetual abidance with them and the successors in their charge, thus, "That He may abide with you for ever;" "He shall abide with you, and shall be in you:" "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind which I have said unto you:" "Whom I will send unto you from the Father:" "I will send Him unto you:" "He shall lead you

* John xiv. 16-18, 26.

† John xvi. 7, 13-15.

into all truth :” “ He shall show the things that are to come.” And so the unity of faith may be expected from its *supreme* cause, the Holy Spirit the Paraclete, *through the medium* of the Apostles and their legitimate successors : the Holy Spirit is its *ultimate*, but they its *subordinate* principle : He is the *source*, but they the *channel*. Thus to trust to the invisible action of the Spirit, but to despise the office and direction of the teachers ordained by Christ, in the very virtue of that Spirit, is to reject His divine institution, and to risk a shipwreck of the promised gift of faith and truth.

For in exact accordance with our Lord’s words here, St. Paul has set forth not only the institution, but the source, as well as the end and purpose, of the whole visible hierarchy. It is instituted by our Lord, as an act of His divine Headship ; its source is in “ one and the same Spirit dividing to every one according as He will ;” its end and purpose is, “ the edifying the body of Christ, until we all meet into the unity of faith.” *

Each of these points is important. Our Lord’s divine Headship over the Church, all encompassing, as it is, and the spring of all blessing and unity, does not dispense with the establishment of a visible hierarchy, but rather is specially shown therein. And again, the Holy Spirit is the source and superior principle of all spiritual gifts to all, but yet He acts *through* this hierarchy. He is the Spirit who maintains faith and truth, but it is by the instruments of His own appointing.

Now these three points, the bestowal of all spiritual gifts and offices by Christ in virtue of His mystical Headship, the Holy Spirit being the one superior principle of such gifts and offices, and His manifold operation therein through the visible hierarchy, are set forth most distinctly in two passages of St. Paul, the twelfth chapter of the First to the Corinthians, and the fourth chapter to the Ephesians. “ To every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of the giving of Christ. Wherefore He saith, Ascending on high He led captivity cap-

* 1 Cor. xii. 11 ; Eph. iv. 13.

tive ; He gave gifts to men. Now that He ascended, what is it but because He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth ? He that descended is the same also that ascended above all the heavens, that He might fill all things. And He gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of the ministry, unto the edifying of the body of Christ, until we all meet into the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ ; that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive. But doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in Him who is the Head, even Christ ; from whom the whole body, being compactly and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in charity.” “And the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man unto profit. To one indeed by the Spirit is given the word of wisdom ; and to another the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit ; to another, faith, in the same Spirit ; to another, the grace of healing, in one Spirit ; to another, the working of miracles ; to another, prophecy ; to another, the discerning of spirits ; to another, divers kinds of tongues ; to another, interpretation of speeches. But all these things one and the same Spirit worketh, dividing to every one according as He will. For as the body is one, and hath many members ; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free, and in one Spirit we have all been made to drink.”*

Thus, then, we have been brought by the words both of our Lord and of St. Paul, through an inward invisible unity, that

* Eph. iv. 7-16 ; 1 Cor. xii. 7-13.

of mystical influx from the vine to its branches, and again, that of charity, and that of faith and truth, to an outward and visible unity, one of social organization, called forth by the great Head for the purpose of exhibiting, defending, maintaining, and conveying the former, since it is expressly said that He gave it "for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of the ministry, unto the edifying of the body of Christ," and in order that "we may be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine." And the inward source and cause of this unity are indeed invisible, being the Holy Spirit of God, sent down by Christ, when He ascended up on high, to dwell permanently among men, but its effects are external and most visible, even the growth of a body "unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ," a body which has an orderly arrangement of all its parts, and a hierarchy of officers to continue till the end of all. And the function of this hierarchy is one never to be superseded, and which none but itself, the organ of the Holy Spirit, can perform, namely, to bring its members "to meet in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God." As our Lord says, in the promise, before His passion, "I will ask the Father, and He shall give you (the Apostles) another Paraclete, that He may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth," so St. Paul of the accomplishment after His ascension, "He gave some Apostles and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors," yet "all these things worketh one and the same Spirit." For as the divine Head took to Himself a body, bridging thereby the worlds of matter and of spirit, and as "in Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead *corporally*," so in His Church, in perfect analogy with the Archetype, the visible is the channel of the invisible, and the outward organization is instinct with inward life, and the hierarchy is the gift of the mystical Head, and the instrument of the one sanctifying Spirit. To think otherwise, to disregard the external framework, under a pretence of exalting the inward spirit, is to undo so far the work of Incarnation,

and to renew the insanity of those early heretics who in one way or another would "dissolve" Christ; for there is no less "one Body," than there is "one Spirit."

But if His headship of mystical influx is *alone* and *immediately* sufficient, as is so often objected, for the maintenance of external unity, to what end is the creation of this visible hierarchy? For the objection that the invisible Headship of Christ renders a visible headship unnecessary, and indeed an infringement on His sole divine prerogative, whatever force it may have, tells not more against an oecumenical head of the Church, than against every order and officer of the hierarchy. These all, and with them the whole system of sacraments as well as symbols, become alike unnecessary and even injurious, if each member of the mystical body be knit to Christ *immediately* without any outward framework. And with what face especially can those maintain that the Bishop is the visible head of each diocese, and in being such does not contradict, but illustrate, the Headship of Christ, who yet deny that there is one in the whole Church put in the like place over Bishops, and see in such an appointment an infringement on the office of Christ? Such an argument is so profoundly illogical and inconsistent, that one has difficulty in believing it to be seriously held, or is hopeless of bringing conviction to those who cannot see an absurdity.

Let those, then, who confound together the supreme Headship of Christ over His Church, whereby He communicates to it life and grace, with the inferior and subordinate headship of external unity, see to what their objection tends. It stops at nothing short of destroying the whole visible hierarchy, and the sacramental grace of which it is the channel. Holy Scripture, on the contrary, tells us in these passages that the providence by which the Church is governed resembles that by which this outward universe is ruled, in the subordination of second causes to the supreme cause. Christ repeats as Redeemer His work as Creator, to give life and force to these second causes, and while He works in the members of His

body both "to will and to do," bestows on them the privilege of co-operating with Him. Thus the dignity of supreme Head which belongs to Christ, and is incommunicable, no more takes away the ministry of the external head who is charged with the office of effecting and maintaining unity, than it impedes the ministry of "apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and doctors," to whom Christ entrusted the Church, that by their means it might be brought to sanctity and perfection.

4. And these words bring us to the fourth unity mentioned by our Lord. For not until "He ascended up on high" did "He give gifts to men." And this visible hierarchy, the sign and token of His mystical Headship and fostering care, is by Him quickened and informed with the Holy Spirit, when He is Himself invisible at the right hand of the majesty of God. This absence, too, is what He foretold, saying, "And now I am not in the world, and these are in the world, and I come to Thee; Holy Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given Me; that they may be one, as We also are. While I was with them, I kept them in Thy name. . . . And now I come to Thee." These words of our Lord show that it was His will that His believers should be no less one among each other, by an outward and visible union, than they were one by the internal bond of charity, the guidance of one Spirit of Truth, and the influx of the one Vine. And so far we have seen that to guard and maintain that unity under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth, He called forth the visible hierarchy, in all its degrees. But what, then, was the external root and efficient principle of this visible hierarchy, when He was gone to the Father? Did He not likewise provide for the loss occasioned by His own absence, which He had foretold? The argument of St. Paul proves that He did so provide, as well as His own words. For St. Paul declares the Church to be "one Body." Was it then a body without a head, or a body with a head invisible? Or did the Lord of all, having with complete wisdom framed His mystical body in all its parts and proportions, and having set *first* Apostles, and then, in their various degree,

doctors and pastors, in one single, and that the main point, reverse the analogy of all His doings? Did He appoint every officer in His household, except the one who should rule all? Did He construct the entire arch, save only the keystone? Did He make a Bishop to represent His person, and be the centre of visible unity in every diocese, but none to represent that person in the highest degree and to be the centre of unity to the whole Church? Was it the end of His whole design "to gather together in one the children of God, that were dispersed," in order that there might be "One Fold," and did He fail to add "One Shepherd"? Yet St. Paul declares that "there are many members, but one body." How can the distinct and diverse members be reduced to the unity of a body, but by the unity of the head, as the efficient principle? In accordance with which we may observe that never is the image of a body used in Scripture to represent the Church, but it is thereby shown to be visible; and never is it compared with a body as a type, but that body is shown complete with its head. Such are the well-known images of one House, Kingdom, City, Fold, and Temple, to which we have had so often to appeal. Even the unity of things in themselves dissimilar is derived in Scripture from the unity of the Head. Thus the man and the woman are said in marriage to be one, and that in a great mystery, representing Christ and the Church, but this because "the husband is the head of the wife." And Christ is said to be one with the faithful, because "the head of every man is Christ:" and God one with Christ, because "the head of Christ is God." If, then,* the Church is one body, it receives, according to the reasoning of Holy Scripture, that property from the unity of its head.

But such a one body, while yet militant upon earth, St. Paul declares it to be, setting forth at the same time the various orders of its hierarchy. Is it then a body complete, or incomplete? With a head or without one? For it is no reply to say that it has indeed a head, but one invisible. That invi-

* Passaglia, p. 254.

sible headship did not obviate, as we have seen, the necessity of a visible hierarchy: why then does it obviate the like and even more striking necessity, that the hierarchy too must have its visible head? If it was, so to say, the very first act of our Lord's supreme headship over all to the Church—the very token that He had led captivity captive—to quicken the visible ministry which He had established by sending down the Holy Spirit to abide with it for ever, is the one place most necessary in that ministry to be the only one left vacant by Him? Is the one officer most fully representing Himself to be alone omitted? “The *perfecting* of the saints” (a metaphor taken, as we have seen, from the exact fitting together of the stones in a building), and “the edifying of the body of Christ,” are described as the end to be reached by those to whom “the work of the ministry” is committed; but as this applies in a higher degree to the Bishop than to the priest, so it applies in the highest of all to the Bishop of bishops.

Again, God's method of teaching by symbols, which runs through the whole Scripture, and the institution of Sacraments, proves to us His will to lead us on from the visible to the invisible, and to make the former a channel to the latter. For “we are all baptized into one body,” and the outward act both images and conveys the inward privilege. And again in the highest conceivable instance, “because the bread is one, we being many are one body, who all partake of that one bread.”* In like manner the outward unity of the Church must accurately represent, and answer to the inward, which, we know, is derived from the Person of Christ, who is its head. And so that Person must be specially represented in the outward unity.

And this is one reason why no unity of a college, whether of Apostles, or of Bishops, will adequately express that visible headship of which our Lord's Person is the exemplar. For the root of all lies in a personal unity, that of the Godhead and Manhood, and therefore a merely collective or representative unity cannot express it. And if the Apostle wrote, “God hath

* 1 Cor. x. 17.

set in the Church *first* Apostles," yet he also wrote that the grand result, "the perfecting of the saints, and the edifying of the body of Christ," was due to the ministry, not only of Apostles, but of prophets, evangelists, pastors, and doctors, each in their degree; they all conspire to a joint action, which does not impede the existence of distinct orders in the hierarchy. And his expression that the Apostles are *first* in this hierarchy without defining their mutual relations to each other, does not exclude those other passages of Scripture which *do* define those relations, and which make Peter among the Apostles "the First," "the Ruler," "the Greater," the Judah among his brethren, the foundation of the whole building, and the one shepherd in the universal fold. And the more so because St. Paul uses three expressions of the Church, two of which are *relative*, but one *absolute*. He calls it "the body of Christ," and "Christ," which are relative; but he also calls it "one body," which is absolute. Now, these expressions are not to be severed from each other, as if each by itself would convey the whole idea of the Church, which rather is to be drawn from them altogether. In answer to what the Church is, we must not say that it is *either* "the body of Christ," *or* mystically called "Christ," *or* set before us as "one body," for it is *all* of these at once, relatively "Christ," and "the body of Christ," and absolutely "one body."

As, then, the former expressions show that the Church is one *in reference to Christ*, so the latter shows that it is so *in itself*, and *simply*. For as the Church is called "Christ," and "the Body of Christ," because it is one with Christ by mystical union, drawing its supernatural life from Christ its head, so it is called "one body," because in the variety of members and parts, of which it consists, no one is wanting to its being one body in itself, and to its being seen to be such. But it would neither be so, nor seem to be so, if it were without a visible head, the origin and principle of its inherent visible unity. And so where the Church is called by St. Paul "one Body," he declares that it has a visible head.

Thus it is that the inherent notion of the Church, as one visible body, and the whole dispensation by which visible things answer to invisible, as their archetypes, demand one visible head. Now to this *inherent* necessity let us add the force of *positive* teaching. When our Lord in almost His last words to His Church prays to His Father, "while I was with them in the world, I kept them in Thy name—but now I come to Thee," what does He but suggest the appointment of another visible head to take that place which He was leaving? and further, what does He but name one to that high dignity, when He calls him "the Greater" and "the Ruler" among his brethren, commits them to him to be confirmed by him, and makes him the shepherd of the whole flock? What else had He done but prepare them for such a nomination, when He promised *one* that he should be the foundation of His Church, and the bearer of the keys? What else did Christians from the beginning see in such an one, when they called him the *head*, the *centre*, the *fountain*, the *root*, the *principle*, of ecclesiastical unity?

Let us remark, once more, as a confirmation of the above, that the archetype of visible unity in the Church, which our Lord sets before us in His prayer to the Father, is no other than that most high and solemn of all things conceivable, the mutual indwelling of the Father and the Son. "Holy Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one, as We also are;" and again, for all successive generations of the faithful, "that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Now, the relation established by our Lord between Peter and the rest of the Apostles, by appointing him the visible head of the Church, and between Peter's successor and all Bishops, does represent, so far as earthly things may, and in a degree which nothing else on earth reaches to, the mutual relation of the three divine Persons to each other. For as these are distinct, but inseparable, so, too, are the Apostles. As the

fulness of the Godhead is *first* in the Father and *then* in the Son and in the Holy Spirit, so the fulness of power *first* promised and given to Peter, is *then* propagated to the other Apostles united with him. As in the Father the economy of the divine Persons is summed up under one head, and gathered into a monarchy, so in Peter is gathered up the fulness of ecclesiastical power, which, through union with him, is one in all, as the Church is one, and the Episcopate one. Moreover, as it is the dignity of the Father to be the exemplar, principle, root, and fountain of unity in the Trinity, so is it the dignity of Peter to be the exemplar, principle, root, and fountain of visible unity in the kingdom of God, which is the Church. This is alluded to by Pope Symmachus, thirteen hundred and fifty years ago: "There is one single priesthood in the different prelates (of the Apostolic See), after the example of the Trinity, whose power is one and indivisible."* And long before him St. Cyprian: "The Lord says, 'I and the Father are one.' And again it is written of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, 'And these three are one.' Is there a man who believes that this unity, coming from the divine solidity, cohering by heavenly sacraments, can possibly be broken in the Church, and torn asunder by the collision of adverse wills? This unity he who holds not, holds not the law of God, holds not the faith of the Father and the Son, holds not the truth unto salvation."†

Whereas, then, all unity in the Body of Christ, the Church, is derived ultimately from the person of its Head, the Word Incarnate, that unity is yet fourfold in its operation, and the efficient principle of one sort is not to be confounded with that of another. There is the *mystical* unity, which consists in the perpetual divine influx from the great invisible Head to His members; there is the *moral* or *spiritual* unity of charity, consisting in the presence of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers, and these two are internal, and in closest correspondence. There are two likewise external, which may

* Mansi, Concil. tom. 8, 208.

† St. Cyprian, de Unitate.

be called the *civil* or *political* unity, consisting in the public profession of the same faith, the same truth, for what the *law* is to temporal states, the *faith* is to the great spiritual kingdom of Christ; and this unity is indeed inspired by the Holy Spirit, but is maintained by Him through the visible hierarchy; and lastly, correspondent to the unity of faith, there is the *visible* unity of external organization, the immediate or efficient principle of which lies in the visible headship over the Church attached by the Lord to St. Peter's chair. The latter two, while they correspond to each other, are indeed subordinate to the former, the unity of faith to that of charity, as the unity of the visible headship to that of the invisible; yet the very truth of the Body which the Lord has assumed, and in which He reigns, and the whole analogy of His dealings with men, and the sacraments whereby He makes us "partakers of the divine nature," warn us that it is of the highest importance for us to see how external unity is the channel of internal, and the visible the road to the invisible. No words can be more emphatic to this effect than those with which the Apostle introduces the description of the visible hierarchy, and the divine headship which called it forth. "There is *one Body* and one Spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all." From which he goes on to say, "Ascending up on high, He gave gifts to men—some Apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors, and teachers." And lastly, "the Head over all things to the Church," is "the Saviour of the *Body*." *

But if this be so, we can say nothing more highly to exalt St. Peter's office in the Church, for he is the great bond and stay of this outward unity, as even enemies † confess. As

* Eph. iv. 4, 8, 11; i. 22; v. 23.

† That such was the belief of the most ancient Fathers, Ignatius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and others, see a most curious admission of the Lutheran Mosheim, in his dissertation, *De Gallorum Appellationibus*, etc., s. 13. And his way of extricating himself is at least as curious as the admission. His words

surely as in a real monarchy the person of the sovereign ties together every part of the political edifice, and is endued with majesty because he is at once the type of God, and concentrates in one the power and dignity of the whole community, so it is in that divine structure in which "the manifold wisdom of God" is disclosed to all creation. The point of strength is felt alike by friend and foe. On the Rock of Peter has fallen every storm which the enmity of the evil one has raised for eighteen hundred years; but yet the gates of hell have not prevailed against it. In the Rock of Peter, and the divine promise attached to it, every heart faithful to God and the Church trusts now, as it trusted from the beginning. Many temporal monarchs in their hour of pride have risen against St. Peter's See, but the greatest of them all* declared that no one had ever gained honour or victory in that conflict, and he lived to be the most signal instance of his own observation. "God is patient, because He is eternal," and the Holy See prevails in its weakness over power, and in its justice over cupidity, because while temporal dominion passes from hand to hand, and stays not with any nation, following the gift of God which the poet calls fortune,—

"Perchè una gente impera, e l' altra langue,
Seguendo lo giudizio di costei
Che è occulta, come in l' erba l' angue,"— †

the visible kingdom of Christ, which is His Church, lasts for ever, and is built upon the rock of Peter. The long line of are, "Cyprian and the rest cannot have known the corollaries which follow from their precepts about the Church. For no one is so dull as not to see that between a certain unity of the universal Church, terminating in the Roman pontiff, and such a community as we have described out of Irenæus and Cyprian, there is scarcely so much room as between hall and chamber, or between hand and fingers. If the *innocence* of the first ages stood in the way of their anticipating the snares which ignorantly and unintentionally they were laying against sacred liberty, those succeeding at least were more sharp-sighted, and it was not long in becoming clear to the pontiffs what force in establishing their own power and authority such tenets possessed." So the ancient Fathers were not intelligent enough to see that *the hand was joined to the fingers*. But the other alternative was still harder to Mosheim, that Lutheranism was fundamentally heretical and schismatical.

* Napoleon.

† Dante, Inferno.

descendants, from Constantine and from Charlemagne, have in their turn impugned and illustrated this glorious privilege of the Papal See. What is there so stable in an empire of commerce, or so solid in the nicely balanced and delicate machinery of a constitutional monarchy, as to exempt them from the action of a universal law, or to ensure their victory in the doomed contest with the Vicar of Christ? Mightier things than they have done their worst, have oppressed, triumphed, and become extinct, and if it be allowed them in the crisis of their trial to crucify Christ afresh, He will yet reign from the cross, and "draw all men unto Him."

CHAPTER VIII.

SUMMARY OF PROOF GIVEN FOR ST. PETER'S PRIMACY.

IT would now seem to be made clear to all that the controversy on St. Peter's Primacy relates *generally* to the question of inequality in the Apostolic college, and *especially* to the question, whether Christ, the Founder of the Church, set any one of the Apostles, and whom of them in particular, over the rest. For as, on the one hand, there would have been no room for the superior dignity of the Primacy, had all the Apostles been completely equal, and undistinguished in honour and authority from each other; so, on the other hand, it is the nature of the Primacy to be incapable of even being contemplated, saved as fixed on some certain definite subject.

But to determine the two questions, whether the Apostles stood, or did not stand, on a complete equality, and whether one of them was superior to the rest in honour and dignity, it seemed requisite to examine chiefly four points.

First, the words and the acts of Christ respecting the Apostles.

Secondly, His expressions which seemed to mark the institution of a *singular* authority.

Thirdly, the mode of writing and speaking usually and constantly employed by the Evangelists and other inspired writers.

Lastly, the history of the Church, from its beginning, from which might be drawn conjectures, or even certain proofs, of

the power which either all the Apostles had exercised equally, or one had held above the rest.

For should it become plain, from the agreement of these four sources, that a certain one of the Apostles, and that one Simon Peter, had been distinguished from the rest by the acts and words of Christ, and set over the Apostles; had been invariably described by the inspired writers, as the Head and supreme authority; and in the history of the rising Church, been portrayed in a way which could only befit the universal ruler, no difficulty would remain, and there would be arguments abundant to prove that Christ was the author both of the inequality among the Apostles, and of Peter's Primacy.

Now we seem to have proved *absolutely*, what we proposed *hypothetically*. For we have shown that Christ declared by His whole method of acting, and by solemn words and deeds, that He did not account Peter as one of the rest, but as their Leader, Chief, and Head.

We have shown it to have been the will of Christ to concentrate in Peter the distinctions which belong to Himself, as Supreme Ruler of the Church. For such must be deemed the properties of being the Foundation, the Bearer of the keys, the Holder of universal authority, the Supporter, and lastly, the Chief Shepherd. Of these there is no one which He did not promise to Peter singly, and confer on Peter singly: no one, with which He did not associate Peter, and Peter only, in making him the foundation of His Church, bestowing on him the keys, and universal power of binding and loosing, in setting him over his brethren to confirm them, and over His fold as universal Pastor.

We have shown that the Evangelists place almost the same distinction between the Apostles and Peter, as between Peter and Christ, while still among us. For as they set forth Peter as second after Christ, so do they subject the Apostles to Peter; as the acts and words of Christ occupy the foreground in respect to those of Peter, so do his in respect to

those of the Apostles; as Christ, in their histories, is pre-eminent above Peter, so is Peter more conspicuous than the Apostles; and as the Gospels cannot be read without seeing in them Christ as the prototype, so neither can they without seeing that Peter approaches the nearest to Christ.

We have shown that St. Paul spoke of St. Peter in no other way than the Evangelists, and that his pre-eminence is evident in St. Paul's Epistles, as well as in the Gospels.

Lastly, we have shown that Peter shines as the superior luminary in the history of the rising Church. The lustre of his deeds in the Acts recalls that of Christ in the Gospels. In the Gospels Christ is named by far most frequently; in the Acts no one occurs so often as Peter. The discourses, the acts, the miracles of Christ occupy every page of the Gospels; and in that portion of the Acts which embraces the history of the whole Church, a very large part has reference to the discourses, the acts, and the miracles of Peter. In the Gospels, Christ leads, the Apostles follow; in the Acts, Peter takes the precedence, the Apostles attend him. In the Gospels, Christ teaches, and the Apostles, in silence, consent; in the Acts, Peter alone makes speeches, and explains the doctrine of salvation; the Apostles by their silence consent. In the Gospels, Christ provides for the Apostolic college, guards it from injury, defends it when attacked; in the Acts, Peter provides for filling up the place of Judas, determines the conditions of eligibility, enjoins the election, and defends the Apostles before people, rulers, and chief priests, in quality of their head.

Moreover, he alone is pre-eminent in exercising the triple power of *authoritative Teacher, Judge, and Legislator*. Of *authoritative Teacher*, not only towards Jews and Gentiles, whom he is the first to join to Christ, so that the same person who was the Church's rock and foundation also became its chief architect; but towards the Apostles likewise, who are taught by his ministry, that the time was come for the blessing of redemption to be extended no less to Gentiles

than to Jews, and that the burden of legal rites could not be laid on the Gentile converts without tempting God. *Of Judge*, because, while the Apostles are silent, he is the first to hear the causes of the faithful, to erect a tribunal to examine the accused, to issue sentence, and to support and confirm it by inflicting excommunication. *Of Head and Supreme Legislator*, both when he singly visits Christians in all parts, and provides for their needs, or when he uses the prerogative of first voting, and draws with authority the wording of the law to which the rest are to give a unanimous consent.

From this compendious enumeration we draw a multifold proof, both of inequality in the Apostolic college, and of Peter's superiority at once in rank and in real government.

I. For, *first*, a college cannot be considered equal, out of which Christ chose one, Simon Peter, whom, by His words and His actions, He showed to be set over all. Now, Christ's whole course of speaking and acting, of which the Gospels give us the picture, tends to exhibit Peter as chosen out from the rest, and set over them. Accordingly, neither is the college of the Apostles equal, nor can Peter be accounted as one of the rest.

II. Again, one who has received all in common with the rest, but much besides peculiar to himself, special and distinguishing, must seem to be taken out of the common number. Now, such must Peter have been among the Apostles, since Christ granted nothing to them which he denied to Peter, but did grant to Peter many most distinguishing gifts which He gave not to the rest.

III. And, further, it is apparent that the Foundation and the Superstructure, the Bearer of the keys, and those who inhabit the house or city whose keys he bears, the Confirmer, and those whom he is to confirm, the universal Pastor and the sheep committed to his charge, cannot be comprehended under the same order and rank. Now the distinctions expressed by the terms Foundation, Bearer of the keys, Confirmer, and universal Pastor, are Peter's official insignia in reference to,

and over, the Apostles themselves. His distinction from them, therefore, and the inequality of the Apostolic college, are plain.

Perhaps this may be put somewhat otherwise even more clearly. And so, IV. Let it first be considered, what is plain in itself, that a distinction carrying pre-eminence depends on distinction in perfection and gifts, and follows in a greater or less degree from the greater or less inequality of these, or in case of their parity exists not at all. Next, be what we hold both of reason and of faith remembered, that "every best gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights," that God is the fountain-head of all good, and that all gifts whatsoever flow over from Him to His creatures. From both points it follows that the amount of the creature's dignity and perfection lies in the participation of divine goods, and is greater or less in proportion to the participation and association with divine goods. So, then, the controversy on Peter's Primacy and the inequality of the Apostolic college, comes ultimately to this: *whether Christ, the God-man, associated Peter singly, above all, with Himself, in the possession of those properties on account of which He stands Himself related to the Church as its supreme Ruler.* For let it be once evident that Christ did so, and it will of necessity be evident also, not only that Peter was preferred to all, but wherein his leadership and headship consisted. And since we have made the inquiry, there is abundant evidence to prove that Christ really did associate Peter singly in five properties, which, belonging to Himself *primarily and chiefly*, contain the special cause for which He is the Prince and Supreme Head of the Church.

For, in truth, it is specially due to the properties and distinctions of *Foundation, Bearer of the keys, Establisher, Chief Shepherd, and Lord*, who has received all authority from the Father, that the Church has an entire dependence on Christ, is subject to Him, and that He enjoys over the Church the right and authority of Supreme Lord and Ruler. But

which of these properties did He not choose to communicate to Peter, according to the degree in which they were communicable? He bestowed them all upon Peter, and upon Peter alone, so that Peter also is termed *the Foundation, the Bearer of the keys, the Confirmer, the universal Pastor, and the Chief* of the whole Church*. We see, therefore, a remarkable proof of Peter being distinguished from the rest of the Apostles, and set over them, in his singular and special association with these gifts.

Again, V., to this tends that disposition of divine wisdom which provides that Peter holds in the Church, and among the Apostles, a rank of dignity greatly resembling that which Abraham among the Patriarchs, and Judah among his brethren, received from God. The former of these relations has been exhibited, and shown not to be arbitrarily conceived, but grounded on due proof. The latter will be presently farther touched upon. Now who shall deny Abraham that superiority whereby he was made the Father and Teacher of all the faithful, or strip Judah of the dignity in which he excelled his brethren, and was in many points preferred to them? As little may any one strip Peter of his authority as supreme teacher, and take from him those singular endowments which make him "the Greater one" among his brethren and Apostles.

Especially as, VI., this authority of Peter is clearly confirmed by the mode of writing usual to the Evangelists. For it is monstrous and preposterous to confound with the rest one whom the Evangelists constantly distinguish and prefer to all. For what more could they do to show their purpose to distinguish Peter, select him from the rest, and place him at all times before all the Apostles? We may venture to say that they omitted nothing to this end. And so it is absurd to doubt of Peter's prerogatives, or set him on the same footing with the rest.

* *ἡγούμενος*, Luke xxii. 26, the very term still given in the East to the head of a religious community; and also, as has been said, that which marks our Lord in the great prophecy of Micah, recorded in Matt. ii. 6.

For, indeed, VII., no one would endure it to be denied, from the usual mode of writing of the Evangelists, that Christ was pre-eminent among the Apostles as their Supreme Head, and was removed from them in dignity by an infinite interval. Now, though the Evangelists do not give Peter all things, nor in the same degree, yet they do give him much, and in a degree not dissimilar, to distinguish him from the rest, showing him, as in a nearer relation to Christ, so proportionably exalted above the other Apostles.

And this proof, VIII., is the more persuasive because St. Paul follows the very same mode of speaking as the Evangelists. For in repeatedly mentioning St. Peter in his Epistles, he always gives him the place of honour, and joins him as near as may be with Christ. Who then can doubt Peter held a certain pre-eminent rank ?

And the more, IX., because what is read in the Acts, and the view of primitive history therein contained, looks the same way, and seems set forth with the same purpose. For if you compare together the Acts and the Gospels, the mind at once suggests that the position of Prototype which Christ holds in the Gospels, belongs to Peter in the Acts, and that Peter seems distinguished above the rest of the Apostles in the Acts, as Christ is pre-eminent far above all in the Gospels. Now what is the result of so apparent a likeness ? What is it fair to deduce from such a bearing in the Evangelical and Apostolical history ? Those who are obedient to reasoning, and follow the bright torch of the Scriptures, must confess with us that in this parallelism of both histories, and so of Christ and Peter, is contained a mark and sign, proving that Peter follows next after Christ in dignity and authority.

In authority, X., I repeat, and, therefore, that kind of superiority which very far surpasses the limits of precedence and order. For what are the grounds on which we see Peter's eminence in the Acts, or a resemblance between the Acts when speaking of Peter, and the Gospels when speaking of Christ ? Chiefly these, that Peter is set forth as remarkable,

singly, above all, for the use and exercise of the triple power, of Judge, Legislator, and authoritative Teacher. Now, the superiority herein asserted, not merely distinguishes Peter from the rest, but attaches to him a greater authority over the rest.

XI. And, indeed, propose an hypothesis which is necessary to solve a complex and undoubted series of facts; such an hypothesis is thereby made a certainty. At least these are the principles of philosophy, from which the laws of reasoning will not allow us to depart. Now, Peter's pre-eminence and supremacy are such an hypothesis, without which you can render no sufficient cause of the facts narrated in the first twelve chapters of the Acts. Accordingly, this supremacy of Peter may be considered as proved.

XII. Or to put the argument somewhat differently, thus: As the existence of causes is deduced, *a posteriori*, from effects, so it is perfectly established, *a priori*, whenever the series and sum of effects, of which the senses are cognizant, are foretold from it with certainty. We deduce the force of gravity necessarily from its effects, *a posteriori*, but we likewise determine it to exist, with a judgment no less invariable, *a priori*, when it is such that we do not merely guess at, but certainly anticipate, its sensible effects. Now, Peter's supremacy is not inaptly compared with this very force of gravity. For it is a characteristic of each to be, in its proper order of things, the source and principle in which effects are involved, which afterwards become apparent, whether in this physical universe, or in the supernatural region of the Church.

Suppose, then, Peter to have held the dignity which we claim for him. What happens in the Acts which might not, nay, which should not, have been anticipated? Is it his being mentioned above all, his speaking in the name of all, his constantly taking the lead, and his eminence, as if he were the head? But it could not be otherwise if he alone received from Christ a higher dignity than all the rest. Is it his

discharging the office of supreme Judge, Legislator, Teacher, and Doctor? Is not this just what was to be expected from the rank of Head and universal Pastor? The Primacy, then, the larger authority, and the unshared majesty of Peter, belong to that class of truths which are indubitably believed on the strength of deduction, and rational anticipation.

Having noted, if not all, at least the greater number of those arguments which we have alleged hitherto in favour of our cause, we approach the question which was secondly to be cleared up, what, namely, is *the force and nature of that Primacy*, which the same arguments prove to belong to Peter. For I know that all Protestants are possessed with the notion that no other pre-eminence should be ascribed to Peter, on Scriptural authority, than one limited to a certain precedency of honour and order. That *precedency* should be granted Peter they are not unwilling to admit, but *supremacy*, they stoutly maintain, must not and cannot be allowed him. As to which their opinion I consider, that it would be much the shorter way to strip Peter utterly of every prerogative, than to attenuate the distinctions applied to him in Scripture to a sort of shadowy precedency. I consider that nothing is so foreign to truth and the Scripture, as on their testimony to allow that Peter was distinguished from the rest of the Apostles, but to confine that superiority within the very narrow bounds of honour and order.

For, *first*, whence do we most evidently and chiefly draw the greater dignity which Peter clearly possessed above the others? We draw it from the endowments separately bestowed upon him, whereby he became the Foundation of the Church, the Supreme Bearer of the keys, the Confirmer of his brethren, and the universal Pastor. But are these names, images, signs, expressing a naked superiority of honour and order, or rather designating an authority of jurisdiction and power? I cannot hesitate to assert either that these forms are most fitted of all to express a singular authority, or that none such exist in language. For, *secondly*, their force is to ascribe to Peter the

main sway, and to mark him as set for the head and leader of all. Who that hears them can, without perverting the natural force of words, or disregarding the laws of interpretation, imagine anything merely honorary, or figure to himself Peter with a mere grant of precedence?

Especially as, *thirdly*, he is named in Scripture not only *the First*, but, comparatively, the *Greater*, and absolutely, the *Superior*.* Now these terms do, of themselves, and far more if you consider the context of the discourse in which they occur, express a singular authority, and one without rival. An authority, *fourthly*, kindred to that with which Christ, while yet in His mortal life, presided over the Apostolic college, and administered as supreme Head, the company which He had formed. For we can never sufficiently urge a point which, being in itself most true, is of itself abundantly sufficient completely to set at rest the present controversy. It is this, that Peter's Primacy proceeds from a singular association with those distinctions, in virtue of which Christ is considered the Head and Chief, and Supreme Ruler of the Church. So that the more his Primacy is depressed, the more Christ's prerogatives and dignity are lowered; nor can he be confined to a precedence of honour and order, without Christ's superiority being shut within well-nigh the same limits.

Besides, *fifthly*, are tokens wanting in Scripture which disclose the nature of Peter's Primacy? Are there not effects which unfold the force and quality of the cause from which they spring? Such tokens there are in abundance, and such effects manifold. These are, the care with which Peter guarded the Apostolic college; the authority with which he visited Christians in every part; the singular exercise of judicial power, by which he established Church discipline, and provided for its maintenance; his acts of authoritative teaching; his drawing the form of laws which were to rule the universal Church; and, in short, the wonderful regard with which that Church followed Peter as its Head, and the Steward of all the

* Πρῶτος, μέγας, ἡγούμενος. See ch. 2.

Lord's family. What Primacy is it which these tokens set forth? What cause which these effects demonstrate? Is it one limited to a precedency of honour and order? or one pre-eminent by an inherent jurisdiction and authority? It is a point which needs no further words. For if any there be whose minds are not struck by a candid and sincere exposition of facts, you will in vain attempt to persuade them by arguments.

Unless, indeed, *sixthly*, they allow themselves to be forced out of their prejudice by the Scriptures exhibiting such a Primacy of Peter as compels all others to profess one and the same faith with him, and to maintain one and the same society. For such an obligation could proceed neither from titles of honour, nor from precedency. It demanded a stronger cause—none other, in fact, but that supreme authority by which Peter is made head of all.

But we shall feel much more at home in the truth of this deduction, if we inquire a little more deeply into the reasons for selecting one among the rest, namely, Peter, and instituting the Primacy. For the purpose and end proposed in a work have the force of a *negative* rule by which we may judge with certainty what ought to be done, or could not be left undone. I know well that it does not follow, if anything has been instituted for a certain purpose, that it ought to be endowed *only* with those properties which appear necessary for the end to be gained; for it may be much more munificently established than the absolute need required. But at the same time I know that there would be a failure in prudence and wisdom in one who, desiring a certain work for a specific end, did not provide it with everything that could be deemed necessary. Thus the *knowledge of the intention and purpose* is equivalent, if not to a *positive* rule, determining all and singular the powers bestowed on any institution, at least to a *negative*, ascertaining what must be given to it, and what cannot be denied to it.

Now, is the purpose for which Christ instituted the Pri-

macy, and honoured Peter with its dignity, unknown, or is it most truly ascertained? The end which moved Christ to make the college of Apostles unequal, and to set Peter as head over it, is it secret, or very conspicuous? There are in all three *classes of reasons* which enable us to form, not a mere guess, but an ascertained judgment, as to the purpose of Christ in instituting the Primacy. There are *typical* reasons, drawn from previous shadowings forth of it: there are *analogical*, derived from relations of resemblance; and there are *real*, inherent in the testimonies themselves, and the Church's endowments. Let us briefly exhibit these in order.

I. By, then, that signal agreement wherewith the two dispensations, the old and the new, correspond to each other, the first in outline, and the last as filled up, this rudimental, and that complete, we are plainly instructed that it was Christ's purpose for Peter, in the new dispensation, to bear the character, whose lineaments had been traced before in Abraham, and to be eminent among the Apostles, for the prerogative which Abraham had possessed among the Patriarchs. Now, Abraham's special prerogative, and pre-eminence, was this, that no one could share either promise, whether carnal or spiritual, which is expressed in Scripture by "the Blessing," who was not joined with Abraham by a double, that is, a carnal and spiritual, a physical and moral, bond. For to him and to his seed were the promises made, with the condition, that only by conjunction with him, and with his seed, they could flow over to the rest. Since, then, in the new dispensation, Peter was to sustain the character of Abraham in the old, and since the only-begotten Son of the Father, having put on the form of a servant, granted to Peter the prerogative which, in prelude of His future order, He had given to Abraham, it is plain that Simon was chosen, honoured with the name of Cephas, and preferred above all, in order that from him as supreme minister of Christ, and by union with him as visible head, all the members of the Church's body might enjoy the blessings and fruits of the Christian institution.

The deductions from this are easy to see. For two things chiefly follow, specially declarative of the nature of the Primacy, and showing its intent to be the cause and efficient principle of that unity by which the Church of Christ is one visible body. First, there follows the *duty* laid upon all the faithful, of being joined with Peter, if they would not fall from those promises with which Christ has most bountifully enriched His mystical Body, being no other than that which reverences Peter as its visible head. Secondly, there follows Peter's *jurisdiction*, in virtue of which he enjoins all to form one communion and society with him, as well as effects, defends, and maintains it. Now, nothing can be stronger than this ordinance of Christ, either to prove a Primacy of supreme jurisdiction, or to unfold its purpose of effecting and maintaining unity.

The same is the bearing of another type no less remarkable, and no less adapted to explain the whole matter. For, as Israel, "according to the flesh," was the shadow of the "Israel of God," which was "according to promise :"* and as the kingdom of Israel was a type and ensample of the kingdom of heaven, the approach of which Christ proclaimed in these words, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of heaven is at hand : " so the twelve sons of Israel, the heads of the Israelitish race, represented and imaged out those Twelve whom Christ chose, made princes in His Church, and endowed with supreme authority to build up that Church's structure, and enrich it day by day with new accessions of spiritual children. Of this type our Lord's words are the strongest guarantee : "Amen, I say unto you, that you who have followed Me in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His Majesty, you also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." And, again, in the very discourse where He sets forth the future Superior, "I dispose to you, as My Father disposed to Me, a kingdom ; that you may eat and drink at My table, in My kingdom ; and may sit upon thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." †

* 1 Cor. x. 18 ; Gal. vi. 16.

† Matt. xix. 28 ; Luke xxii. 29.

But now, though all the sons of Israel in the former typical kingdom were chiefs, and heads of tribes, yet one of them, that is Judah, had a special prerogative, which the Scriptures set forth, and which was called the *right of the first-born*. In virtue of this, on the one hand, Judah was esteemed the Lord of his brethren, whom they were to reverence as the parent of the whole family; and on the other, it was only by union with him, and with the seed that was to spring from him, that the other chiefs could promise to themselves the divine blessing. And so the tribe of Judah had a great pre-eminence over the other eleven. It was its prerogative to take the lead;* it had received from God the promise of an authority † which was not to terminate before the old covenant should be transformed into the new: from it was the seed † to be expected, which should be the source of blessing to all nations, prefigured as they were by the twelve tribes; the other tribes were bound ‡ to union with it, and to the profession of its religion, on pain of falling into schism, and forfeiting the divine covenant. All this was expressed by Jacob in prophetic inspiration, when he addressed Judah as the head and root of his line: "Judah (praise) art thou, thy brethren shall praise thee: thy hand is on the neck of thine enemies: the sons of thy father shall bow down to thee." It remains, then, to ask, who was to represent Judah's person in the new kingdom, and on whom Christ bestowed the prerogative, the type and image of which had gone before in Judah. It is most plain that this was Simon Peter, for whom we have, therefore, to claim a double prerogative, the one of being the source and origin, from which no one may be separated without severance from the kingdom and promises of Christ: the other of being the first-born, as betokening excellence, by which he was pre-eminent in the possession of special rights among his brethren, the Apostles.

The former prerogative was expressed by the Fathers of Aquileia, when, in the words of St. Ambrose, they stated their

* See Num. ii. 3-9; x. 14; Judges i. 1-3; xx. 18.

† Gen. xlix. 10; and see John iv. 22.

‡ 3 Kings xii.

belief in St. Peter's chair, "For thence, as from a fountain-head, the rights of venerable communion flow unto all." * The latter is confirmed and illustrated by the solemn expressions so often recurring in Christian records, wherein Peter is called "the Bishop of Bishops," † "the Pastor of Pastors," ‡ "first prelate of the Apostles," § "Patriarch of the whole world," || "universal bishop," ¶ "father of fathers," ** "having the dignity of pastoral headship," *** "the most divine of all heads, arch-pastor of the Church." **

II. To these reasons, which, as we think, may be called *typical*, succeed the *analogical*, which prove with equal evidence the purpose of the Primacy as instituted, and its inherent powers. If we ask what are these reasons from analogy, and to what they point, one only answer can be given commended by any show of truth, that the Primacy was instituted in order that the Church of Christ might seem to be moulded after the analogy of one human body, one house, one kingdom, one city, and one fold. But whence the need that so very remarkable and clear an analogy should be obtained by the institution of the Primacy? Doubtless because the Primacy was created as a principle, by whose virtue and efficiency what was various and manifold should be gathered up into unity, because it was to be a head in which all the diverse members of the ecclesiastical body should be joined, the centre of the Church's circle.

Therefore the reasons drawn from analogy show that the unity of the Church is to be considered the special end for which the Primacy was instituted, and the Primacy itself a principle abundantly provided with all those means by which so admirable a blessing as unity may be first produced and then maintained.

* St. Ambrose, Ep. 11.

† Arnobius Junior in Ps. 138.

‡ Eucherius of Lyons, Hom. in Vig. St. Petri.

§ Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople, on the Transfiguration.

|| The Archimandrites of Syria to Pope Hormisdas, Mansi 8, 428.

¶ St. Bernard, de Cons. lib. 2, c. 8.

** S. Theodore Studites to Pope Leo III., lib. I. Ep. 33.

And this is confirmed by another analogy, well worthy of close attention. This consists in the double and reciprocal relation in which the universal Church stands to particular Churches, and the institution of the Primacy to the institution of Bishops, who, by Christ's appointment, govern those particular Churches: an agreement which ought to have especial force with those who believe in the divine institution of Bishops. For as the whole society of true believers, and the particular congregations of which it is made up, are called in Holy Scripture and the Christian records by one and the same name of the Church, so is there the very closest analogy between the bond which connects the universal Church and that which connects its several parts.

Exactly, then, as it is asserted with great truth of all these particular Churches that they are one house, one city, and one fold, so must this be repeated of the whole Church, since it is set forth in Scripture by no other images, and has no less right to claim the property of unity. Hence St. Chrysostom's golden saying, "If it is the Church of God, it is united and one, not at Corinth only, but in the whole world. For *the Church* is a name not of division, but of union and harmony;"* and St. Gregory calls it, "The tunic without seam, woven from the top throughout." †

Now, the same reason which existed for instituting particular Bishops to govern and preserve in unity particular flocks, moved Christ to institute a universal Primate, and to set him over the whole fold. If in the former case the best description of a particular Church is that of St. Cyprian, "A people united to its Priest, and a flock adhering to its Pastor;" ‡ in the latter the *form of unity*, which Christ established in the universal Primate, no less imposes on all, both taught and teachers, the necessity of saying with St. Jerome, "I, following none as the first save Christ, am joined in communion with your blessedness, that is, with the chair of Peter. Upon that

* In 1 Cor. Hom. I. n. 1.

† St. Greg. Naz., Orat. 12, alluding to John xix. 23.

‡ St. Cyprian, Ep. 79.

rock the Church is built, I know. Whoever outside of this house eateth the lamb, is profane. If any one was not in the ark of Noah, he shall perish. I know not Vitalis; I reject Meletius; I am ignorant of Paulinus. Whoever gathers not with thee, scatters: that is, he who is not of Christ is of Antichrist."*

III. A great accession of evidence will accrue to what we have said if we attentively consider the reasons deduced from the texts containing the institution of the Primacy, and those proceeding from the inherent properties of the Church. To speak of the texts first:

1. Either they carry no meaning with them, or they prove at least this, that Christ, in instituting the Primacy, intended,† while exhibiting the whole Church under the usual image of a house and building, to give it a *foundation*, the bond at once of its strength and unity; and, again, while communicating to one the special gift of unwavering faith, to make him the channel for establishing and *confirming* ‡ all the faithful; to render § the fold which He had gathered out of all nations one by the unity of a supreme visible *pastor*, and to constitute || in the Lord's family, amid so manifold a distinction of officers, one of such eminence as to be *the Ruler* and *the Greater* among all.

But can we, or ought we, to conclude from this as to the purpose of the Primacy, and as to its constituent force and principle? Assuredly these texts prove directly and categorically that the Primacy was set up as *the efficient principle*, whereby to mould the Church's visible unity, and was endowed with all that authority, without which unity could neither have been produced, nor maintained in existence.

2. And in this judgment we shall be confirmed if we investigate the properties of which the Church cannot be deprived, without taking a form and an appearance different from that which it received from Christ. The first which

* St. Jerome, Ep. 57.

† Matt. xvi. 18.

‡ Luke xxii. 31, 32.

§ John xxi. 15.

|| Luke xxii. 26.

occurs is that *identity* by which the Church must always be like itself, and cannot be substantially different at its beginning and in its growth; one thing when it had Christ for its visible head, and another when His words had come to pass, "A little while, and now you shall not see Me—because I go to the Father." Now, at its first commencement, in the time of our Lord's mortal life, the Church presented the form of a society governed by the supreme power of one, and deriving its visible unity from one supreme visible head. That it might not subsequently lose this identity, and put on another form, our Lord chose a Primate to be the principle of visible unity, and to have the power of a head over the whole body.

And indeed this was necessary to maintain the double character and test of *unity* * and *Catholicity*, † by which the Church is distinguished in Holy Scripture and in the records of Christian antiquity. As to *unity*, not only are the expressions in the creeds, and the more ample explanation of them in the Fathers, ‡ most clear and emphatic, but likewise what is said in the Holy Scriptures of the *end* for which the Church was founded by Christ. For the grace § of God our Saviour hath appeared to all men, instructing those who had || changed the truth of God into a lie, and liked not to have God in their knowledge, that denying ¶ all these things they might become an acceptable people, and enlightened ** by Christ, and sanctified in the truth, might by the profession of one faith be one †† body and one spirit, in the same manner ‡‡ in which the Father and

* Unity. John x. 16; xvii. 20–23; 1 Cor. xii. 12–31; Ephes. ii. 14–22; iv. 5; 1 Cor. i. 10.

† Catholicity. Luke xxiv. 47; Mark xvi. 20; Acts i. 8; ix. 15; Rom. ix. 18; Colos. i. 8–23.

‡ For all the Fathers hold the doctrine thus expressed by St. Hilary of Poitiers on Ps. 121, n. 5. "The Church is one body, not mixed up by a confusion of bodies, nor by each of these being united in an indiscriminate heap and shapeless bundle; but we are all one by the unity of faith, by the society of charity, by concord of works and will, by the one gift of the sacrament in all." No notion of the Church's unity in England, it may be remarked, outside of Catholicism, goes beyond "the indiscriminate heap and shapeless bundle."

§ Tit. ii. 11. || Rom. i. 25. ¶ Tit. ii. 14, with 1 Pet. ii. 25.

** John xvii. 17.

†† Eph. iv. 4.

‡‡ John xvii. 21.

the Son are one, and might be divided * by no sects and dissensions, which are manifestly the works of the flesh, not of God, who is not the God † of dissension but of Peace. For therefore Christ, ‡ the only-begotten of the Father, gave His blood for it, to present it to Himself, a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, which would break peace, and disturb the agreement of faith; but that it should be holy and without blemish, § immovable through that rock on which it rests, and against which not even the gates of hell shall prevail; wisely ordered as the house of God, || in which ¶ all hear his voice, who is set over as the ruler, ** and has received his brethren to be confirmed, †† and the care †† of the whole flock; endued §§ with virtue from on high, and strengthened by the Spirit of truth ||| who proceeds from the Father; possessing the power of authoritative ¶¶ teaching, which if any hear *** not, nor obey, they are to be accounted as heathens and publicans, by a judgment which binds both in heaven and on earth. Are there any who do not see that in this description, which sets forth the Church's pre-ordained end, its proper character and very lineaments, the Primacy itself is included, and exhibited as the principal cause which effects the unity of the whole body? I hardly think that any such can be, so apparent is the bond which ties these several parts together.

Yet perhaps this may be more vividly brought out if we shortly mention the common opinions among Protestants on the Church's unity. For, omitting those who hold an invisible ††† Church, and so expunge visible unity from its attributes, all the other opinions may be reduced to three.

A. Anglicans, whose belief has been set forth, besides Pearson on the Creed, with more than usual care by Dodwell

* Gal. v. 20, 19. † 1 Cor. xiv. 33. ‡ Eph. v. 27. § Matt. xvi. 18.

|| 1 Tim. iii. 15. ¶ Matt. xviii. 17. ** Luke xxii. 26.

†† Luke xxii. 31, 32. †† John xxi. 15. §§ Acts i. 4-8.

||| John xv. 26. ¶¶ Matt. xxviii. 20. *** Matt. xviii. 18.

††† The first Reformers fell into this grievous error because they had no other way to defend their schism. They may be passed over at present, as in most even of the Protestant confessions visibility is reckoned among the notes of the Church.

(in his Treatise on the Bishop, as the Principle of Unity, and St. Peter's Primacy among the Apostles as the Exemplar of Unity), begin by noting that the question of visible unity cannot be determined in the same way as it respects the universal Church, or each particular Church. But why? Because, they say, it was indeed the will of Christ, that each particular Church should have a double unity, inward and outward, but it was not His will that the whole Church, the sum of these particular Churches, should have the same mark and test. Because, it was His will that both unities should characterize the particular Churches, to use a school phrase, *separately* and *distributively*, but not the whole body, and the sum of these, taken *collectively*. Whence they conclude that Bishops were chosen and made, by the command of Christ, to preside over particular Churches, and be in them the source and principle of external unity, but that a Primate was not chosen, to whom the whole Church should be subject, and on whom its external unity should depend.

At this argument one is lost in astonishment, how it could have suggested itself to learned men, and gained their assent. For what had they to prove, or how could they assure themselves, or others, as to either of these two points, that external unity was necessary to particular Churches, but not to the whole Church, or that the institution of Bishops, presiding over particular Churches, came from Christ, but not that of the Primate, whose charge was to rule, administer, and maintain in unity the whole Church. Had they texts wherein to trust? But as often as the Bible speaks of the Church's unity, it means that Church, which is called "the kingdom of God," "the kingdom of Christ," and "the kingdom of heaven," which is termed "the inheritance of the Gentiles," and embraces with a mother's bosom, and a mother's love, the whole race of man, from one end of the earth to the other. Had they creeds to cite? But in these unity is attributed to that Church only, which is so termed absolutely, and very often has the epithet of Catholic.

Moreover, is the word Church, in its unrestricted application, of doubtful meaning? On the contrary, it is specially defined as well in the Holy Scriptures,* where it expresses of itself the whole society of believers, as in the Fathers, such as Irenæus,† Tertullian, ‡ Clement § of Alexandria, Origen, || Hilary, ¶ Jerome,** and all the rest without exception, who, in using it, express the whole Christian people joined in one sole communion. It is defined also by Councils, as in the Canons of Laodicea, †† Carthage, ‡‡ and Constantinople, §§ where the Church means the whole assembly of orthodox believers, as distinct from heretics and schismatics. It is defined in the most ancient explanation of the creeds, the unanimous meaning of which Tertullian seems to have rendered in saying: “And, therefore, so many and so great Churches are that first one from the Apostles, whence all come. So all are first, and all Apostolical, while all set forth one unity, while they have interchange of peace, the appellation of brotherhood and the common rights of friendship, privileges regulated by no other principle than the tradition of the same sacrament.” ||| Lastly, the very heretics ¶¶ defied this term, who, in order to make themselves understood, could use the word Church in no other sense than to express the universal assembly of the faithful.

After this it is not at all necessary to ask Anglicans afresh if they have ancient Fathers whose authority they can quote. What these thought and believed about the Church’s unity is fully shown by those whom we have quoted, and by the words of Irenæus, “The Church, though dispersed throughout the whole world, yet, as if it were contained in the same house,

* 1 Cor. vi. 4; x. 32; xi. 22; xii. 28; Ephes. i. 22; iii. 10–21; v. 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32; Colos. i. 18–24; 1 Tim. iii. 15.

† Irenæus, lib. 1, c. 3, lib. 3, c. 4.

§ Clement, Stromat, lib. 7, 17.

¶ Hilary, de Trin. lib. 7, c. 12.

†† Concil. Laodic. Can. 9, 10.

§§ Concil. Constant. 2, act 3.

‡ Tertullian, de Præsc. c. 4.

|| Origen in Cantic. Hom. 3.

** Jerome, adv. Luceifer.

‡‡ Concil. Carthag. 4, Can. 71.

||| De Præsc. c. 20.

¶¶ See in the sixth act of the second Nicene Council the quotations from the iconoclast synod of Constantinople.

carefully preserves the rule of faith, and holds it as if she had one soul and one heart, nay, and teaches it with one consent, as if she spoke with one voice. For although different tongues occupy the world, yet, the force of tradition is one and the same, nor do the Churches of Germany, Spain, Gaul, the East, Egypt, Libya, and the middle of the world embrace any other faith. But as there is one and the same sun shining over the whole world, so the preaching of the truth shines everywhere, and enlightens all men who desire its knowledge." *

What, then, was the motive of Anglicans, in maintaining the unity of particular Churches, and the institution of Bishops cohering with it, to be necessary, while they denied the necessity of unity in the Church universal, or of a Primate's institution, to effect universal unity? What induced them to assert incompatibilities, and defend them as a matter of life and death? The evidence of the Scriptures, and the unquestionable belief of all Christian antiquity, extorted from them the acknowledgment that unity was a mark of the Church, and the ascription to Christ of the institution of Bishops as necessary for the forming and maintaining unity. *But the fixed purpose of defending their schism, and their determination to reject the Primacy, urged them to deny that unity in the whole Church was ordered and provided for by Christ.* The result of these affirmatives and negatives was a doctrinal † monster of incomparable ugliness, an outrage on the light both of nature and of revelation, as incapable of defence, as abhorrent from reason and from grace.

B. The second Protestant opinion has been set forth at length by Vitringa, ‡ and supported with all his ingenuity. It is that of those who distinguish a twofold unity of the Church, one interior, spiritual, proceeding from union with one and the

* Adv. Hæreses, lib. 1, c. 3.

† Even the Puritan Cartwright observed, "If it be necessary to the unity of the Church that an Archbishop should preside over other Bishops, why not on the same principle should one Archbishop preside over the whole Church of God?"—Defence of Whitgift.

‡ Sacred Observations, lib. 5, c. 7, on the hypothetical external communion of Christians.

same invisible Head, Jesus Christ, and completed and perfected by the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit, and the bestowal of heavenly gifts ; the other exterior, visible, depending on profession of the same faith, participation of the same sacraments, obedience to the same superiors. Having made this distinction, they proceed to argue for the purpose of proving that while the former unity is universal, and absolutely necessary, the latter is neither universal nor necessary, save hypothetically (of which hypothesis Vitringa nowhere explains the nature), and so is capable both of extension and restriction. In a word, they attach simple and absolute necessity and universality to the spiritual and invisible unity, but by no means to the external and visible.

But for this what are their authorities? Can they allege the most ancient Fathers in unbroken succession from the Apostles? Nay, they candidly confess that the Fathers thought external and visible unity simply and absolutely necessary, and not those only of the fourth and fifth century, but those of the second and third. Witness Vitringa,* who says, "If we consult on this point the doctors of the ancient Christian Church, they seem on all hands to have embraced the view that the communion of believers in holy rites, in the supper of the Lord, and in reciprocal offices of brotherly love, was maintained absolutely, not hypothetically. They supposed, and seem to have persuaded themselves, that all who were joined to the Christian Church by the due right of baptism after previous preparation, were really regenerated by the grace of the Holy Spirit, and so that the Christian Church was an assembly of men, who in far greater part, saving hypocrites, of whom a few might exist in secret, participated in the renewing and sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, to be joined to the Church was much the same as being joined to the heavenly city ; to have one's name on the Church's books, much the same as to have it in God's book of life. On the other hand, to be severed from Church communion, or, to

* See also the testimony of Mosheim, quoted above, p. 216, note.

use Tertullian's words, 'to be deprived of the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and to be debarred from all brotherly communion,' was to risk salvation, and incur the danger of eternal death. That is, they supposed that no one was saved out of the external communion of the Church, which they confounded with the mystical and spiritual communion of the Saints. And again, kindred points to these, and resting on the same principle, that Bishops represent the office and person of Jesus Christ Himself in the Christian Church; that those who separated themselves from them when rightly and duly elected, separated themselves at the same time from the communion of Christ Himself. That those who were absolved by the bishops after penance publicly performed according to the canons of ecclesiastical discipline, restored to their rank, and honoured with the kiss of peace, were absolved in the heavenly court by God Himself, and Christ the Judge. Lastly, which was the most *audacious* * of all such hypotheses, that it was all over with the salvation of all who separated themselves in schism from the external communion of the Church and its rites, although hitherto they had neither been tainted with heresy, nor involved in crimes destructive of the Christian † profession. It would be easy for me to support at length each one of these particulars by the sentiments and the discipline of the doctors of the primitive Church, were they unknown to the more instructed, or did my purpose allow it. I now only appeal to Cyprian's letter to Magnus, in the whole of which he supposes and urges the very hypotheses which I have been enumerating; and amongst the rest, speaking of Novatian's schism, he writes thus distinctly: 'But if there is one Church, which is beloved

* Thus the universal belief of the Fathers from the beginning is charged with *audacity*. It is difficult not to be struck with the utter antagonism of feeling which separates Protestants from the whole body of the Fathers. The statements here ascribed, and truly, by Vitranga to them, would be viewed, in modern English society, as the very insanity of bigotry.

† Because to rend Christ's mystical body, and to subvert that unity for which He had prayed the Father, was regarded by them as a crime of the deepest dye. In modern England it would be consecrated by the glorious principle of "civil and religious liberty."

by Christ, and alone is cleansed in His laver, how can he who is not in the Church,' (that is, in communion with that particular external assembly which makes a part of the external Catholic Church,) 'be loved by Christ, or washed and cleansed in His laver? Wherefore, as the Church alone possesses the water of life, and the power of baptizing and washing a man, let him who asserts that any one can be baptized and sanctified with Novatian, first show and teach that Novatian is in the Church, or *presides over the Church*.* For the Church is one, which, being one, cannot be at once within and without. For if it is with Novatian, it was not with Cornelius. But if it was with Cornelius, who succeeded the Bishop Fabian in regular order, and whom the Lord hath glorified with martyrdom over and above the rank of his high priesthood, Novatian is not in the Church.' † It is the precise thing which we have been stating."

But where did Vitranga and the supporters of his doctrine get courage to contradict the whole line of Fathers and their unbroken tradition? You would surely expect from them decisive arguments, and expressions from Holy Writ distinctly laying down no other than a *hypothetical* necessity of visible and external unity. But you may search in vain all over the Gospels, the Epistles, and the Acts, for any such. Not only is there no mention in them of such a distinction as that invisible unity is absolutely necessary, while external and visible unity is but hypothetically so, but this latter is plainly enjoined and set forth as the note which the mystical body of Christ, the true Church, cannot be without; and its violation is reckoned among those works of the flesh which exclude from the kingdom of God.

How, besides, can that be deemed necessary only under hypothesis, without holding and faithfully maintaining which

* The unrestricted expression, "to preside over the Church," used by Cyprian of Novatian, who claimed to be Peter's successor, contains a clear indication that the fold entrusted to Peter was as wide as the Church itself. It is the same Church in the two clauses, but in the former it *must* be understood universally.

† Ep. 69.

you cut yourself off from the very fountain of blessing, and transgress and subvert the order appointed by God for attaining salvation? Such an assertion would be senseless. Yet in most of the Protestant professions,—the Helvetic, art. xiv., the Gallican, art. xvi., the Scotch, art. xxvii., the Belgian, art. xxviii., the Saxon, art. xii., the Bohemian, art. viii., and that of the Remonstrants, art. xxii.,—it is laid down as an indisputable principle, “That the heirs of eternal life are only to be found in the assembly of those called.” What then do those who violate outward and visible unity, and withdraw from the outward and visible body of the Church? They stop up the very way which Providence has opened for their obtaining “the inheritance of sons.”

For indeed Christ is the Saviour, but of His mystical body, which is the Church,* which therefore He purchased with His own blood, joined to Himself by that closest bond of being His spouse, enriched with promises,† provided with all manner of graces, and most nobly dowered with truth, charity, and the Holy Spirit,‡ to give her at last salvation, and “the weight of eternal glory.”§ But have these things reference to a visible or an invisible Church? To a Church one and coherent, or rent and torn by factions? It is the Church which Christ founded, which He made to be “the light of the world,” || bound together by manifold ¶ external links, ordered to be one with the unity of a house, a family, a city, a kingdom; with that unity wherewith the Father and the Son are one; in which He placed ** pastor and doctors to bind and to loose, and to watch over the agreement of all the parts; which He founded upon Peter, committed in chief to

* Ephes. v. 23–25.

† Ephes. iv. 15–17.

‡ John xiv. 16–26; xv. 26; xvi. 7.

§ 2 Cor. iv. 17.

|| Matt. v. 14.

¶ Compare Luke xii. 8, 9, with Matt. x. 32; Mark viii. 38; Rom. x. 10; and again, Mark xvi. 15, with Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts ii. 41; viii. 36; xix. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 13; and Matt. xxvi. 28, with Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. x. 17; xi. 21; and Ephes. iv. 11, with Acts xx. 28; Tit. i. 5.

** Compare Ephes. iv. 11–16, with 1 Cor. xii. 13–31; and Matt. xviii. 18, with John xx. 21; Acts xv. 41; xvi. 4; 2 Cor. x. 6; 1 Tim. v. 20; Tit. i. 13; ii. 15.

Peter to rule and to feed it. Such, then, as fall off from one single visible Church are of the condition of those whom the Apostles of the Lord foretold, that "in the last time there should come mockers, walking according to their own desires in ungodliness: these are they who separate themselves, sensual men, having not the Spirit:"* these tear themselves from their Saviour, lose the fruit purchased by His blood, and fall from the inheritance which the Head obtained for His body and His members.

Therefore the necessity of union with the one single visible Church is as great as the necessity of union with Christ the Head, as the necessity of the remission of sins, "for outside of it they are not remitted: for this Church has specially received the Holy Spirit in earnest, without whom no sins are remitted:"† as the necessity of charity, "for it is this very charity which those who are cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church do not possess," ‡ whence "whatsoever thing heretics and schismatics receive, the charity which covers a multitude of sins is the gift of Catholic unity and peace:"§ as great, in fine, as the necessity not to involve oneself "in a horrible crime and sacrilege,"|| "in the greatest of evils,"¶ one "by which Christ's passion is rendered of no effect, and His body is rent,"** by which †† the sin is committed of which Christ said, "It shall not be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come:" by which one is estranged "from the sole Catholic Church, which retains the true worship, in which is the fountain of truth, the home of faith, the temple of God, into which if any one enter not, or from which if any one go out, he loses the hope of life and eternal salvation. Let no one flatter himself in the spirit of obstinate contention, for life is at issue, and salvation,

* Jude 18; 2 Pet. iii. 2, 3.

† Augustin. in Enchirid. c. 63.

‡ Aug. in Tract. de Symb. c. 11.

§ Aug. de Baptismo, cont. Donat. lib. 3, c. 16.

|| Aug. Cont. Litt. Petilian, lib. 1, c. 21-22; lib. 22, c. 13-23; lib. 3, c. 52.

¶ Optat. lib. 1.

** Ambros. de Obitu Satyri Fratris, lib. 1, n. 47.

†† Idem de Pœnit. lib. 2, 4.

which without care and caution will be forfeited.”* Can any necessity be greater, or less conditional than this? Or what can be more plain than this statement of the simple and absolute necessity of visible unity and outward communion?

Where, then, are we to find the cause which induced so many learned and able Protestants first to imagine this distinction between the necessity of internal and external communion and unity, and then to deceive themselves and others with such a mockery? The real cause was, as I believe, that having denied the institution of the Primacy, and the authority lodged in it for the purpose of forming and maintaining unity, they were without a criterion or proof, in virtue of which, among so many Christian societies divided from and condemning each other, they could safely choose the one with which they were to be joined in communion, and the outward unity of duty and obedience. For they would readily conclude that the unity so often commended in Scripture, and so earnestly enjoined, could not be external, since God, who does not command impossibilities, had instituted no visible sign to mark that company of Christians, which alone among all the rest was the continuation and development of the Church founded by Christ, and built up by the Apostles.

C. From the same source must the third Protestant doctrine on unity be derived. Jurien † filled up the sketch of this, which Casaubon, ‡ Claude, § and Mestrezat || had drawn, and it became so popular as not only to infect a large number of Protestants, but to exert a withering influence on certain unstable members of the Catholic body. It teaches that we must believe not only in an internal and spiritual, but in a visible and external unity, for the Scriptures plainly urge its necessity, and Christian tradition fully describes it, so that there is not a truth more patent or established on greater

* Lactant. Div. Institut. lib. 3, c. 30.

† Le vrai Système de l'Église.

‡ Answer to Cardinal Perron.

§ Défense de la Réforme, p. 200.

|| Traité de l'Église, p. 286.

authority ; but this unity is restricted within narrow bounds, and confined to the articles called fundamental, though as to how many these are no one defender of the system is agreed with another. For it is sufficient for Christians not to differ in the profession of such articles for them to be deemed members of one and the same Church. Whence they infer that one and the same true Church is made up out of almost all Christian societies, the Roman, the Greek, the Nestorian, the Eutychian, the Waldensian, the Lutheran, the Anglican, and the Calvinist, for their differences, important as they are, offer no hindrance to the unity which Christ enjoined, the Apostles preached, the creeds express, and universal tradition demands.

As Bossuet,* the brothers Walemburg,† Nicole,‡ and even some Protestants have most fully dealt with this portentous opinion, there is no need to urge much against it here. I prefer repeating the question, What *occasion* the Protestants had to get up so unheard-of a paradox, and a system so absurd ? It was twofold : one theoretical, and the other practical.

The theoretical was this. The crime of heresy, depicted in Scripture, and Christian antiquity, with colours so dark, had gradually lost its foulness and its magnitude in the minds of Protestants, who had, at length, come to the pass of reckoning religious, as well as civil, liberty, among the unquestionable rights of man. As if, all other human acts being subject to a law, those alone which proceed from the intellect are exempt : as if the difference between right and wrong, which embraces the whole range of man's life, did not relate to its noblest part, in the acts of the intellect and the reason : as if God had laid down a law of justice, charity, fortitude, and prudence, but entirely omitted a *law § of faith* :

* Bossuet, writings against Jurien.

† The brothers Walemburg, Treatise on Necessary and Fundamental Articles.

‡ Nicole, de l'Unité de l'Église.

§ See the recognition of this law, Mark xvi. 16 ; Matt. xxvii. 18-20 ; Luke xii. 8, 9 ; Rom. x. 10.

as if the will submitted to a law of *good*, but the mind owned no law of *truth*: or as if God cared for the boughs and leaves, but took no thought of the root.* But what could Protestants do? Having allowed to all full licence of thought, and overthrown the authority which ruled the mind, they were forced, while they kept the *name* of heresy, to give up the *thing* meant by it, and the effects springing from that thing: they were forced to attenuate to the utmost the crime of heresy, and to reduce to the smallest possible number articles necessary to be believed by all; they were forced to extend beyond all measure the Church's limits, while they contracted beyond all measure the range of necessary unity.

Besides the theoretical, there was a practical occasion in those schisms which, not merely in later or in mediæval times, but in the first ages also, rent the Christian society. Jurien and Pfaff appeal to these, pretentiously enumerating those which arose under Popes Victor, Cornelius, Stephen, Urban VI., and Clement VII., and those named from Donatus, Meletius, and Acacius. Then they ask if the true Church of Christ can be thought to consist in one single society perfectly at union with itself. They allege many conjectures against this, but dwell on the argument that *in defect of a visible external test*, such an assertion could not be maintained without *imposing upon all a most intolerable burden of searching out where is the true doctrine and the legitimate ministerial succession*: for it is not until these are found, that, at length, that one single society will be recognized, with which, as the only true Church, unity of communion is to be kept.

Now, I profess that I do not see how this argument can be met, if the institution of the Primacy, and its proper function to form and maintain unity, be rejected. For, with-

* Such the Fathers call Faith, terming it, "the beginning and foundation," "the greatest mother of virtues," "the principle of salvation," "the prelude of immortality," "the clear eye of divine knowledge," "the fountain of all wisdom." See Suicer, art. *πίστις*.

out this, by what visible token among so many Christian societies, divided by intestine dissension, and condemning each other, can you distinguish the one which has the character of the true Church, and the right to exact communion with itself? There is none to be found; and so, either all hopes of finding the true Church must be relinquished, or an inquiry must be undertaken into purity of doctrine, and legitimate ministerial succession, on the termination of which the only true Church will at last be found. But as this latter course is to by far the greater number of men impossible, dangerous* to all without exception, and most foreign to the Christian temper, the only conclusion remaining is, that the selection of a Primacy with the power of effecting unity impressed upon it *is most intimately involved and bound up in the visibility and unity of the true Church.*

And quite as closely is it bound up with that other test of the Church, its Catholicism. We are not to believe Voss and King,† in their assertion that this test began to be applied first in the fourth century, for the purpose of distinguishing the genuine company of the orthodox, and the true body of Christ, from heretics and schismatics. For we find the Church distinguished by the epithet of Catholic, not merely in the records of the fourth‡ and fifth§ century, but in those of the third,|| and the second,¶ at the beginning of which St. Ignatius wrote, "Follow all of you the Bishop, as Jesus Christ

* After having gone through the search for ten long years, I may be allowed to express how great its danger, and how great too the blessedness of those who are not exposed to it. It is worth the experience of half a life to receive the truth, without personal inquiry, from a competent authority. Protestantism begins its existence by casting away one of the greatest blessings which man can have.

† De Symbolo, Diss. 1, 39, and Hist. Symb. Apostol. cap. 6, 16.

‡ Pacian, Ep. 1, n. 4. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. 18, n. 23. Eusebius on Isai. xxxii. 18. Chrysostom on Colos. hom. 1, n. 2; on 1 Cor. hom. 32, n. 1. Jerome on Matt. xxiv. 26.

§ Augustine on Ps. 41, n. 7; Epist. 49, n. 3-52, n. 1, and elsewhere.

|| Council of Antioch, quoted by Euseb. Hist. lib. 7, c. 30. Origen on Romans, lib. 8, n. 1; Cyprian, Epist. 52; Acts of St. Fructuosus, n. 3, and of St. Pionius, n. 9.

¶ Irenæus, lib. 3, c. 17, and Epistle on Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, n. 19.

the Father; and the body of Presbyters, as Apostles. But reverence deacons, as the command of Christ. Without the Bishop let nothing of what concerns the Church be done by any one. Let that be deemed a proper Eucharist which is under the Bishop, or with his sanction. Where the Bishop is, there also let the multitude be; as, where Christ Jesus is, *there is the Catholic Church.*"* As, therefore, that cannot be the Church of Christ, which is not Catholic, we ought to investigate the meaning which is given to this word by the consent of all orthodox believers.

Now, two points are signified in it, one of which is its *material*, the other its *formal*, or *essential*, part. Its *material* part is, that the geographical extension of the true Church be such that its mass be *morally* † universal, *absolutely* great, and eminently visible, but *comparatively* with all heretical and schismatical sects, larger and more numerous. Of this *material* meaning attached to the epithet Catholic, we find abundant witnesses in all ‡ the orthodox writers who defended the cause of the Church against the Donatists, and again, against the Luciferians § and Novatians; and likewise, in those who have explained the creeds, || and, as occasion offered, have touched on the force of the term Catholic. ¶ But the same first-cited witnesses tell us that universal diffusion is not sufficient, and that we require another element to infuse a soul into this universally extended body, and to bring it to unity.

For two properties are continually recurring in Christian records, one of which may be called *negative*, the other *affirmative*. The force of the former is to *expel from the circle*

* Epist. to Smyrneans, n. 8.

† Augustine, Ep. 52, n. 1, Sermon. 238, n. 3.

‡ As Optatus, lib. 2, Aug. de Unitate Ecc. c. 2, etc.; cont. Cresconium, l. 2 c. 68. Contr. Petilian, l. 2, c. 12-55, 58-73; on Ps. 21, 47, 147, and on 1 Ep. John Tract. 1, 2.

§ Pacian, Ep. 3, Jerome cont. Luciferianos.

|| Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat. 18.

¶ Irenæus, lib. 1, c. 10; lib. 4, c. 19. Tertullian adv. Judæos, c. 7. Bernard in Cantica, serm. 65.

of the one true Catholic Church all sects of heretics and schismatics : of the latter, that this Church consist in one single communion and society, whose members cohere together by hierarchical subordination.

But is it true that both these points are so plainly and constantly inculcated? To remove all doubt we will quote the authors who most distinctly assert the one and the other. As to the first, there are Clement of Alexandria,* Tertullian,† Alexander of Alexandria, ‡ Celestine, § Leander, || the Emperor Justinian ; ¶ then again the Councils of Nice,** Sardica, †† and the third of Carthage ; ††† nay, the heretics §§ themselves ; and all these agree in asserting that *there is one only ancient Catholic Church*, outside of which the Divine patience endures and bears with heresies, which are as thorns. Thus in language ecclesiastical and Christian nothing can be considered as more certainly proved than that the epithet of Catholic is *distinctive*, and shows the communion which rejects from its bosom all heresies and all schisms. It was with great reason, therefore, that Pacian ||| wrote what Cyril of Jerusalem ¶¶ and Augustine very frequently repeated, “Our people is divided from the heretical name by this appellation, that it is called Catholic.”***

Moreover this unity, which we have said may be called *negative*, is necessary indeed to the understanding of the Church as Catholic, but is by no means sufficient to complete the idea of Catholicity. To it therefore must be added the *affirmative* unity, by which Catholicism is not only divided from heretics and schismatics, but becomes in itself a coherent

* Clement, Stromat. l. 7, § 15-17.

† Tertullian de Præsc. c. 30.

‡ Alexander, apud Theodoret, H. E. lib. 1, c. 4.

§ Celestinus, Homil. in laud. eccles.

|| Leander, Cont. Origenistas in Actis Synodi V.

¶ Justinianus, Epist. ad Mennam Constantinopolitanum.

** Council of Nice, in the Creed, and Canon 8.

†† Sardica, in letter to all Bishops, quoted by Athanasius, Apol. 2.

††† 22nd Canon of Codex Africanus.

§§ The Nestorian profession of faith, in fifth act of Council of Ephesus.

||| Pacian, Ep. 1.

¶¶ Cyril, Catech. 18.

*** Aug. de Vera Relig. c. 6, de Utilit. Credendi, c. 7.

body with members and articulations. That which we so often read in the monuments of antiquity, about the necessity* of communion among the members of the Church and the tokens † and means of that communion, has reference to the assertion and maintenance of this unity, which is the soul of Catholicity, and without which it cannot even be conceived. There are very distinct and innumerable testimonies about it in the ancient Fathers, ‡ declaring its *necessity*, and setting forth its *mode* of composition and coherence.

For to set forth the *mode* of this is the plain drift of what Irenæus § writes in confutation of heretics by the tradition of the Apostolical Churches: "For since it would be very long in the compass of our present work to enumerate the successions of all the Churches, taking that Church which is the greatest, the most ancient, and well known to all, founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, by indicating that tradition which it has from the Apostles, and the faith which it announces to men, which has reached even to us by the succession of Bishops, we found all those, who, in whatsoever manner, either through self-pleasing, or vainglory, or blindness and evil intention, gather || otherwise than they ought. For to this Church on account of its superior principate, it is necessary that every Church should come together, ¶ that is, the faithful who are

* Pacian, Ep. 3, "The Church is a full and solid body, diffused already through the whole world. As a city, I say, whose parts are in unity. Not as you Novatians, an insolent particle, or a gathered wen, separated from the rest of the body."

† Such as are *γράμματα κοινωνικά*, Euseb. H. E. lib. 7, c. 30; *ἐπιστολαί κοινωνικαί*, Basil. Ep. 190, or *κανονικαί*, Ep. 224, letters of peace commendatory, ecclesiastical, etc.

‡ See especially Chrys. Hom. 30 on 1 Cor. § Irenæus, lib. 3, c. 3.

|| Compare Jerome's often-quoted passage, Ep. 15, to Pope Damasus, "Whoso gathereth not with thee, scattereth; that is, whoso is not of Christ is of anti-christ."

¶ For the meaning of "come together," see further on, c. 40. "God hath placed in the Church Apostles, Prophets, Doctors, and all the rest of the operation of the Spirit, of which all those are not partakers who do not *run together* to the Church, but defraud themselves of life by an evil intention and a very bad conduct. For where the Church is, there is the Spirit; and where is the Spirit of God, there is the Church and all grace."

everywhere; for in this Church the tradition which is from the Apostles has been ever preserved by those who are everywhere. . . . By this ordination and succession, the tradition and preaching of the truth, which is from the Apostles in the Church, has reached down to us. And this proof is most complete, that it is one and the same vivifying faith, which has been preserved, and handed down in truth, in the Church from the Apostles to the present day.”

The Churches, therefore, which are everywhere diffused, derive that strength and harmony of parts, out of which the whole body of the Catholic Church is made up, from the fact of their agreeing in the unity of faith and preaching with that Church of Peter, which is the greatest, the chief, and the more powerful. It follows that the Primacy of Peter, and the authority inherent in it to effect unity, is that principle which Christ selected, that the Church which He had set up might be Catholic, and bear the note of Catholicity on its brow.

And Cyprian would set forth the same *mode* of communion, when he speaks of the *coherence of Bishops*, by which both *the Catholic episcopate* is made one, and *the Church one and Catholic*. For as the *several communities draw the unity of the body from the unity of the prelates* to whom they are subject; so all prelates, and the communities subject to them, constitute *one Catholic episcopate and one Catholic Church*, because they cohere with the *principal Church, the root and matrix*, which is the Church of Peter, upon whom the Lord founded the whole building, and whom He instituted to be the *fountain and source of Catholic unity*.*

These words are a clue to understand Tertullian's † mean-

* See St. Cyprian's letters, 69, 55, 45, 70, 73, 40. Consider the force of the words, "Peter, upon whom the Church had been built by the 'Lord, speaking one for all, and answering with the voice of the Church, says, Lord, to whom shall we go?'" Ep. 55, on which Fenelon (de sum. Pontif. auct. c. 12) remarks, "What wonder, then, if Pope Hormisdas and other ancient Fathers say, 'the Roman, that is, the Catholic Church,' since Peter was wont to answer with the voice of the Church? What wonder if the body of the Church speaks by the mouth of its head?"

† De Pudicitia c. 21.

ing, when, already become a Montanist, he called the Catholic Church, whose discipline he was attacking, *the Church near to Peter*—"concerning your opinion, I now inquire whence you claim this right to the Church. If because the Lord said to Peter, 'Upon this rock I will build My Church,' 'to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' or 'whatsoever thou shalt bind or loose on earth, shall be bound or loosed in heaven,' you, therefore, pretend that the power of binding and loosing is derived to you, that is, to all the Church near to Peter; how do you overthrow and change the manifest intention of the Lord in conferring this on Peter *personally*,* 'Upon thee I will build My Church,' and 'I will give to thee the keys,' not to the Church, and 'whatsoever thou bindest or loosest,' not what they bind or loose?" Now, he used this mode of speaking because it was customary with Catholics, who were wont to exhibit *nearness with Peter* as the characteristic of the Church, and the necessary condition for sharing that power, whose plenitude and native source Christ had lodged in Peter.

This certain and undoubting judgment of Catholics, Tertullian himself, before his error, had clearly expressed in his book, "De Scorpiace," c. x., where he says, "For if you yet think the heaven shut, remember that the Lord here (Matt. xvi. 19) left its keys to Peter, and *through him to the Church*." Nearness, then, with Peter, and *consanguinity of doctrine* † thence proceeding, are no less necessary to the Church, that it may be the Catholic Church which Christ founded and built upon Peter, than that it be partaker in those gifts which, again, He himself granted only to unity, as it is effected in Peter and by Peter.

* This Montanist corruption (into which Ambrose on Ps. 38, n. 37, and Pacian in his three letters to Sempronius, state that the Novatians also fell) induced some Fathers, and especially Augustine (Enarrat. on Ps. 108, n. 1, Tract. 118 on John, n. 4, and last Tract. n. 7), to teach that the keys were bestowed on Peter so far forth as he represented the person of the Church in right of his Primacy. By which mode of speaking they meant this one thing, that the power of the keys, as being necessary to the Church, and instituted for her good, began indeed in Peter, and was communicated to him in a peculiar manner, but by no means dropt, or could possibly drop, with him.

† Tertull. de Præsc. c. 32.

Now, not only the most ancient Fathers, as Irenæus, Tertullian, and Cyprian, but the whole body of them, assign the origin of this to Peter. This they make the vivifying principle of agreement, society and unity, without which the Church can neither be intrinsically Catholic, nor the mind conceive it as such. It is so stated by Pacian,* Ambrose,† the Fathers‡ of Aquileia, Optatus,§ Gregory Nazianzen,|| Jerome,¶ Augustine,** Gelasius,†† Hormisdas,‡‡ Agatho,§§ Maximus Martyr,||| and, to shorten the list, by Leo the Great.¶¶ It is in setting forth the unity of the Catholic episcopate that he writes what ought never to be forgotten by Christian minds: "For the compactness of our unity cannot remain firm, unless the bond of charity weld us into an inseparable whole, because, as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. For it is the connection of the whole body which makes one soundness and one beauty; and this connection, as it requires unanimity in the whole body, so especially demands concord among Bishops. For though these have a like dignity, yet have they not an equal jurisdiction; since even among the most blessed Apostles, as there was a likeness of honour, so was there a certain distinction of power, and the election of all being equal, pre-eminence over the rest was given to one, from which mould, or type, the distinction also between Bishops has arisen, and it was provided by a great ordering, that all should not claim to themselves all things, but

* Pacian, ad Sempronium, Epist. 3, § 11.

† Ambrose, de Poenit. lib. 1, c. 7, n. 33.

‡ Synodical Epistle, among the letters of Ambrose.

§ Optatus, de Schism. Donat. lib. 2, c. 2, and lib. 7, c. 3.

|| Gregory, de Vita sua, tom. 2, p. 9.

¶ Jerome, adv. Jovin. lib. 1, n. 14.

** Augustine, in Ps. Cont. partem Donati, cont. Epist. Fundam. c. 4, de Utilitate Credendi, c. 17, and Epist. 43.

†† Gelasius, Epist. 14.

‡‡ Hormisdas, Mansi, tom. 8, 451, in the conditions on which he readmitted the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Eastern Bishops to communion.

§§ Agatho, in a letter to the sixth council, read and accepted at its fourth sitting.

||| Maximus, Bibl. Patr. tom. 2, p. 76.

¶¶ Leo, Epist. 10, c. 1.

that in every province there should be one whose sentence should be considered the first among his brethren ; and others, again, seated in the greater cities, should undertake a larger care, through whom the direction of the universal Church should converge to the one See of Peter, and nothing anywhere disagree from its head."

And, if I do not deceive myself, the direct drift of all this is to answer the question, whether the doctrine of Peter's Primacy, and its virtue, as the constituent of unity and Catholicity, is contained in the most solemn standard of faith, the creed. For although there are unimpeachable testimonies to prove that the creeds were not published and explained to Catechumens, in order to convey to them a full and complete Christian instruction ; and though it be proved further to have been the purpose of the Church's ancient teachers to omit many points in the creeds which were to be set before the initiated at a more suitable season afterwards, it may nevertheless be said that the most commonly received articles of the creeds may be regarded as so many most faithful germs, from which the remaining doctrines would spontaneously spring. And so, to keep within our present point, what is more plain than that the sum of doctrine concerning Peter's Primacy, contained in the Bible, illustrated by the Fathers, and defined by Councils, is involved in that article of the creed in which we profess that the Church is one and Catholic ? No doubt there nowhere occurs in the creeds, *expressed in so many words*, mention of Peter, or of the Primacy bestowed on him, or of hierarchical subordination ; yet it is most distinctly stated that the Church is one and Catholic. What meaning, then, were the faithful to give to those epithets ? What were they to intend in the words, I believe one Catholic Church ? What but the meaning of the words themselves, which they received from the Church's teachers together with the creeds ? But they could not form the conception of one Church and that Catholic, without thinking likewise of one Catholic *principle* of the Church ; nor could they assign the dignity of that one Catholic principle to

any other but Peter, whom alone they had invariably been taught to have been set over all. For what St. Bernard* wrote in mediæval times, "For this purpose the solicitude of all Churches rests on that one Apostolic See, that all may be united under it and in it, and it may be careful in behalf of all to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," must be considered nothing but a repetition of the faith which resounded through the whole world, from the very beginning of the Christian religion.

Unless, therefore, any can be found who prefer asserting *either* that true believers *never* understood what they believed, in professing the Church to be one and Catholic, *or* that they understood this *otherwise* than it had been universally and constantly explained by the Church's teachers, it must be admitted, that faith in Peter's Primacy, and in the power bestowed upon it for the purpose of making the visible kingdom of Christ one and Catholic, is coeval with that profession of the creeds which sets forth the Church as one and as Catholic.†

* Ep. 358, to Pope Celestine.

† The above chapter is translated from Passaglia, pp. 298-336.

CHAPTER IX.

THE NATURE, MULTIPLICITY, AND FORCE OF PROOF FOR
ST. PETER'S PRIMACY.

* As the natural end of all proof is to give assurance, every kind of it must be considered a mean to persuade and determine the mind. Not but that there are different kinds, and that in great variety. If we refer these to their respective topics, some are *internal* and *artificial*, others *external* and *inartificial*; some belong to the philosopher, others to the theologian, the former having their source in nature, the latter in revelation; another sort, again, rests on *witnesses*, and another on *documents*. But if we consider their persuasive force, they may be conveniently ranged under the two classes of *probable*, and *certain* or *demonstrative*.

But if it be asked what sort of proof we have hitherto used, and drawn out to the best of our ability, we must distinguish between the *principal* and prevailing proof, and this in form is inartificial, theological, and drawn from the inspired documents; and the proofs *occasionally inserted* and confirmatory of the principal; these, it will be evident, are sometimes artificial and internal, such as those drawn from analogy, and the harmonious coherence of doctrines, from the unity and Catholicity of the Church, and the institution of Bishops to rule particular flocks; and sometimes derived from witnesses, for such

* The following chapter is translated from Passaglia, pp. 339-360.

we may deem the ancient Fathers, whose importance and force, as testimonies, no prudent mind will reject. To embrace, then, the full extent of our proof, it ranges over all forms and modes, is artificial and inartificial, and rests not only on documents, but on witnesses. Now, two things follow from this mixed and manifold character of our proof, of too great importance to be passed over in silence.

The first of these is, the standard and criterion of resistance which our proof presents to opponents. For consisting, as it does, of so many elements, confirmed, as it is, by the absolute harmony of so many various parts, that only can be a satisfactory answer, which meets at once every particular proof, and the whole sum of it. For it would be to small purpose to give another sense, with some speciousness, to one or two points, if the great mass of matter and argument remained untouched. The only valid answer would be to *reject and deny the Primacy of supreme authority, presenting at the same time a sufficient cause for all those results of which the proof consists.* For so long as the institution of the Primacy is necessary to supply a sufficient cause for these results, so long the force of our proof remains untouched, and the institution of the Primacy unquestionable. We can therefore demand of our opponents this alternative, either to acquiesce in our proof, or, rejecting the Primacy, to find, and when they have found to establish, an hypothesis equal to the explanation of all that is contained in our arguments artificial and inartificial, in our documents and our witnesses.

The second point is one which all will admit. The proof we have given is such that *unless* it be deceptive, the institution of the Primacy is demonstrated to be not only *true*, but also *revealed*, not only *tenable*, but matter of *faith*. For although we have interwoven testimonies and artificial arguments, this was to confirm what was already demonstrated, and to shed fresh light on what was already clear; but the *proper* source from which we have drawn our proofs, was the documents of the Holy Scriptures themselves. Now what is thence drawn

is revealed,* and enters into the number of things which, being revealed, are matter of *faith*.

These two points are clear, but a third may be somewhat less so. Many will ask, what is the force of the proof, its power to persuade, and whether it carry complete certitude, or be defective? Now, to this we shall reply, that the proof which we have presented is not only probable, but altogether decisive. It wants nothing to produce the fullest assurance. This is a subject which I have judged fit for special and separate investigation, as due both to myself, my readers, and the cause which I am defending. For it is not a happiness of our nature to catch the whole and the pure truth at a single glance. This requires repeated acts of the mind; we have to make the effort again and again, and only terminate our examination when we have submitted our supposed discovery to reiterated reflection. Thus it is that truth comes out in full light, imposture is detected, the line drawn between doubt and certainty, and every point located in its due place. This inquiry, then, into the proof itself I consider due not only to myself and my readers, but to a cause, which requires the utmost attention as being of the highest importance, and the source of the deepest dissensions; for it is not too much to say that the origin of all those divisions which we see and lament in the Christian name may be referred to the reception or the denial of this doctrine concerning the Primacy.

Now we shall best reach the subject by first considering the inherent force of the proof *in itself*, and *absolutely*, and then *comparatively* with those arguments to which the most distinguished Protestant sects ascribe a full and complete demonstrative power.

I. First, then, as to the force of proof *absolutely*. We must reflect that two conditions complete a proof derived from documents; *first*, the authenticity of the document; *secondly*,

* This is not said as *limiting* revelation to such points, but to exhibit the scope of the present work, which uses testimony merely as a human, though very important, support of the cause.

either the immediate and unquestionable evidence of the testimonies quoted from it, or their meaning being rendered certain by argument. If these two conspire, nothing is wanting to produce assurance. Now, as to the documents, whence our proof is derived, no Christian doubts their authenticity; and as to the testimonies drawn from them, part * belong to a class of such evidence as to admit of no doubt; and part, † being equally clear and marked in themselves, have had to be defended from false interpretations. Accordingly, our proof is peremptory in both particulars.

Moreover, our proof was not restricted to one or two passages of Holy Scripture, but extended over a great series, all tending to support and consolidate the argument. We have set forth, not a naked institution of the Primacy, but multifold foreshadowings and promises of it, its daily operation and notoriety. From its first anticipation we went on to its progressively clearer expression, its promise, its institution, its exercise, and the everywhere diffused knowledge of it in the primitive Church. So far, then, as I see, nothing more can, with reason, be asked, to remove all doubts as to Peter's prerogative of Primacy; for, when the bestowal of certain privileges can be proved by documents, all question as to their existence is terminated. But here we find in documents, not their bestowal merely, but antecedents and consequences, a beginning, a progress, and a manifold explanation, which stand to the Primacy as signs to the thing signified.

Accordingly, the demonstration which we have given of the Primacy, considered *in itself*, and *absolutely*, needs nothing to challenge assent.

For, suppose it disputed whether Cæsar surpassed the other Roman Senators in honour and power. Could it be proved by

* The texts relating to the Primacy, the Evangelists' mode of writing, that of St. Luke in the first twelve chapters of the Acts, and that of St. Paul.

† The Apostles' contest about "the greater," the distinction between the founder, and the visible head of the Church, and for false interpretations, the Primacy of mere precedency, the perversion of John xxi. 15-20, the assertion of Apostolic equality, and Gal. i. 18-20.

undoubted records, that he so conducted himself as gradually to smooth his path to the supreme power; that he next gained from the senate and Roman people the title of Emperor and Prince; that he exercised these powers at home and abroad, and received universal testimony to the dignity he had acquired; in such case the judgment would be unanimous that he was Emperor, and head of the Roman Senators. Now, substitute Peter for Cæsar, the Apostles for the Senators; Christ, the Evangelists, Luke and Paul, for the senate and people; and you will see all the proofs enumerated for Cæsar, to square exactly with Peter. For we learn from Scripture *the steps* by which he rose to the Primacy, *the time* when he received it, *how* he exercised it, and the lucid testimonies to it which he received from Christ, the Evangelists, the Apostolic Church, and Paul. Accordingly, his Primacy and supreme authority among the Apostles rests on a proof which gives complete assurance, and challenges assent. It is a consequence deduced, not from a single, but from manifold inference; not merely drawn from results, but foreseen in its causes; declared not merely in the words of institution, but in the very acts of its exercise; supported not only by sundry texts, but by a cloud of conspiring witnesses; proved by an interpretation, not obscure, and far-fetched, but clear and obvious. A thing of such a nature it is folly to deny and temerity to doubt.

But, further, reflect on the other arguments which come in collaterally to support that from the Holy Scriptures. Then it will be found that our proof consists in the harmonious concurrence of these four sources: 1. *The authentic Scriptural documents* distinctly setting forth the promises, the bestowal, the exercise, and the everywhere diffused knowledge of the Primacy; 2. *Witnesses* the most ancient, well-nigh coeval with the Apostles, of great number, renowned for their holiness, or their martyrdom, excellent in learning, far removed from each other in situation, faithful maintainers of the Apostolic teaching, who, with one mouth, acknowledge the Primacy; 3. *The analogy of doctrines*, for the Church, which we profess to be

one, and Catholic, can neither exist, nor even be conceived as such, without the Primacy; 4. *The facts of Christian history*, which are so entwined with the institution of the Primacy, that they cannot be even contemplated without it. For there are no less than fourteen distinct classes of facts in Christian history, all of which bear witness to the Primacy, and which cannot be studied without coming across that power. Such are, 1. *The history of heresies*, where, in ancient times alone, consider the acts and statutes of Pope Dionysius in the causes of Paul of Samosata, and Dionysius of Alexandria; of Popes Sylvester and Julius, in the cause of Arius; of Pope Damasus, in that of Apollinarius; of Popes Innocent and Zosimus, in that of Pelagius; of Pope Celestine, in that of Nestorius; and of Pope Leo, in that of Eutyches; so that Ferrandus* of Carthage wrote in the sixth century, "If you desire to hear aught of truth, ask in the first place the prelate of the Apostolic See, whose sound doctrine is known by the judgment of truth, and grounded on the weight of authority." 2. *The history of schisms*, which have arisen in the Church, when we consider the unquestionable facts about Novatian, Fortunatus and Felicissimus, the Donatists, and Acacius of Constantinople, so that Bede, in our own country, wrote in the seventh century, commenting on Matt. xvi. 10, "All believers in the world understand, that whosoever, in any way, separate themselves from the unity of the faith, or from the society of Peter, such can neither be absolved from the bonds of their sins, nor enter the threshold of the heavenly kingdom." 3. *The history of the liturgy*, as the contests about the paschal time, and what Eusebius, in the fifth book of his history, c. 22-25, says about Pope Victor. 4. *The history of the summoning, the holding, and the confirming general councils*, wherein the Acts of Synods, the letters of the supreme Pontiffs, and the writings of the Fathers, show the entire truth of what is stated by the ancient

* "Interroga igitur, si quid veritatis cupis audire, principaliter sedis Apostolicæ antistitem, cujus sana doctrina constat iudicio veritatis, et fulcitur munimine auctoritatis."—Ferrandus in Epist. ad Severum.

Greek historians, Socrates and Sozomen,* that an ecclesiastical Canon had always been in force, "that the Churches should not pass Canons contrary to the decision of the Bishop of Rome," which Pope Pelagius,† in the sixth century thus expressed, "the right of calling councils is entrusted by a special power to the Apostolic See, nor do we read that a general council has been valid, which was not assembled or supported by its authority. This is attested by the authority of canons, corroborated by ecclesiastical history, and confirmed by the holy Fathers." And Ferrandus says, "Universal councils, more especially those to which the authority of the Roman Church has been given, hold the place of second authority after the canonical books." ‡ 5. *The history of ecclesiastical laws*, for the regulation of discipline, a summary of which, enacted by the successors of Peter from Victor I. to Gregory II., may be found in Zaccaria's *Antifebronius*, tom. ii. p. 425, and his *Antifebronius Vindicatus*, Diss. vi. c. 1. 6. *The history of judgments*, specially the most remarkable in the Church, of which, if we are to believe history, we can only repeat what Pope Gelasius wrote at the end of the fifth century, to the Bishops of Dardania, "We must not omit that the Apostolic See has frequently, to use our Roman phrase, *more majorum*, even without any council preceding, had the power to absolve those whom a council had justly condemned, or to condemn, without any council, those who required condemnation:" and as he wrote to the Greek Emperor, Anastasius, "that the authority of the Apostolic See has in all Christian ages been set over the Church universal, is established by the series of the canons of the Fathers, and by manifold tradition." § 7. *The history of references*, which were wont to be made to the chair of Peter, in the greater causes of faith, and in those respecting Catholic unity. Thus, Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, A.D. 500, said, "It is a rule of synodical laws, that, in matters relating to the state of

* Socrates, Hist. 1. 2, c. 8-17. Sozomen, Hist. 1. 3, c. 10.

† In *Fragm. Epist. apud Baluzium, Miscell. lib. 5, p. 467.*

‡ Ferrandus in *Litteris ad Pelagium.* § Mansi, tom. 8, 54, 34.

the Church, if any doubt arises, we, as obedient members, recur to the Priest of the Roman Church, who is the greatest, as to our head." * To the same effect is the letter of Pope Innocent I., to St. Victrice, of Rouen, at the beginning of the fifth century, and again, the African Fathers to Pope Theodore; or again, St. Bernard, writing to Pope Innocent II., against the errors of Abelard, "All dangers and scandals emerging in the kingdom of God, specially those which concern faith, must be referred to your Apostolate: for I esteem it fitting that the injuries done to faith should be repaired there in particular, where faith cannot fail. That is the prerogative of this See."

8. *The history of appeals*, of which a vast number of remarkable instances exist. Take, as the key, the words of Pope Gelasius once more: "It is the canons themselves which have ordered the appeals of the whole Church to be carried to the examination of this See. But from it they have allowed of no appeal in any case; and, therefore, they enjoin that it should judge of the whole Church, but go itself before the judgment of none: nor do they allow of appeal from its sentence, but rather require obedience to its decrees." † And Pope Agatho, in the Roman Council, pronouncing on the appeal of our own St. Wilfrid, of York, the contemporary of Bede, A.D. 688, declares that "Wilfrid the Bishop, beloved of God, knowing himself unjustly deposed from his bishopric, did not *contumaciously resist by means of the secular power*, but with humility of mind sought the canonical aid of our founder, blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, and declared in his supplication that he would accept what by our mouth, blessed Peter, our founder, whose office we discharge, should determine." ‡ 9. *The history of the ecclesiastical hierarchy*, § and of the *rights possessed by certain episcopal Sees over others*, of which we may take an instance in the grants of Pope Gregory the Great, and his successors, to the See of Canterbury, which alone made it a Primacy. For the

* Avitus, Epist. 36.

† Gelasius, Epist. 4, ad Faustum. Mansi, 8, 17.

‡ Mansi, tom. 11, 184.

§ See Peter Ballerini, de Potestate Ecclesiastica, cap. 1, § 1-6.

Bishops of Canterbury had no power whatever over the other Bishops of this country, save what they derived from St. Peter's See. And the documents and original letters conferring these powers still exist, giving the fullest proof that Pope Pius only did in 1850, what Pope Gregory did in 596. 10. *The history of the universal propagation of the Christian religion.** 11. *The history of those tokens and pledges,*† such as letters of communion, whereby Catholic unity was exhibited and maintained. 12. *The history of Christian archaeology,*‡ inscriptions, paintings, and other monuments of this kind. 13. *The history of the emperors,* as, for instance, what Ammianus Marcellinus § says of Constantius; the letter of the Emperor Marcian to Pope Leo, entreating him to confirm the Council of Chalcedon; that of Galla Placidia, the 130th novel of Justinian, and the remarkable constitution of Valentinian III., A.D. 445. "Since the merit of St. Peter, who is the chief of the episcopal coronet, and the dignity of the Roman city, moreover, the authority of a sacred synod" (that of Sardica, A.D. 347) "have confirmed the Primacy of the Apostolic See, let presumption not endeavour to attempt anything unlawful, contrary to the authority of that See: for, then, at length, the peace of the Church will everywhere be preserved, if the whole (universitas) acknowledge its ruler." And, 14, lastly, *the history of codes,* in which is contained the legislation of Christian kingdoms, wherein we may refer to the capitulars of the Franks, and the laws of the Lombards.

Now, from these concordant proofs thus slightly sketched, it follows that the institution of the Primacy belongs to that class of facts which is most certain, and which is absolutely demonstrated. For would it be possible to find a concurrence of proofs so various in case it had never been instituted? Is it possible to imagine so many various results of a cause which

* See Mamachi, *Origines et Antiquitates Christianæ*, tom. 2.

† See Muzzarelli, *de Auctoritate Rom. Pontificis in Conciliis Generalibus*, c. v. § 9.

‡ See Mamachi, as above, tom. v. part 1, c. 2.

§ Amm. Marcellinus, lib. 15, c. 7.

never existed?—so many various tokens of reality in a fiction? What are the chances for letters thrown at random forming themselves into an eloquent speech? Or a beautiful portrait coming out from a mere assemblage of colours? Or a whole discourse in an unknown tongue being elegantly rendered by a guess? If these be sheer absurdities, although a few letters have sometimes tumbled at random into a word, or a single clause been decyphered, though in ignorance of the alphabet, then we may be sure that the Primacy, attested by so vast a variety of convergent results, can no more be untrue, than effects can exist without a cause, splendour without light, or vocal harmony without sound. Accordingly an institution established by such a union of proof, carries prisoner the assent. It may indeed be disregarded by a resolution of the *will*, but can neither be passed by, nor refuted, by a judgment of the *reason*.

And * having on the one hand this vast amount of *positive* proof, from sources so various, in its behalf, so that without it the whole Christian history of eighteen centuries, in all its manifold blendings with secular history, becomes unintelligible, a tangle which it is impossible to arrange; when we come on the other hand to consider what its opponents allege of *positive* on their own side, we find nothing. They content themselves with objections to this or that detached point, with historical difficulties, and obscurations of the full proof, such, for instance, as the conduct of St. Cyprian in one controversy, the occasional resistance of a metropolitan, the secular instinct of an imperial government stirring up Eastern Bishops to revolt, and fostering an Erastian spirit in the Church, the ambition of thoroughly bad men, such as Acacius or Photius, and the like. But what we may fairly ask of opponents, and what we never find the most distant approach to in them is, if, as they say, St. Peter's Primacy be not legitimate, and instituted by Christ for the government of the Church, what *counter system* have they,

* The following paragraph, down to "within and without," I have introduced here. It is not in F. Passaglia.

which they can prove by ancient documents, and whereby they can solve the manifold facts of history? In all their arguments against the Primacy they are so absolutely *negative*, that the grand result, if they were successful, would be to reduce the Church to a heap of ruins, to show that she, who is entrusted with the authoritative teaching of the world, has no internal coherence either of government or doctrine, in fact, no message from God to deliver, and no power to enforce it when delivered. In the arguments of Greeks and Anglicans, Lutherans and Calvinists, and all the Protestant sects, the gates of hell have long ago prevailed against the Church, and the devil has built up at his ease a city of confusion on the rock which Christ chose for her foundation. If we listen to them, never has victory been more complete than that of the evil one over the Son of God: the promised unity he has scattered to the winds: the doctrine of truth he has utterly corrupted: the charity wherewith Christians loved one another he has turned into gall and wormwood. That is, the opponents of St. Peter's Primacy are one and all simply *destructives*; they inspire despair, and are the pioneers of infidelity, but are utterly powerless to build up. Ask the Anglican what is the source of spiritual jurisdiction, and the bond of the episcopate which he affects to defend? *He makes no reply*. All he can say is, it is *not* St. Peter. Ask the Greek, if Bishops and Patriarch disagree, and come to opposite judgments on the faith, or to schisms in communion, which party make the Church? *He has no solution to offer*, save that it is *not* the party which sides with St. Peter's successor. Ask the pure Protestant, who maintains the sole authority of the written Word, if you disagree about the meaning of Scripture in points which you admit to touch salvation, who is to determine what is the true meaning of the Word of God? *He has nothing to reply*, save that he is sure it is *not* the Pope. Contrast, then, on the one side, a complete coherent system, fully delineated and set forth in the Bible, attested by the Fathers, corroborated by analogy, and harmonizing the history of eighteen hundred

years in its infinitely numerous relations, with, on the other side, a mere heap of objections and denials, with shreds of truths held without cohesion, with analogy violated, history thrown into hopeless confusion, and, to crown the whole, Holy Scripture incessantly appealed to, yet its plainest declarations recklessly disregarded, and its most consoling promises utterly evacuated. Choose, upon this, between *within* and *without*.

II. But such being the argument for the Primacy of *itself* and *absolutely*, look at it now in a *comparative* point of view with other doctrines. Let us ask Anglicans, Lutherans, and Calvinists, respectively, to compare it in order with the proofs with which they, each in behalf of his own sect, defend either the authority of Bishops, and their distinction from Presbyters, as instituted by Christ, or the real presence of the Lord's body in the Eucharist, or the divine nature of Christ, and His consubstantiality with the Father. Can they state, upon a comparison of these, that there are *more* testimonies of Holy Scripture in behalf of these latter doctrines than for the Primacy of Peter? As for the articles of the real presence, and the superiority of Bishops, this cannot be asserted with any show of truth, since in behalf of both there are undoubtedly fewer. Certainly there are a great number for the divinity of Christ, yet not much less are those which the same Scriptures contain in support of Peter's Primacy. So that if the force of proof is to be judged of by the *number of texts*, that in behalf of the Primacy will either be preferred to the rest, or at least yield to none.

But I anticipate the answer that it is not the number of texts which will decide the question, but their perspicuity and evidence, which constitute their force. To meet which objection I shall merely set these several parties against each other. What, then, do Lutherans think of the perspicuity of those texts by which Anglicans maintain the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters? They are unanimous in thinking them not merely most obscure, but absolutely foreign to the purpose for which they are cited. Just the same is the Calvinist opinion

of the Lutheran proofs for the real presence, and the Socinian view of the texts alleged by Calvinists in behalf of Christ's divinity. Both obstinately refuse to admit that their opponents urge anything decisive. It would be easy to quote instances of this, if it was not notorious. It is, then, no unfair inference that Protestants have no particular reason to boast triumphantly of the perspicuity and evidence of the texts on which they severally rely.

But who, they retort, cannot see that the cause of the Primacy, which we defend, is far inferior? For our exposition is opposed not by one or two parties, but by them all in a mass, Anglicans, Lutherans, Calvinists, and *all who are not Catholics*. The addition is significant, *all who are not Catholics*, for indeed all these, and these alone, are our opponents. Yet their very name creates the gravest prejudice against them, and shows them to be unworthy of attention. As St. Augustine said, "The Catholic Church is one, to which different heresies give various names, they themselves each possessing their own name, which they dare not refuse. Whence judges unaffected by partiality can form an opinion to whom the name of Catholic, which all aim at, ought to be given."* If, then, the name of Catholic is a note of truth, the negation of that name is a test of error and heresy. But no one will imagine that heretics, that is, the enemies of Christ and the Apostles, have a right to be followed in what concerns the doctrine of Christ, and the Apostolic institutions. Thus, what Tertullian said is to the point, "Though we had to search still and for ever, yet *where* are we to search? Is it among heretics, where all is foreign and opposed to our own truth, whom we are not allowed to approach? † What servant expects food from a stranger, not to say an enemy of his lord? What soldier takes donative or pay from confederate, not to say from hostile kings, except he be an open deserter and rebel? Even the woman in the Gospel searched for her piece of silver within her own house. Even he who knocked, struck the door of a

* Aug. de Utilitate Credendi, c. 7, n. 19.

† Tit. iii. 10.

friend.* Even the widow solicited a judge, who was hard indeed, but not her enemy. No one can be built up by the person who destroys him: no one be enlightened by one who shuts him up in darkness. Let us search then in our own, and from our own, and about our own, and only that which can be questioned without harm to the rule of faith." †

But if we look closer into the matter, we shall find that even in the interpretation of our texts Protestants are not so agreed with each other as uniformly to oppose us. Some of the greatest names amongst them, such as Cameron, Grotius, Hammond, Leclerc, Dodwell, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, and Kuinoel, differ from the rest and agree with us in interpreting, "upon this rock I will build My Church," words of great importance in the controversy about the Primacy. So that we were not wrong in stating that Protestants do not entirely agree among each other in their interpretation, nor disagree with ours.

But grant that they were one and all opposed to it, it would not prove much. For, *first*, it could hardly happen otherwise, since the old Protestant cause is so contained in this matter of the Primacy, that, were they to confess themselves wrong in it, they would pronounce themselves guilty of the most groundless schism. Therefore it is a matter of life and death with them to resist us. *Secondly*, as they dissent from us, so do they desert that doctrine which the whole Christian body solemnly professed and defined before the sixteenth century in Ecumenical Councils, that of Florence held in 1439, the second of Lyons in 1274, and the fourth Lateran in 1215. We, then, follow antiquity, and they take up novelty. And so it follows that while we have Protestants against us, we have the earlier Christians for us, whilst Protestants are opposed not only to the present race of Catholics, but to those whose children these are, and whose doctrines they have preserved. For as to the ancient interpretation of these texts take the following proof, contained in a letter of

* Luke xv. 9; xi. 5; xviii. 2.

† Tertullian, de Præsc. c. 21.

Pope Agatho to the Greek Emperor Heraclius, read and approved in the sixth General Council, A.D. 680: "The true confession of Peter was revealed by the Father from heaven, for which Peter was pronounced to be blessed by the Lord of all, who likewise by a triple commendation was entrusted with the feeding of the spiritual sheep of the Church by the Redeemer of all Himself; in virtue of whose assistance this His Apostolical Church hath never turned aside from the path of truth to any error whatsoever; whose authority, as of the Prince of all the Apostles, the whole Catholic Church at all times and the universal councils faithfully embracing, have in all respects followed, and all the venerable Fathers have entertained its Apostolic doctrine; through which there have shone the most approved lights of the Church; which while the holy orthodox Fathers have venerated and followed, *heretics have pursued with false accusations, and calumnies inspired by hatred. This is the living tradition of Christ's Apostles, which His Church everywhere holds.*"* We might imagine that Sir Thomas More had these words before his eyes when he answered Luther, "Not only all that learned and holy men have collected to the point moves me to give willing obedience to that See, but especially what we have so often witnessed, that not only there never was an enemy to the Christian faith who did not at the same time declare war against that See, but also that there never has been one who professed himself an enemy of that See without shortly after declaring himself signally a capital foe and traitor of Christ and our religion. Another thing, too, has great weight with me, that if, in this matter, the faults of individuals are laid to the charge of their office, all authority will collapse, and the people will be without ruler, law, or order. And if this ever happens, as it seems likely to happen in parts of Germany, at length they will learn to their cost how much more it is to the interest of society to have even bad rulers rather than none."†

Protestants, then, have many more opponents than we; to

* Mansi, *Concilia*, tom. II, 239.

† *Responsio ad Lutheram*, c. x.

which we may add, *thirdly*, that we assert and maintain a doctrine which for several ages had no opponent worth mentioning, and which received a general belief and assent. Protestants, on the contrary, no sooner brought their doctrine to light than they roused the whole Catholic Church against them ; that very Church, *fourthly*, from which they had rebelled, in which they had been washed in the laver of regeneration, whose motherly care had enrolled them as Christians, from which they had received the Bible and all other Christian blessings, which, before that fatal schism, alone presented the appearance of the true Church, and was invested with attributes which inspired belief and fostered obedience. For such were antiquity, the hierarchy, unity, the agreement of its members, universality ; such, again, the splendour of sanctity and learning ; zeal in the guardianship of primeval tradition, hatred of profane novelties ; and, lastly, the renown of those heavenly gifts, which cannot fail the true Church of Christ, and were ascribed to no other body.

But, *fifthly*, it would be very apposite to compare the Catholic Church with herself, and contrast her state and condition in the nineteenth century with that same state and condition in the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth. Now who, in the fourth century, professed the consubstantiality of the Trinity ? Well-nigh Catholics alone, while innumerable sects of heretics opposed this doctrine. War to the knife was waged against it by Praxeans, Noetians, Sabellians, Paulianists, Arians, and their worst portion, the Anomæns, Macedonians, and those who then made their appearance, Tritheists. Again, in the fifth and the sixth centuries, who were they who retained the true faith in Christ the God-Man, and His dispensation in taking flesh ? Once more the true faith was hardly found outside the Catholics, while the followers of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Diodorus of Tarsus, Nestorius and the Nestorians, Eutyches, and the Eutychean sects at daggers drawn with each other, and in fine, the Monothelites and their sects, who hated one another and the Catholics with equal bitterness,

clubbed all their forces together to oppose it. Now, do any Protestants venture to infer that in the fourth and following centuries the cause of the Catholic Church was less certain, on account of this mob of hostile sects? I should consider such an insinuation an insult to them. They must accordingly allow my parallel inference, that it is fair to pass the same judgment on the cause of the Primacy now for some centuries defended by the Catholics against the Protestants.

Lastly, to address specially Lutherans and Anglicans. They are well aware that almost all sects are not more opposed to the supremacy of Peter than to the superiority of Bishops, and the verity of the Lord's body in the Eucharist. But are they therefore deterred by the number of their enemies, or do they distrust the goodness of their cause, or doubt the perspicuity of those documents on which they rely for the victory? They can afford to disdain the tricks of their opponents, as well as repulse their attacks. They must, accordingly, agree with us that the assertions or denials of contesting parties ought not to be, and cannot be, the test of a cause's goodness, and of documentary evidence.

But, then, by what standard are we to go? I reply, by those criteria which are not subject to just exception, and which must be approved by all who seek the truth, and obey the dictate of reason. Now, four such criteria in chief I think may be assigned, the two former of which are *immediate* and *internal*, the third *internal*, but somewhat more remote; the fourth, *external*, but of great weight, and not to be overlooked. To speak of the former first: one of these is *verbal*, and belongs to the words and phrases of which the text consists; the other *real*, and regards the meaning of the sentence. Indeed, no other sources of obscurity or of clearness can be imagined than either the *words* which express the *matter*, or the *matter* intended by the *words*. If both words and matter are plain, and perspicuous, the discourse will be clear, and the language distinct; but if either the matter exceed the power of reason, or the words do not run clear, or both these conspire, the evidence of the meaning will be more or less impaired.

1. Now, to begin with *words*, I shall not be severe, but allow to Anglicans, Lutherans, and Calvinists, that the texts alleged by each of them in behalf of his own cause consist of words which are either immediately perspicuous, or become mediately clear upon definite principles. But in turn I should ask them repeatedly to consider whether such a perspicuity can be denied to the words of which the texts cited for the Primacy of Peter consist. These words are in general and vulgar use, continually repeated in the Bible, but so connected together that their certain meaning is either immediately evident, or fixed with very little trouble. But are not most of them metaphorical, such as *rock, building, keys, binding, loosing, lambs, sheep, feeding*? Undoubtedly some are such, yet not that words used in their *proper* sense are wanting, as when Peter is called *the first, the greater, the superior*; also when he is charged to *confirm his brethren*; and what we collect from the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul, and the Evangelists' mode of writing. Not, secondly, that it is not evident, from the connection of the discourse, what fixed and established meaning must be given to those metaphorical expressions. Not, thirdly, that the meaning of those formulas is not shown by the exercise of the powers conferred in them. Not, fourthly, that there is any inability, if you remove the metaphor, to express in *proper* words what the metaphor shadows out. Not, fifthly, as if the literal and immediate sense were therefore wanting; for it is very plain that the metaphorical* sense likewise is literal and immediate. And sixthly, not that *metaphorical* can be considered equivalent to *obscure*, for obscurity is most opposed to the very genius of metaphor, and such a canon would destroy the perspicuity of human language. For there is no language, ancient or modern,

* Sense, says Jahn, is the connection or mutual relation of notions intended by the author in his words, or, according to others, which is the same thing, the conception of the mind which the author has expressed in words, and wishes to raise in his readers. This sense, whether it springs from the proper or whether from the improper and metaphorical meaning of words, or from allegorical language, is immediate, grammatical, and literal.

rude or polished, semitic, chamitic, or japhetic, whose *metaphorical* is not much more copious than its *proper* vocabulary.

Metaphor, then, and obscurity are very far removed from each other, and there is nothing to prevent a metaphorical expression bearing the plainest sense. For such the sense will be, whenever what is called the *foundation* of the metaphor is clear, and the series of the discourse indicates *the point of likeness*, and usage of speech unfolds *the force* of the metaphor. Now, all these conditions, which ensure perspicuity in the metaphor, are found in interpreting the metaphors which contain the singular prerogatives of Peter. For as it is perfectly plain whence the metaphors of *foundation, building, keys, binding, loosing, sheep, lambs, shepherd*, are drawn, so the context defines the point of similitude, and usage of speech does not allow ignorance of the force of such metaphors. And thus the texts on Peter's Primacy have a verbal perspicuity which will bear a favourable comparison with those texts on which Anglicans, Lutherans, and Calvinists rely. For indeed all the difficulties, in the invention of which Protestants have shown their ingenuity, are introduced, put upon the words, not drawn from them. So, on the contrary, the haters of the Primacy evidently wince at their clearness.

2. *Verbal* perspicuity is followed by *real*, or that which concerns the *subject-matter*. And this, I assert, is far inferior, far more slender, in the above-named Protestant controversies, than in this of the Catholics. Indeed, both the controversies, on the real presence and on the divinity of Christ, have a super-intelligible object, so far exceeding the natural power of reason, as to admit of the mind's conceiving it by analogy, but not by a *distinct* and *proper* knowledge. For this is the nature of mysteries, whence it follows in them that neither single words have distinct notions, nor a whole proposition distinct sense. Whereas in the controversy about the Primacy, there is nothing which is not commensurate with reason, and which has not the advantage of proper and distinct notions. For, of revealed truths, some being *rational*, some *beyond*

reason, and some *above* reason, the proper character of those which are called *beyond* reason is, that, *if* revealed, they are cognizable by reason. Now, to such an order of truths the institution of the Primacy belongs. Thus its *real* evidence, that, namely, which concerns its *subject-matter*, is much superior to that which the others admit of. But should we grant as much to the controversy in which Anglicans defend the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters? Grant this, yet still it remains that in this species of *real* evidence the cause of the Primacy is far superior to that of the real presence, or that of the divinity of Christ. But, in truth, the Anglican doctrine on Bishops may be considered from two points of view, either as severed from the Catholic dogma on Peter's Primacy, or as in connection and coherence with it. From the latter point of view I should admit it to be so agreeable to reason, that this power calls for it, and rests in it, when once illuminated by faith, so as to know, that is, the purpose of Christ that each particular Church should present the aspect of a united family. But sever this superiority of Bishops over Presbyters from the dogma of the Primacy, and inveigh as keenly against Peter's supremacy as you defend their presidency, which is what Anglicans do, and then I could only conclude that this doctrine is plainly contrary to reason instead of agreeing with it.

For whence do Anglicans deduce its agreement with reason? Hammond, Pearson, Beveridge, Bingham, and their other greater theologians, tell us that it follows very plainly, because we know that Christ carefully provided for the unity of particular Churches, which, they say, it seems impossible to obtain without the superior power of Bishops. It is a good inference; but did Christ show less care for the unity of the whole Church than for that of particular Churches? Who can seriously maintain this? For what is the unity recommended by Christ and so earnestly urged by the Apostles, save that of the whole Church? And when we acknowledge in the Creed *one* Church, do we mean a particular or the universal Church? We mean that which we also acknowledge to be

Catholic, and therefore the unity is that of the Catholic Church. And therefore it was Christ's intention, and His certain will, that not only particular Churches, but the universal body of the Church, should possess the test and the dower of unity. And this Anglican notion, which denies of the universal Church what it affirms of particular Churches, may suit very well an island, holding itself aloof from the rest of the world, but it is quite incompatible with the radical idea of the kingdom of Christ.

Moreover, if it was necessary for the production and maintenance of unity in particular Churches to set Bishops over them, with authority superior to that of Presbyters; if reason demands that it being Christ's will for particular Churches to live in unity, He should likewise have instituted the power which distinguishes Bishops from Presbyters; can we suppose either that it was not necessary for the production and maintenance of unity in the Catholic Church, to commit its government to a universal superior, or that reason does not *equally* require, that Christ, who enjoined the Catholic Church to maintain unity, should have instituted the universal Pastor? Nay, as the necessity is not equal on the two sides, but so much stronger on the side of unity in the *Catholic* Church, as it is more difficult to hold together in one an innumerable than a limited number, men scattered over the globe than men within a narrow region, nations differing in genius, habits, and laws, than those who resemble each other in these; so reason, which for particular Churches requires their respective Bishops, *much more* requires the institution of a *universal* superior, lest the end should appear to have been devised without the means, and the divine work of Christ be deficient in wisdom. What, then, are Anglicans about in dividing these two doctrines, and contending for the institution of Bishops, while they obstinately deny the institution of the Primacy? They strip of its authority the very truth which they defend, and by severing doctrines which derive their consistency from their cohesion,

put weapons in the hands of Presbyterians to assault and even overthrow the very dogma from which they take their name of Episcopalians. Accordingly the evidence derived from the *subject-matter* is much clearer in those texts which are alleged for Peter's Primacy, than in those by which the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, the real presence, and the divine Person of Christ, are proved.

Now the force of demonstration derived from documents corresponds to the sum of *verbal* and *real* evidence in the texts, being greater or less as this is stronger or weaker. In other words, the force of demonstration belongs to that class of evidence which mathematicians call *direct*. But both these sorts of evidence exist in the same, or even in a fuller degree, in those texts which concerns the Primacy, and set forth its divine institution. Accordingly the force of demonstration for the Primacy is equal or superior to that belonging to the arguments which prove the superiority of Bishops, the real presence, and Christ's divine Person. Yet these arguments have such force, that the articles which they prove cannot, in the opinion of the Anglicans, Lutherans, and Calvinists, be questioned without incurring the deepest guilt of heresy. We have, then, the same or even a stronger reason to affirm that the Primacy of Peter, resting on the same, or even a stronger evidence, as *revealed*, cannot be denied without heresy.

And this is a corollary which I would entreat Anglicans, Lutherans, and Calvinists, carefully to consider, and then say whether they are consistent; for then I feel assured they would become discontented with themselves, by reflecting that, in the choice of the articles which they hold, they are not following the clearness of revelation, but party spirit and factious prejudices. What satisfactory answer can they ever return to the Catholic who asks why they, who on equal or less evidence defend the superiority of Bishops, deny the Primacy which rests on similar or greater proof? Or why they attack the Primacy,

while they defend the real presence, or the divinity of Christ, which are supported by no more evident arguments? And how will they satisfy their own conscience, should this thought ever cross them, "Why do I at one time obey, at another time resist, the same evidence of revelation?" That same faith with which they severally believe the divine appointment of Bishops, the real presence, and the consubstantiality of Christ, compels them, if they would maintain consistency, and not repel conviction, to confess the Primacy of Peter.

And this argument might be carried much farther, if they would reflect how great is the brilliancy of evidence in behalf of the Primacy, compared with sundry other capital Christian doctrines, some or all of which they hold without question: such are the consubstantiality of the Trinity, the unity of Christ's Person, the propagation of original sin, the eternity of punishment, regeneration in baptism, and gratuitous justification. They will find, on reflection, that they hold these doctrines not because they are proved by stronger Scriptural evidence than the Primacy, for quite the reverse is the truth, nor because they are encompassed with less obscurity in their own character, for the subject-matter of the Primacy is clear and distinct in comparison with them all, but because the doctrines do not oppose the particular tradition which they have received, and so their minds are not set against them. Let them once come to compare the whole evidence for the Primacy, Scriptural, traditional, analogical, and historical, which last alone comprehends the fourteen heads above enumerated, with the same evidence in behalf of any or all of those, and they cannot but admit its great superiority.

3. But we must proceed to the *third* criterion, which increases not a little the evidence from revelation for the Primacy. For Catholics and Protestants are agreed in considering *analogy* as one of the best helps in interpretation, and in assigning to it the force of a real parallelism, a pro-

ceeding which rests on the necessity of the Scripture presenting one whole and harmonious body of doctrine in its several parts. And in order not to deprive this help of its efficacy, both parties give two conditions for its exercise: the first, *that no sense be put upon passages of Scripture contrary to analogy*; the second, *that no violence be used to the language of Scripture to confirm it with analogy, which would be imposing on Holy Writ the sense wanted from it.* These two faults carefully avoided, analogy is of great service, and throws much light upon interpretation.

But, now, is there such a sum of doctrine, so remarkable, and so diffused through all the books of the New Testament, that the texts expressing the gifts and prerogatives of Peter, can be tried by the touchstone of this analogy? Such, indeed, there is, very remarkable, and threefold in character. The first point is found in the texts* which regard the divine institution of Bishops: the other two in those which show the unity† and the Catholicity‡ of the Church. For what can stand in closer connection with these articles of doctrine, than the appointment of a supreme ruler to discharge over the universal Church the office which every Bishop exercises over his own particular Church, and his own portion of the flock? What, again, can be more opposed to them, than the supposition that provision was made, by the institution of Bishops, for *the parts*, but none, by the institution of a supreme pastor, for *the whole body*, which is to be one and Catholic? Therefore, that exposition of the texts concerning Peter, which exhibits him as ruler of the Church universal, and as made to be the visible cause of that same Catholic unity, so admirably agrees with analogy, that it must be considered unquestionable, unless texts contradictory to it can be pro-

* Acts xiv. 22; xx. 28; 1 Tim. v. 19-22; 2 Tim. iv. 2-5; Tit. i. 5; 1 Pet. v. 2, 3.

† Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 18; John x. 16; Eph. v. 25; 1 Cor. xii.; John xvii. 20-26.

‡ Luke xxiv. 47; Acts i. 8; ix. 15; Coloss. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 23; ix. 20; Rom. x. 18.

duced. But so far is it from the case that texts *considered in themselves* contradict it, that, on the contrary, they *immediately* express it *of themselves*, and can be distorted from it only by violating all the laws of interpretation. Accordingly, that view of the texts about Peter, which establishes his Primacy, is wonderfully confirmed by analogy, and by its harmony with what the Scriptures tell us of the Church, as instituted by Christ.

4. And nothing will be wanting to give full assurance to this confirmation, if we add the *fourth or external* criterion, that derived from consent of witnesses. I am not going to urge here the divine force and infallible authority of Christian tradition; I shall merely allege what no person of discretion can deny or question. The first point is, that in the actual controversy the testimony of the most ancient witnesses cannot be disregarded; and the second, that it carries the very strongest prejudice in favour of whichever interpretation it supports.

Now, here we have to do, first, with the interpretation of a series of dogmatic texts; and, secondly, with a point of doctrine, which, being of the utmost moment, could not be unknown to any one. But are these matters on which ancient witnesses, such as the Christian Fathers, and ecclesiastical writers, can be safely passed by unheard? If it were a matter of geography, chronology, or archæology, one might allow it, though with regret: but this is out of the question, in a matter of dogmatic texts, and those relating to a most important doctrine. For notorious is the zeal with which the ancient Fathers laboured to preserve and interpret the dogmatic texts of Scripture. We know their care to prevent the introduction of new and false interpretations, and new and false doctrines thence arising. And we know that, together with the Scriptures, they received from the Apostolic teaching the kindred power of interpreting them. For, as Origen remarked, "Since there are many who think that they believe what is of Christ, and some of them believe

what is different from those before them, yet, since the preaching of the Church is preserved, as handed down by the order of succession from the Apostles, and to the present day abiding in the Church, that verity alone is to be believed, which in nothing is discordant from the ecclesiastical and Apostolical tradition.” *

Moreover, can it seem safe to enter upon a track most divergent from that which the Apostles marked out, and the Christian people constantly followed? St. Paul † taught us to listen to witnesses, and Christendom, whether assembled in council, or everywhere diffused, was content to depend on them. Most clear is what is said on this point about the Fathers at Nicea ‡ and Ephesus, § and no less so the words of Leontius of Byzantium, || John Cassian, ¶ Theodoret, * * Augustine, † † Jerome, ‡ ‡ Epiphanius, §§ Basil, ||| Origen, ¶ ¶ Tertullian, * * * Clement of Alexandria, † † † and the oldest of all, Irenæus, † † † who says, “The true knowledge is the doctrine of the Apostles, and the ancient state of the Church in the whole world, and the character of the body of Christ, according to the succession of Bishops, by which they handed down the Church, which is in every place, which hath reached even to us, being guarded without fiction, *with a most full interpretation of the Scriptures*, admitting neither addition nor subtraction, and the reading without falsification, and legitimate and diligent exposition according to the Scriptures, without danger, and without blasphemy, and the chief gift of charity, which is more precious than knowledge, more glorious than prophecy,

* Origen, preface *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, n. 2.

† 2 Tim. ii. 2.

‡ See Athanas. de decretis Nic. Synodi, and also Hist. tripartit. lib. 2, 2, 3.

§ See Vincent of Lerins, Commonit. c. 32, 33.

|| Leontius, contr. Nestorium, lib. 1.

¶ Cassian, de Incarn. lib. 1.

* * Theodoret, in the three dialogues.

† † Augustine, cont. Cresconium, 1, c. 32, 33.

‡ ‡ Jerome, Ep. 126, and Dialog. adv. Luciferianos.

§ § Epiphanius, Hæres. 61, 75, 78.

||| Basil, cont. Eunomium, lib. 1; de Spiritu S. c. 29.

¶ ¶ Origen in Matt. Tract. 29.

* * * Tertullian, throughout the book De Prescriptionibus.

† † † Clement, Stromatum, lib. 7.

‡ ‡ † Irenæus, lib. 4, c. 63 and 45.

more eminent than all graces." For, as he says elsewhere, "We ought to learn the truth, where the gifts of the Lord are placed; among whom is that succession of the Church, which is from the Apostles, sound and irreproachable conversation, and discourse unadulterated and incorrupt. For these maintain that faith of ours in one God, who made all things: these increase that love towards the Son of God, who has made for our sake so great dispositions: *these explain to us the Scriptures without peril.*"

And, besides, where is the Protestant who does not praise the Hebrew illustrations of Lightfoot, Schoettgen, and Meuschen? or who does not at least make much of the commentaries of Aben Ezra, Kinchi, Jarchi, and others, in the interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures? They all see the advantage of approaching such sources of information, and using them for their own purpose. But are we to refuse to the Fathers and ancient doctors of the Church the deference which we allow to Rabbins and Thalmudists? This is at least a reason for hearing the testimony of the Fathers.

And if it be concordant, constant, and universal, it most powerfully recommends that Scriptural interpretation which agrees with it. In this, all Catholics without exception, and the most judicious and learned Protestants, are agreed. In good truth, it would be incredible that an interpretation could be false, which was adopted unanimously by the Fathers of every age and country. And it ought to be as incredible to find any one so conceited, as not to be greatly moved by the witness and consent of Christian antiquity.

One point of inquiry remains, whether the Fathers have given their opinion, and that unanimously, on Peter and the texts which relate to him. But their words* inserted in the foregoing pages entirely terminate this controversy, and show that they were all of the mind expressed by Gregory the Great, in these words, which, it is well to remember, were directed to

* It may be allowable also to refer to the fifth section of the work mentioned in the preface, "The See of St. Peter," etc.

the supreme civil authority of those days, for he tells the emperor—

“To all who know the Gospel, it is manifest that the charge of the whole Church was entrusted by the voice of the Lord to the holy Apostle Peter, Prince of all the Apostles. For to him it is said, ‘Peter, lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep.’ To him is said, ‘Behold, Satan hath desired to sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not; and do thou, one day, in turn, confirm thy brethren.’ To him is said, ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church,’ and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.”*

* St. Greg. Ep. lib. 5, 20.

INDEX.

A.

- Abraham*, parallel between, and Peter, 261-268, 426, 432, 433.
- Acts*, division of, 346—state the accomplishment of Christ's promises, 346, 348—history of the mystical body, as the Gospels of the Head, 347—elucidate the institution of the Primacy by showing its execution, 348 and following.
- Africa*, Church of, its terms addressing Pope Theodore, 342, 467.
- Agatho*, Pope, A.D. 678-682, referred to, 467—states his Primacy in the case of St. Wilfrid, 467—to the Emperor Heraclius and the 6th Council, 474.
- Alexander* of Alexandria, referred to, 463.
- Ambrose*, St., interprets the name of Peter, 255—terms Peter "the Rock of the Church," 259—"the Apostle in whom is the Church's support," 260—affirms and describes his Primacy, 299—declares, "where Peter is, there is the Church," 301—interprets John xxi. 15-17 of Peter's Primacy, 315—says, "the rights of venerable communion flow from St. Peter's chair as from a fountain-head," 435—describes schism as rendering Christ's passion of no effect, 447—and as the unforgiven sin, 447—mentions a Novatian error of restricting the keys to Peter personally, 456, n.—assigns the origin of unity to Peter, 457.
- Ambrosiaster*, makes Paul's visit an acknowledgment of Peter's Primacy, 389—ranges James and John under Peter, as Barnabas under Paul, 392—sees in Paul's censure of Peter a proof of Peter's Primacy, 395.
- Ammianus Marcellinus*, referred to, 468.
- Analogy*, between universal and particular Churches and the Primate and all bishops, 435—of the body, house, kingdom, city, and fold, with the Church, 248-250, 435—its force as a proof for the Primacy, 464—as a criterion of interpretation, 482.
- Anglicanism*, the peculiar inconsistency of, 439-442.
- Anglicans, Lutherans, and Culpinists*, comparative proof for their doctrines and for the Primacy, 471, 484.
- Apostles*, their relation to Peter, 271, 307, 311-314, 331-333, 335, 337, 341—their commission as given in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, 306—exercise of their powers, 307, 376—how they sent Peter and John, 366—are teachers and judges in controversy, 376—the spirit of truth promised to them and to their successors, 407-411—inequality in the college of, 421—twelve proofs of it, 424-429.
- Aquilaia*, Fathers of, ascribe the origin of unity to Peter, 457.
- Archimandrites* of Syria, call Pope Hormisdas "Patriarch of the whole world," 435.
- Arnobius*, calls Peter the Bishop of Bishops, 374, 435.
- Athanasius*, St., states the object of the Incarnation, 270, 404—referred to, on behalf of the principle of tradition, 485.
- Augustine*, St., terms Peter "the rock which the proud gates of hell prevail not against," 259—"the figure of the Church," 300—"made another self by Christ, and one with Himself," 342—states the object of the Incarnation, 270, 403—explains the banquet in John xxi., 309—says the order in which the Apostles were called is uncertain, 324—mentions Peter's holy humility in being censured by Paul, 399—says there is no remission of sins outside the Church, 447—that those who are out of the Church have not charity, 447—terms schism a horrible crime and sacrilege, 447—distinguishes the Church as Catholic, 451—referred to as explaining the term Catholic, 452, 453—and quoted, 472—why he teaches that the keys were bestowed on Peter as representing the person of the Church, 456, n.*—referred to, 457—and on tradition, 485.
- Avitus*, St., attests the Pope's Primacy, 466.

B.

- Ballerini*, Peter, his works referred to, 467.
- Baronius*, explains St. Peter being sent to the circumcision, 392—remarks on the distortion of Paul's censure against Peter, 396.
- Basil*, St., calls Peter underlying the building of the Church, 259—interprets John xxi. 15-17 as a grant of all pastoral authority to the Church in the person of Peter her shepherd, 317—referred to, on principle of tradition, 485.
- Bevo*, St., interprets "Arise, Peter, kill and eat," 368—condemns all separation from the society of Peter, 465.
- Bernard*, St., appeals to Pope Innocent II., as holding the Primacy of faith, 299, 467—calls the Pope universal Bishop, 435—referred to, as explaining the term Catholic, 452—speaks of the solicitude of all Churches resting on the Apostolic See, 459.
- Bishops*, divine institution of, texts for, 483, n. *—proof for, compared with that for the Primacy, 478, 481.
- Βίσκεν*, its meaning, contrasted with *κοιμαίεν*, 337, n.
- Bossuet*, explains the relation between Peter and the Apostles, 312, 314, 336—his writings against Jurien referred to, 449.

C.

- Cæsar*, Julius, parallel between proof for his having been emperor, and for Peter's Primacy, 464.
- Calvinists*, their proofs for the divinity of Christ compared with those of Catholics for the Primacy, 471.
- Canons*, the 22nd of the Apostolic, quoted, 365.
- Cartwright*, the Puritan, observes the inconsistency of Anglicanism, 442, n. †.
- Casanbon*, referred to, 448.
- Cassian*, John, states the Primacy of St. Peter as continuing in the Church, 343—referred to, 485.
- Catholicity*, texts on the Church's, referred to, 438, 483, n. †—in what it consists, material and formal parts, 452—the formal part as negative and as affirmative, 452-456.
- Christ*, at His passion, commends the Church as His "finished work" to God the Father, 247—stands in two relations to the Church while on earth, as Founder and as Ruler, 251, 284—selects from His disciples first twelve and then one, 262, 324—explains the name of Peter, 256—communicates to Peter the gift of being the Foundation, 267—educates him for the office of chief ruler, 272—associates him in a peculiar manner with Himself, 277—designates a chief

ruler in His Church, 280, 284—and that one to be Peter, 289—makes a further disposition of power after His resurrection, 303—makes Peter the one Shepherd over His fold, 309, 318—fulfils His promises to the Twelve, 305—and to Peter, 307—foretells Peter's crucifixion, 318—paraphrase of His promises to Peter in Matt. xvi. 17-20, 330—the mystical Head of the Church, 382—the incarnate Word the principle of Unity and Headship in the Church, 402-405—His headship does not dispense with a visible hierarchy, 408—and cannot be expressed by the unity of a college, 414—bestows all spiritual gifts, 408, 411.

- Chrysostom*, St., interprets the name Peter, 254, 270—terms Peter "the support of the faith," 260—"the mouthpiece of the Apostles and teacher of the world," 300, 351—the Teacher, 371, 372—the Father, 379—the greater and elder, 388—interprets "the keys" to mean power over all things in heaven, 258—interprets, "give it to them for me and for thee," 278, 279—interprets John xxi. 15-17 as the charge of the whole Church given to Peter, 315, 316—witnesses to St. Peter's Primacy, 322, 327, 355, 357—describes the subject of the Acts, 346—says that in Christ the race of God and man is become one, 347—describes Peter as the first on every occasion, 352—says the Acts are those of St. Peter and St. Paul, 352—interprets "confirm thy brethren" of St. Peter's supreme authority, 355—makes St. John subordinate to St. Peter, 358—interprets Acts x. 47, 369—likens Peter to the commander of an army, 374—says that he anticipates St. Paul's doctrine to the Romans, 375—makes St. Paul prefer Peter to himself, 387—and to the other Apostles, 387—considers St. Paul's visit to him a proof of his Primacy, 389—explains Gal. ii. 7-9, 391—speaks of the dignity of St. Peter's person, 395—denies it to have been St. Peter who was censured by St. Paul, 398—remarks on St. Paul's prudence in the manner of giving this censure, 400—his remark on the Incarnation, 403—describes the unity of the Church all over the world, 436—distinguishes the Church as Catholic, 451—referred to on necessity of communion between the Church's members, 454.
- Church*, establishment of, the "finished work" of God the Word incarnate, 247, 250—unity and visibility part of its primary idea, 249—and a visible headship, 250—unchangeable, like her Lord, 285—had one ruler from the beginning, 286—unity of, fourfold, 405—of mystical influx, 406—of charity, 406—of faith, 406, 411—of visible headship, 412-417

—its identity, 438—its unity, and texts proving it, 438—its Catholicity, 451—these three viewed as reasons for the Primacy, 451—456—means the whole society of believers, 441—texts which so define it, 441, n. *—as set forth in Scripture, 446.

Claude, the Calvinist, referred to, 448.

Clement of Alexandria, referred to as defining the Church, 441—on the term Catholic, 453—on the principle of tradition, 455.

Clement, the Pseudo, his epistle to St. James quoted, 365.

Celestinus, referred to, 453.

Confirming, meaning of the term in Luke xxii. 32, 53.

Cornelius, conversion of, 367.

Council of Nicea, referred to, 453, 485.

— of Sardica, referred to, 453.

— of Ephesus, referred to, 453.

— of Chalcedon, terms Peter "the rock and foundation of the Catholic Church, and the basis of the orthodox faith," 260.

— third, of Carthage, referred to, 441, 453.

— second, of Constantinople, referred to, 441.

— of Laodicea, referred to, 441.

— second Nicene, referred to, 441.

Creed, how it contains St. Peter's Primacy, 458.

Criteria of interpretation, four chief ones, 476—verbal, 477—real, 476—analogical, 481—consent of witnesses, 484.

Cyprian, St., terms Peter the rock of the Church that was to be built, 259—quotes the confessors out of Novatian's schism, 236—says that perfidy cannot approach the Roman faith, 294—says that the Church is built on Peter, 301, 399—says that the Apostles, as such, are equal, 306—but adds the Primacy of St. Peter, 317—solution of his phrase, "the episcopate is one, of which a part is held by each without division of the whole," 334—how his statements on the unity of the Catholic episcopate cohere with the Primacy, 455—makes St. Peter's See the fountain in the Church, 342—says the Church is in the bishop, 364—compares the unity in the Church to that of the Holy Trinity, 417—defines a particular Church as a people united to its priest, and a flock adhering to its pastor, 436—describes the one Church and its prerogatives, 445—distinguishes it by the name Catholic, 451.

Cyril, St., of Alexandria, says the Church is founded on Peter, 254—describes the presence of the Holy Spirit in Christians, 347—remarks on the Incarnation, 404.

Cyril, St., of Jerusalem, affirms St. Peter's Primacy, 300—calls the Church Catholic, 451—explains the term, 452.

D.

Dante, his words on fortune, 419.

Dionysius, the so-called Areopagite, states that the office of the Holy Spirit is the deification of man, 347.

E.

Ephrem of Antioch, on the unity produced by the Incarnation, 404.

Ephrem, St. Syrus, calls Peter the candle and tongue of the disciples and the voice of preachers, 300.

Epiphanius, St., terms Peter the immovable rock of the Church, 259—and says that the charge of bringing the Gentiles into the Church is laid on him, 369—referred to, on tradition, 485.

Eucherius, St., of Lyons, calls Peter the Pastor of pastors, 435.

Eusebius, states that St. John visited the Churches of Asia, 373—calls the Church by the name of Catholic, 451—referred to, 465.

Euthalius, his summary of the Acts, 351.

Evidence, moral, how far intended to be convincing, 324.

F.

Faith, how called by the Fathers, 450, n.

Fathers, the Greek, on Gal. ii. 11, unanimously set forth St. Peter's Primacy, 397—399.

Ferrandus, refers inquirers to the Apostolic See, 465—states the authority of Councils confirmed by it, 466.

First, force of the term, 322.

Fructuosus, St., the Church in his Acts called Catholic, 451.

G.

Gelasius, Pope, A.D. 492—496, referred to, 457—states the power of the Apostolic See, 466, 467.

Gnostics and Marcionites, distort Paul's censure of Peter, 396.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, St., his remark on the Incarnation, 403.

Gregory Nazianzen, St., terms Peter the rock of the Church, 260—remarks on the Incarnation, 403—calls the Church the tunic without seam, etc., 436—referred to, 457.

Gregory of Nyssa, St., his remark on the unity produced by the Incarnation, 404.

Gregory the Great, St., A.D. 590—603, remarks Peter's humility in defending himself, 371—founds the Primacy on the three great texts, 487.

Gregory II., Pope, A.D. 715—731, describes the reverence felt to Peter in the eighth century, 345.

H.

- Heresy*, why it has lost its foulness in the minds of Protestants, 419.
- Hierarchy*, the visible, why constituted, 408-412—a head of it necessary, 412-417.
- Hilary* of Poitiers, St., terms Peter the rock of the Church, 259—his remark on the effect of the Incarnation, 403—speaks of the unity produced by the Incarnation and the Eucharist, 405—sets forth the Church's unity, 438, n. †—referred to as defining the Church, 441.
- Hippolytus*, St., his remark on the fruit of the Incarnation, 403.
- History*, Christian, fourteen distinct classes of facts in it attest the Primacy, 464-468.
- Hormisdas*, Pope, A.D. 514-523, referred to, 457.

I.

- Ignatius*, St., uses the word Catholic of the Church, 451, 452.
- Incarnation*, the order and gifts of, lost sight of by those without the Church, 270—the object of, 270, 402-405.
- Innocent I.*, Pope, A.D. 401-417, makes the Apostolic See the fountain in the Church, 342—his letters to St. Victrice, 467.
- Irenæus*, St., his remarks on the Incarnation, 403—referred to as defining the Church, 441—describes the Church's unity, 441—and terms it Catholic, 451—and explains the term, 452—sets forth tradition and the chiefship of the Roman Church, 454—states the principle of tradition as guarding the faith, 485, 486.
- Isidore*, St., declares that whoever does not obey Peter is a schismatic, 345.

J.

- James*, St., the martyrdom of, how mentioned by St. Luke, 378.
- Jerome*, St., puts the safety of the Church in the bishop, 286—makes the Primacy to be instituted against schism, 315—says it is not a Church which has no priest, 364—ascribes the decision of the Council of Jerusalem to St. Peter, 377—and makes St. Paul's visit to Peter a token of his Primacy, 390, 395—gives the reasons of those who denied it to be St. Peter who was censured, 396, 397—describes the necessity of adhering to Peter's See, 436, 454, n. ||—referred to as defining the Church, 441—distinguishes it as Catholic, 451—referred to, 457—referred to on principle of tradition, 485.
- John*, St., his sphere distinguished from that of Peter, 326—how often mentioned

- in the New Testament, 327—with his brother called Boanerges, 256, n. *, 322—makes himself subordinate to Peter, 353, 364, 366.
- Judith*, among his brethren, a type of Peter among the Apostles, 426, 433, 434.
- Julian* the Apostate, distorts Paul's censure of Peter, 396.
- Jurien*, referred to, 448.
- Jurisdiction*, spiritual, derived from the person of Christ to St. Peter, 393, 340, 342—creation of, precedes the formation of the Church, 338, 340.
- Justinian*, the Emperor, referred to, 453.

K.

- King*, on the Creed, referred to, 451.

L.

- Lactantius*, describes necessity of belonging to the Church, 447.
- Lancelot*, referred to, 453.
- Leo*, St., Pope, 440-461, paraphrases the name of Peter, 255—states his Primacy and association with Christ, 259—explains why our Lord prays specially for Peter, 290—says that Peter rules all by immediate commission, 317, 393—that Christ gave to the rest through Peter, 334—that he assumed Peter into the participation of His indivisible unity, 343—remarks on the unity produced by the Incarnation, 404—describes the unity of the Catholic episcopate as knitted up in the See of St. Peter, 457.
- Leontius*, referred to, 485.
- Luke*, St., his purpose in writing the Acts, 346—part which he assigns to Peter, in general, 340-353—in particulars, 353-379—slightly mentions the other Apostles, 351—exhibits Peter's miracles as John does those of Christ, 361—makes him the main figure in the Apostolic college, 360.
- Lutherans*, their proofs for the real presence compared with those of Catholics for the Primacy, 471.

M.

- Mamachi*, his works referred to, 468.
- Marius* Victorinus, makes Paul's visit an acknowledgment of Peter's Primacy, 389.
- Maximus*, St., of Turin, says that Christ gave to Peter His own title, the Rock, 260—sets forth Peter's Primacy, 344.
- Maximus*, martyr, referred to, 457.
- Mezzanat*, referred to, 448.
- Metaphor*, tests of clearness in, 478.
- More*, Sir Thomas, his statement to Luther of reasons for maintaining the Primacy, 474.

Mosheim, his admission that the early Fathers set forth a unity which terminates in the Papal See, as the hand does in the fingers, 418, 419, n. †
Muzzarelli, his works referred to, 463.

N.

Names, classes of, given in Scripture, 260, 261.
Nicole, referred to, 449.

O.

Oecumenius, on the fruit of the Incarnation, 403.

Optatus, St., calls St. Peter's the single chair in which unity was to be observed by all, 343—calls schism the greatest of evils, 447—referred to, as explaining the term Catholic, 452—ascribes the origin and maintenance of unity to Peter, 457.

Origen, says that Peter is so called from Christ the Rock, 255—calls Peter the great foundation of the Church, 260—describes the great honour given by Christ to Peter in the matter of the didrachma, 278—makes Peter the first, as Judas the last, of the Apostles, 322—referred to, as defining the Church, 441—distinguishes the Church as Catholic, 451—states the principle of tradition, 484—referred to, on same, 485.

P.

Pacian, St., calls the Church Catholic, 451—explains the term, 452, 453—describes the Church's unity, 454, n. *—ascribes the origin of unity to Peter, 457.

Paul, St., distinguishes St. Peter among the Apostles, 304—why so much said of him in the Acts, 352—his visitatorial power contrasted with St. Peter's, 373—his epistles incidentally confirm St. Peter's Primacy, 386—recognizes St. Peter's Primacy, 387—by going to visit him, 388-390—and in his second visit, 390-394—what is involved in his censure of St. Peter, 394, 395—its real amount, 400—force of his terming the Church "one body," 415—how emphatic he is in setting forth visible unity, 418.

Pelagius II., Pope, 578-590, states privileges of the Apostolic See, 466.

Petavius, shows that spiritual jurisdiction springs from the direct gift of Christ, 340.

Peter, St., first mention of him in the Gospel, 253—meaning of his name, 254—a special title of our Lord, 254—name first promised, 253—conferred, 256—

explained and promises attached, 257, 331-333—titles of, betokening his association with Christ, 259, 260—parallel between, and Abraham, 261-263, 426, 432, 433—his name explained by St. Chrysostom, 270—his relation to the Apostles, 271, 332, 333, 335-337, 341—his instruction in the theology and economy, 273—witness of the transfiguration, 275—of the Lord's prayer in His agony, 273—of raising the daughter of Jairus, 276—associated with Christ in paying of the didrachma, 276—designated to be chief ruler of the Church, 289—charged to confirm his brethren, 289-301—is distinguished in having the resurrection proved to him, 304—all our Lord's promises fulfilled to him, 307 and following—mentioned by the Evangelists differently from the other Apostles, 320—named first in every catalogue, 322—his sphere distinguished from that of John, 326—his predominance in the sacred history, 327—how often mentioned in the Gospels, 328—and in the Acts, 349—the type, the origin, and the efficient cause of unity, 334, 341—looked up to, as a God upon earth, by the West, 345—prominence given to him in the Acts, 348-353—directs the election of a new Apostle, 353—defends the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, 356—speaks for them the third and fourth time, 358—proves his supreme authority by special miracles, 359—cures Eneas and raises Dorcas, 362—heals with his shadow, 362—receives the Samaritans into the Church, 363-366—and the Gentiles, 367-370—exercises supreme judicial power, 372—visits all Churches, 373—is the first to pronounce decision in the Council of Jerusalem, 374-378—his imprisonment and that of St. James and St. Paul, 378—summary of his conduct in the Acts, 379-382—his visible headship quite other than the headship of mystical influx, 382—set with James and John parallel to Paul with Barnabas and Titus, 391—the head, centre, fountain, root, and principle of unity, 416—is in the episcopate what God the Father is in the divine monarchy, 417—his office in the Church acknowledged by friend and foe, 419—typified in Judah, 426, 433-434.

Peter Chrysologus, St., says of Peter that he founds the Church by his firmness, 260—advises Eutyches to obey the Pope, 299.

Philip, St., perhaps the first-called Apostle, 324.

Pionius, St., his Acts call the Church Catholic, 451.

Polycarp, St., the epistle on his death calls the Church Catholic, 451.

Porphyry, distorts Paul's censure of Peter, 396.

Primacy, the nature of, defined in the three palmary texts, 337-348—shown to consist in superiority of jurisdiction, 429-431—compared to the law of gravitation, 342, 428—institution and exercise of, compared, 381—the controversy on, reduced to one point, 425—summary of, as set forth in the Acts, 379—and generally, 421-424—the end and purpose of, 431—to which end three classes of reasons guide us, i. the typical, 432—ii. the analogical, 435—iii. the real, 437—bound up in the visibility and unity of the Church, 451—what is required of those who deny it, 461—its denial the origin of all actual divisions among Christians, 462—its proof as considered *absolutely*, 462—*comparatively* with that for the divine institution of bishops, the real presence, and the divinity of Christ, 471-482—multiplicity of proof for it, 464-468—the opposition of Greeks, Anglicans, and Protestants to it, merely negative, 469, 470—parallel between the opposition to it by sects now, and that to the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, 475.

Primacy and Apostolate, their relation to each other, 315, 332, 333, 336, 338.

Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople, calls Peter first prelate of the Apostles, 435.

Proofs, the different sort of, and their whole sum, to be considered, 253—different sorts of, and the principal here used, 460—multiplicity of, for the Primacy, 461—as considered *absolutely*, 462—*comparatively*, 471—concurrence of four great proofs for the Primacy, 464.

Prudentius, calls Peter the first disciple of God, 300.

R.

Reformers, distort Paul's censure of Peter, 396—opposition between them and the Fathers as to Peter's Primacy, 400—as to Church principles, 444, n. *—denied the visibility of the Church, 439, n. †††.

S.

Sacraments and Symbols, lead from the visible to the invisible, 414.

Sense in writing, definition of, 477, n.

Socrates and Sozomen, their canon respecting the Bishop of Rome, 466.

Stephen, Bishop of Dora, describes Peter's Primacy, 295, 319.

Stephen, Bishop of Larissa, makes all the Churches of the world to rest in Peter's confession, 301.

Symmachus, Pope, A.D. 418-514, likens the unity of the Apostolic See to that of the Trinity, 417.

T.

Tertullian, why our Lord gave Peter a name drawn from figures of Himself, 256—says the Church is built on Peter, 259—expresses Peter's supreme power, and distinguishes his sphere from that of John, 326—ascribes the decision in the Council of Jerusalem to St. Peter, 377, 389—referred to, as defining the Church, 441—and as explaining the term Catholic, 452, 453—sets forth Church unity, 441—denies that Peter's doctrine was censured, 399—calls the Catholic Church *near to Peter*, 456—says the Lord left the keys to Peter, and through him to the Church, 456—his rule not to search for the truth among heretics, 472—referred to, on the principle of tradition, 485.

Theodore, Abbot of the Studium at Constantinople, addresses Pope Paschal I. as Peter, and beseeches him to exert his Primacy, 295—calls Pope Leo III. father of fathers, etc., 435.

Theodoret, says *stone* is a title of our Lord, 255—terms Peter the most solid rock, 259—ascribes the decision in the Council of Jerusalem to St. Peter, 377—recognizes Peter's Primacy, 386, 388.

Theophylact, says that Peter confirms not only the Apostles, but all the faithful to the end of the world, 292—interprets John xxi. 15-17 of supreme power over the Church given to Peter, 316.

Thomas, St., of Canterbury, sees in Paul's visit to Peter a proof of his Primacy, 300.

U.

Unity, that of the Father and the Son the archetype of the Church's unity, 416—fourfold in the Church, of mystical influx, charity, faith, and visible headship, 405-417—texts on the Church's unity, referred to, 438, 482, n. †—Protestant notions of the Church's unity, 439—that of Anglicans, 439—that of distinguishing between internal and external unity, 442—that of agreement in fundamentals, 448.

V.

Valentinian III., his constitution on the Primacy quoted, 468.

Vincent of Lerins, referred to, on principle of tradition, 485.

Viringa, sets forth a Protestant notion of unity, 442-445.

Voss, on the Creed, referred to, 451.

W.

Walonburg, the brothers, referred to, 449.

Z.

Zaccaria, his works referred to, 466.

Zeno, St., quoted, 259.

INDEX OF TEXTS.

The number indicates the page.

GENESIS.	PAGE	WISDOM.	PAGE	PAGES.	PAGE
v. 29	261	viii. 1	365	xvii. 1	323
x. 25	260			— 23	276
xii. 1	262	ISAIAH.		— 24	325
— 4	262	vii. 3	261	— 27	277, 326
xvii. 5	262	ix. 6	337	xviii. 1	334
— 15	261	xxviii. 16	254, 267	— 2	280
— 19	260	xl. 9-11	310	— 17	439
xviii. 17	265			— 18	302, 335, 439
xxii. 1	263	EZECHIEL.		— 21	327
— 10	263	xxiv. 33	310	xix. 23	328
xxv. 25	260			— 27	328
— 26	260	DANIEL.		— 28	433
— 30	260	ii. 35	254	xx. 20	282, 334
xxvii. 36	260	ix. 26	251	— 27	323
xxx. 18	260			xxiii. 8	285
xxxii. 28	261	OSEA.		— 9	219
xl. 51, 52	260	i. 4, 6, 9	261	xxvi. 36	275
xlix. 10	434			— 40	325
		MICAH.		— 69	321
EXODUS.		v. 2	283, 310	xxviii. 18	306, 336
ii. 10	260			— 19	311
		ZACHARIAH.		— 19, 20	248, 439
NUMBERS.		iii. 9	254	— 36	275
ii. 3-9	434			MARK.	
x. 14	434	MALACHI.		i. 16	308
xii. 2	382	i. 11	366	— 16, 17	262
xiii. 17	261			— 18	262
xvi. 3	332	1 MACC.		— 36	321, 325
		ii. 2-4	260	ii. 25	320, 325
JUDGES.				iii. 11	320
i. 1-3	434	MATTHEW.		— 13	251, 302
xx. 18	434	i. 1	267	— 14	256
		ii. 6	283, 310	— 17	260
1 PARALIP.		iii. 1	261	— 16-19	322
xxvii. 33	323	v. 14	249, 446	iv. 38	308
		x. 1	256, 302	v. 35	276
2 PARALIP.		— 2-5	322, 325	— 37	323
xxvi. 20	323	— 5	368	xiii. 3	323
		— 7	360	xiv. 33	323
NEHEMIAH.		xii. 3	320, 325	xvi. 6	304
xii. 45	323	xv. 24	363	— 7	321
		— 30	363	— 10	320, 325
PSALMS.		xvi. 13-19	257	— 15	306, 311, 336, 367
ii. 9	312	— 15	263, 328	— 15-17	360
xlvii. 2	249	— 16	263, 302, 329	LUKE.	
lxix. 26	354	— 17-20	330	iv. 40, 41	362
lxxxii. 6	268	— 18	248, 329, 332, 337, 367, 388, 437, 439	v. 3	308
cviii. 8	354	— 19	335, 337	— 10	262
cxvii. 22	254			vi. 4	320
cxxxii. 13, 14	249			— 12, 13	302
				— 14	256



LIBRARY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

262.11

A.855

122423

v.2

ALLIES, THOMAS

262.11

A.855

122423

v.2

ALLIES, THOMAS

PER CRUCEM AD LUCEM







