

UC-NRLF



B 3 245 738



Baelborough hall.



Ri



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

REASONS

FOR

NOT TAKING THE TEST

FOR

NOT CONFORMING TO THE ESTABLISHED
CHURCH

AND FOR

NOT DESERTING THE ANCIENT FAITH

WITH PRELIMINARY AND CONCLUDING
OBSERVATIONS

TOGETHER WITH

SOME REMARKS ON THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH'S
LATE CHARGE,
&c. &c.

BY

JOHN, EARL OF SHREWSBURY.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JOSEPH BOOKER, NEW BOND STREET.

1828.

52260720

LOAN STACK

X99

479A

London:—Printed by C. RICHARDS,
St Martin's-lane, Charing-cross.

TO HIS GRACE

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK,

EARL MARSHALL,

&c. &c. &c.

CONCEIVING myself called upon to vindicate the religion of my Catholic fellow-countrymen from the virulent calumnies so unwarrantably fixed upon it by the laws of the land, as well as to defend their conduct in their capacity of members of the state, I cannot bring the hasty result of my labours before the Public, in a manner more worthy of the subject, or more agreeable to my own feelings, than by dedicating them to your Grace.

The Catholics of this Empire may be justly proud in the reflection that, while they are fellow-sufferers in the same cause with the

first nobleman in the kingdom, they suffer with one who is more entitled to his rank and honours, by the public and private virtues which adorn him, than by the adventitious circumstance of hereditary descent,—whose patriotism is only outshone by the noble sacrifice which he offers to the dictates of his conscience,—and whose chief regret in being deprived of the privileges from which he is so unjustly debarred, arises from the inability to employ them for the advantage of his country.

I have the honour to remain,

MY LORD DUKE,

With the most sincere respect

and esteem,

Your Grace's most obedient

humble Servant,

SHREWSBURY.

SIDMOUTH,

March 18, 1828.

ERRATA.

PAGE.	LINE.	
lxxv	5 and 7,	for <i>was</i> read <i>were</i> .
lxxxii	20	for <i>promiscuous</i> read <i>indiscriminate</i> .
lxxxiv	10	for <i>similar</i> read <i>criminal</i> .
lxxxvii	6	omit the comma after <i>evidence</i> .
cvii	last line,	omit <i>as</i> after <i>happy</i> .
cxx	12	for 28 read 16 ; and line 14, for 73 read 61.
147	16	for <i>formerly</i> read <i>formally</i> .
191	17	omit the inverted commas after <i>same</i> .
242	6	lines from bottom, omit the comma after <i>were</i> .
248	19	omit <i>which</i> .
249	7	omit <i>parts</i> ; and line 11, put semicolon after <i>Christians</i> .
254	2	for <i>writing</i> read <i>writings</i> .
270	5	lines from bottom, after <i>authority</i> insert * to mark the following note at the bottom of the page, " <i>See Lingard's Hist. of England,</i> " p. 153, Vol. vi. 4to.
271	1	after <i>infallibility</i> insert * to indicate the following note at the foot of the page, " <i>See Lingard's History,</i> " p. 591, Vol. vii. 4to.
272	7	after <i>therefore</i> insert <i>instead of being collected into one fold</i> .
274	4	for <i>to the God of Truth for another false worship</i> , read <i>for another false worship to the God of Truth</i> .
278	16	omit <i>by its fruits you shall know it</i> .
279	3	insert after <i>narrowly</i> ,— <i>by its fruits you shall know it ; the evil tree bringeth forth evil fruit : do men gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles !</i> and omit this quotation in the latter part of the same page.
284	10	for <i>none but such as have</i> , read <i>none who have</i> .
289	21	for <i>Lord Strafford</i> read <i>Lord Stafford</i> ; and line 23, after <i>me</i> insert <i>says Boswell</i> .
290	12	for <i>at least</i> read <i>of what is concomitant to holiness</i> .
293	17	for <i>memorial</i> read <i>accomplishment</i> .
297	2	put semicolon after <i>Apostles</i> .
298	3	put semicolon after <i>college</i> .
307	5	for 1000 read 1500.

PAGE,	LINE.	
310	10	for <i>it's</i> read <i>her</i> .
323	14	insert <i>and</i> before <i>to expel</i> .
326	4	insert <i>her</i> before <i>errors</i> .
327	6	after <i>interpretation</i> insert <i>of the sacred writings</i> .
328	10	for <i>essence of religion</i> read <i>essence of revealed religion</i> .
345	4	read, <i>baptism which is now given by infusion, was formerly administered by immersion; nay, &c.</i>
346	4	after <i>all</i> insert <i>that</i> .
347	24	read, <i>of arriving at a solution of my difficulties, and above all, of acquiring that steadfast faith in the various articles of my religion, without which. &c.; and line 26, for acquire, &c. read obtain amidst such palpable contradictions as are presented by your system. Such are the means, &c.</i>
350	2	from bottom, for <i>paradise</i> read <i>the paradise</i> .
351	24	for <i>division</i> read <i>dissension</i> .
352	9	for <i>destructions</i> read <i>distractions</i> .
354	3	lines from bottom, erase <i>No</i> .
358	4	for <i>writing</i> read <i>writings</i> .
367	2	between <i>have</i> and <i>defrauded</i> , insert <i>thereby</i> ; and at line 8, insert <i>that</i> after <i>finding</i> .
371	4	instead of <i>judged it should</i> read <i>judged it not expedient that it should</i> .
377	1	for <i>is</i> read <i>be</i> ; and last line, for <i>annotation</i> read <i>quotation</i> .
379	1	for <i>an</i> read <i>some</i> ; and line 2, for <i>this cannot be more clearly done</i> , read, <i>nor can this be more satisfactorily done</i> ; and line 10, after <i>faith</i> read <i>amongst them</i> .
391		At the foot of the page insert the following notice : <i>See Origin of Divorces by the Parliament of England, in Lingard, Vol. vii. p. 507. 4to.</i>
397	22	erase <i>all</i> after <i>alone</i> .
411	24	for <i>it</i> read <i>is</i> .
425	11	for <i>it</i> read <i>them</i> .
432	27	for <i>insult</i> read <i>consult</i> .
487	16	and 17, put the semicolon after <i>stigma</i> instead of after <i>perform</i> , and insert <i>while</i> before <i>the tale</i> .
528		last line, for <i>cane</i> read <i>cone</i> .
532	5	for <i>the blood</i> read <i>their blood</i> .
537	8	for <i>beginning</i> read <i>beginnings</i> .
543	28	for <i>address</i> read <i>redress</i> .
690	6	for <i>there</i> read <i>these</i> .

PREFACE

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE man who feels no precise and determined steadfastness in his religious belief, is but little suited to comprehend that unhesitating faith which is the pride, as it is the consolation, of a Catholic; and unconvinced himself, he would only labour in vain in endeavouring to convince others. Receiving his first impressions in a country in which the doctrines of Christianity are become as changeable as the climate, and as various as the productions of the soil, an Englishman is too apt to consider a certainty of faith in any particular system of religion, either as unimportant or unattainable. Amidst the extraordinary diversity by which he is surrounded, he deems it unnecessary to choose, and perhaps dangerous to enquire. He considers many as the dupes of imposture, and others as the victims of fanaticism. His perception of right and wrong, of truth and falsehood, is impaired and blunted by the disorder which reigns around him; he mistrusts his powers in a voyage of discovery

in which such numbers are wrecked before his eyes ; or, he considers the possession of the prize an inadequate reward for the task of obtaining it.

To those who are sunk in apathy and indifference, I would say, that they are afflicted with the most fatal malady to which the soul of man is exposed ; they have condemned to ignominious contempt the very end for which they were created. To those who acknowledge the law, but hold it impossible to be fulfilled, I will answer, that they are guilty of impugning the justice of God, and of placing heaven and earth in irreconcilable opposition to each other. Both are the effects of the insufficiency of that principle, which, incapable of producing conviction, leads either to indifference or despair ; and while the inefficacy of the principle is proved to demonstration by the confusion prevalent amongst those who affect to follow it, the Catholic is preserved in one undeviating and tranquil course, by placing himself under the protection of a guide which both lights and cheers him on his way. Thus unhesitatingly fixed in our belief, it is not surprising that we should think lightly, very lightly indeed, of any attempt made to overturn it. There are but two

methods of attack which can be employed against it: the one, an empty, unmeaning declamation, which, taking the place of argument, refutes itself, or rather, evaporates in air; the other, a gross perversion of facts and reasoning, put together with a degree of disingenuous artifice which no honest man would deign to employ. The former method has been brought into action against the work which I judged it expedient to publish last spring. Having exhausted itself by its own efforts, it neither merits, nor needs, reply. The second has been announced as in preparation; but the period since the announcement is so long, that it seems very questionable whether it will ever make its appearance. If it should, it requires but little foresight to predict, that it will end, like every other artifice employed to sully our religion, by paying a fresh homage to its truth, in the vanity and impotence of its attack.

If our Religion shrink from the most caustic touch of criticism, it can possess but little intrinsic value.—If there be no system of Christianity which can withstand the tests before which all the far-famed philosophy of the ancients has crumbled into atoms, we may boast in vain of its superiority.

It may delight the mind by the beauty of its morality, and the sublimity of its mysteries, but if it command not our unhesitating assent—if its authority be not absolute and paramount—if the law be to be ruled by men, and not men by the law,—we shall soon perceive that while we affect to be obedient to Religion, we are only guided by decorum;—that while the lamp of Faith burns dim and languid, the laws of honour are more powerful than the laws of God;—that we are only Christians by profession, and moralists through a principle of public decency. But if a true religion exist on earth, and a stedfast faith be attainable in Christianity, it cannot be like the philosopher's stone, ever eluding the keenest search. Enquiry will make it our own. The avenues are open; we have only to enter and advance. The sun of knowledge will dissipate the mists from the mountain top, and disclose to our enraptured view, the great city of God upon its summit, in pure and cloudless effulgence.

We court enquiry.—We are only fearful it will be denied us. For, whatever period be selected for investigation,—whatever point of doctrine be singled out for discussion,—so sure are we to find

evidence of its truth, and so certain to discover the object of our solicitude—the true faith of Christ. In vain do we challenge our opponents to conjure up before us the individuals by whose magic powers the novelties, which are imputed to our religion, were first engrafted upon the primitive faith of Christendom, without any one perceiving the strange exotic foliage which thenceforth appeared upon the ancient indigenous stock. No branch, however small or insignificant, has been lopped off; no tender shoot, blighted by the noxious exhalations of error, has drooped and withered on the parent stem; whose fall has not been registered in the annals of history. Could then so many and such gigantic plants, sucking like vampyres the strength and vigour of the tree of which they had taken such tyrannic hold, parasites of the most deadly quality, not only attach themselves, but flourish upon the very life-blood of the dishonoured monarch of the woods, and no man tell the tale of their unnatural usurpation? Was all nature so deeply sunk in apathy and ignorance, as to be unconscious of the mighty change? Were the human passions become so docile, as to submit without a murmur to these

new and galling restraints? Was reason so subjugated, as to embrace strange and unheard of mysteries, without even an expression of astonishment? Was every watchman of the Lord slumbering at his post, when the angel of darkness came to steal away the body of Faith, and bury it impervious to the search of man? Was there not even one 'sleeping witness' to attest the fact? No, not one! The mysterious deed was accomplished by such master-magicians, that no man knew, not even the most wakeful sentinel, who they were, or whence they came, whether

In airs from heaven, or blasts from hell.

Yet these are paradoxes with which the credulity of mankind is mocked, and their reason insulted, by men who have exalted that reason into a very goddess.—They would annihilate, at one fell sweep, every attesting monument,—would obliterate every trace of historic record from the world,—would fill the dreary wilderness they had made, with the creations of their own fancy, and people the regions from which they had banished so many sages, saints, and scholars, with mere shadowy phantoms or revolting chimeras. They would apply their flimsy machinery to raze the stately structure of

our religion to the ground, forgetting that, to crown their vain endeavours with success, they must undermine the foundations of Christianity itself.—But the power which preserved our religion in her infancy, when she had, perhaps, even stronger prejudices and passions to contend with than she has at present, and which has brought her triumphantly through the troubles and misfortunes of her manhood, will continue to guide her in her old age, till, having accomplished her destinies upon earth, she returns, pure and spotless, to whence she came—to the bosom of the Divinity.

I have ventured, very considerably, to enlarge the present edition, both by the introduction of fresh materials, and by entering more minutely into some of the arguments already advanced. I am still fully aware of the very feeble manner in which I have conducted the cause I have undertaken to advocate; and, were it not for the very powerful minds of whose assistance I have availed myself, I could hope to make but little impression. But, of the merits of the question itself, I have no mistrust. I must only hope that the poverty of the workmanship does not conceal the richness of the materials; and that the might of the weapon

may be measured, rather by the justice of the cause, than by the strength of the arm that wields it.

I have frequently referred to a work which has but very lately appeared, and of which it is impossible to speak in terms of sufficient praise. I feel conscious that I have offered it violence, and perhaps done it injustice, in the few quotations I have given. A solitary, scanty, and unconnected passage can convey no adequate idea of the merit of an argument, which has been sketched, coloured, and finished, in its minutest details, by the most masterly hand. I hope that the temptation to draw from so rich a mine, but above all an anxious desire to introduce this elegant writer to the acquaintance of my readers, will afford a sufficient excuse for mutilating so perfect a performance.

Stuttgard, October 1st. 1828.

. Since the date of the above, additional materials of interest, relative to Irish affairs, having been supplied, they will be found in No. XVII. of the APPENDIX.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS, &c.

So many, with much abler pens than mine, have of late years entered the lists of controversy, that I should consider myself only a useless volunteer in the cause, were it not for the peculiar circumstances in which I find myself placed. Out of more than a hundred English peers of my own rank, I am the only one who refuse the Test which the Legislature has thought proper to establish, as the qualification for the exercise of constitutional rights. It is an enviable privilege, though one to which a high responsibility is attached, to enjoy a voice in the affairs of the Commonwealth; to be a guardian over the people's rights, and an instrument for the public good: I therefore consider it a sacred duty to show, why I refuse the exercise of functions so exalted in their character, and so important in their consequences.

That such a Test should *ever* have existed, is matter of astonishment; ^(a) but that it should exist

^(a) This Test is the true-born offspring of that atrocious conspiracy which sacrificed the lives of so many innocent

now, as a measure of high state policy, is beyond all reason and understanding. How the faithful and honourable discharge of the duties of Parliament can be affected more by a belief in Transubstantiation, than by a belief in Consubstantiation, or by a disbelief in the real presence altogether;

individuals, and which Mr. Fox thus characterizes: "The proceedings on the Popish Plot must always be considered as an indelible disgrace upon the English nation, in which king, parliament, judges, juries, witnesses, have all their respective, though certainly not equal, shares. Witnesses of such a character as not to deserve credit in the most trifling cause, upon the most immaterial facts, gave evidence so incredible, or to speak more properly, so impossible to be true, that it ought not to have been believed if it had come from the mouth of Cato; and upon such evidence from such witnesses, were innocent men condemned to death and executed." We have only to look around us to be satisfied that the same delusion still exists in the minds of many;—that even those master-spirits who are the enemies of emancipation, are haunted with the same imaginary horrors of Popery; and that both our doctrine as Christians, and our reputation as subjects, are, to this very day, condemned upon evidence equally incredible and impossible.

When this Test was passing the House of Lords, "Gunning, bishop of Ely, maintained that the Church of Rome was not idolatrous. The lords did not much mind Gunning's arguments, but passed the bill. And though Gunning had said he could not take that test with a good conscience, yet as soon as the bill was passed, he took it in the crowd with the rest."—*Burnet*.

how a man is less fitted to serve his country, because he acknowledges a *spiritual* authority in the Bishop of Rome, as the visible head of the Christian Church, than if he believed that authority to belong to the King of England, are paradoxes which no reflecting mind can for an instant entertain. That *they* who preach, (in conformity with the Doctrine of Christ,) that the kingdom of God is not of this world, and that men are bound to honour and obey their king, and to be subject to the civil power, under pain of damnation; that *they* should hold a divided allegiance, between the spiritual head of their Church, and the lawful authorities of their country, it is preposterous and absurd to imagine.^(b) No: it cannot

^(b) Vindicating his church and country from similar accusations, that admirable patriot and exemplary pastor, Dr. Doyle, in his most powerful and most eloquent reply to Dr. Magee, says:—

“The Catholic Church is also loyal—but she is loyal through a sense of duty, and because such is the line of conduct prescribed to her by Almighty God. She is devoted to the prince established by divine Providence, not through fear or necessity, but freely and cheerfully; in every country, and under whatsoever circumstances, she offers up, as is prescribed by St. Paul, prayers and petitions for the king, and for all that are in high station, that all men may lead a quiet and holy life. To impugn the sincerity of her children in this country in praying for the monarch, and bearing towards him the most sincere devotedness of

be, that we merit our exclusion, because we continue our submission, in doctrinal points, to the

mind and will, is one of the most unworthy deeds of which any person, lay or ecclesiastic, could be guilty.

“The insinuations in the Charge respecting a division of allegiance, and the insecurity of that which we owe and pay to the sovereign of these realms, are **SLANDEROUS** and **MALIGNANT**. They are founded on no facts, supported by no proof; they are contradicted by every page of our history, by the preambles of divers acts of Parliament, by the statements of our friends, the confessions of our enemies, by the senate and the ministers of the king. I omit our own oaths of allegiance, which are incompatible with a division of allegiance, because I cannot submit to vindicate myself or my fellow-countrymen from the imputation of perjury. It is the grossest insult which men were ever condemned to endure.”

But, says the Bishop of St. David's, “they [Roman Catholics] are incapable of the allegiance, which is due from subjects to their sovereign. My Lords, they *are* incapable of that allegiance, because they are bound by a contrary allegiance to a foreign sovereign.”—(*Speech of Dr. Thomas Burgess, Bishop of St. David's*, delivered on the 9th July, 1823, and published by the Right Reverend prelate himself!!)

My only reply to Dr. Burgess is, that his assertion is *false, calumnious, and insulting*. But to what a condition are we reduced! we not only *swear* a true and perfect allegiance, but we swear it in much stronger terms than any Protestant in the kingdom, than the Bishop of St. David's himself. That oath is framed by the legislature, is ac-

authority of the ancient Church of Christendom, instead of transferring it to one of more modern

cepted by the sovereign, and qualifies us for the service of the state. Yet, a peer of parliament is suffered with impunity, and in the face of the whole world, to impeach other peers of parliament, of bearing no true allegiance to their sovereign, *though the sovereign himself has ratified that allegiance by his acceptance of it*,—to accuse them of having called the Almighty to witness, that they would do that which they were incapable of doing,—in truth, to arraign them both of perjury and of treason,—of the highest crimes before God and man. Was ever outrage like this? But this, and much more than this, are we compelled to endure. This same Bishop of St. David's (since translated to the bishopric of Salisbury, doubtless for the merit of having composed the Catechism from which the following dogma is taken) emphatically avows, that, in his infallible judgment, no man can be a Protestant, whatever he may profess to be, who does not KNOW it to be TRUE *that the worship of the Church of Rome is idolatrous*. That the Bishop of St. David's should *know* that to be true of us, which *we know to BE FALSE* of ourselves—that he should SWEAR that to be true of us, which *we would swear to be false* of ourselves, is not so much to be wondered at, because....but even against the Bishop of St. David's I will not condescend to employ the weapon of retaliation which he has thrust into my hand. But if his Protestantism depend upon *his knowledge of the truth of that WHICH IS POSITIVELY, AND ABSOLUTELY, AND NOTORIOUSLY FALSE*; and if the *sincerity* of his allegiance can only be ascertained by his *abjuration of the spiritual authority of the head of the Christian Church*; I envy

date (for she also demands our submission); nor, because in a country in which a hundred different

him neither his principles as a Protestant, nor his profession of fidelity as a subject. But let us hear his own words:

Q. "What is Protestantism?"

A. "The abjuration of Popery, and the *exclusion* of Papists from all *power*, ecclesiastical or civil."

Q. "Is it any hardship on Protestants to make the declaration against Transubstantiation and the invocation of Saints?"

A. "No: Because if they are really Protestants, they are so, on this very principle, that the worship of the Church of Rome is unscriptural, superstitious, and idolatrous."

Q. "Is it any objection to the declaration, that many Protestants, who are called upon to make it, do not know enough of the subject to be satisfied of the truth of the declaration?"

A. "No: Because no one can be a Protestant on principle, who is *not* satisfied of the truth of the declaration; and if he is a Protestant on principle, there can be no hardship in making a declaration, which he *knows* to be true, and, as an avowed Protestant, he *professes* to believe."

Q. "Is it any objection to the declaration, that many Protestants, who are called upon to make it, do not consider the worship of the Church of Rome to be idolatrous, and may therefore think the declaration an unfounded calumny?"

A. "If they think the declaration an unfounded calumny, and hold the worship of the Church of Rome not to be idolatrous, they are not *Protestants*, whatever they may profess to be; and the objection does not apply to them."

sects have found an unmolested footing, we choose to believe one code of religious tenets in preference

Q. "Can we, then, consider the declaration as unnecessary, in respect of the Papists, or hard on Protestants?"

A. "It is neither unnecessary as to the Papists, because the experience of the past shews that former laws were insufficient without it; nor can it be any hardship on the Protestants, because if they are Protestants, on principle, they *know* it to be true, and, as avowed Protestants, *profess* to believe it; and which, if they do not believe, they belie their Protestant profession."

Q. "How may we co-operate with the laws for preventing the growth of Popery?"

A. "By exposing the false pretensions, the errors, the evils, and the interests of Popery; and by doing what the laws require us to do for its prevention."

Q. "What do the laws require us to do for this purpose?"

A. "Certain solemn days are set apart for commemorating the plots and conspiracies of Popery against our Church, and our deliverance from them, &c."—(*The Protestant's Catechism*, by Thomas Burgess, Bishop of St. David's. Fourth Edit. pp. 216, 242, 250.)

Now, if to our Catholic Catechisms, we were to attach the following Appendix, to edify our catechumens with a specimen of the Christian charity of a Protestant divine, we should only be delineating with accuracy the conduct and principles of many of our revilers, and exhibiting a true portrait of the Bishop of St. David's "Protestant's Catechism," painted with his own colours.

Q. What is Protestantism?

A. The *abjuration* of Popery, and the *exclusion* of Papists from all *power*, ecclesiastical or civil.

to another ; nor because, in spite of calumny and proscription, we continue to profess a Christianity

Q. How are we to abjure Popery ?

A. By falsifying history*—by boldly maintaining the assertion of that which is false, under pretence that it is the proof of that which is true ; by framing such fictitious doctrines for the Papists as they abhor and detest,—for their Church is so pure, that without this, we should have nothing to allege against them ;—by calumny and misrepresentation in every shape and of every hue ; by denying that which is true, and believing that which is false ; by accusing Papists of crimes which they never committed, and punishing them for trespasses of which they never dreamt ; by *swearing* that we *know* their doctrines to be superstitious and idolatrous, though they believe the same gospel that we do, and though they most solemnly aver that they hold superstition and idolatry in the same abhorrence and detestation as ourselves.

Q. How are we to *exclude* Papists from all *power*, ecclesiastical or civil.

A. By tyranny, oppression, and injustice ; by scornfully refusing them all civil rights ; by declaring them to be incapable of fulfilling the duties of good subjects, though they have ever been remarkable for their loyalty to their king, and their services to their country ; by pretending that they desire to overthrow the constitution which they are so justly proud of having inherited from their ances-

* See *Examination of certain opinions of the Right Rev. Dr. Burgess, &c.* ; Dr. Lingard's *Tracts*, p. 351, &c.

“Forgery—I blush for the honour of Protestantism while I write it—seems to be peculiar to the reformed ; I look in vain for one of those accursed outrages of imposition among the disciples of Popery.”—*Dr. Whitaker.*

“The Protestants seem to have thought, (says Hume) that no truth should be told of Papists.”

which has been the admiration of all ages, and of all nations, and which is still the prevailing religion of civilized man.^(c) It cannot be, that, in this free and

tors—by carefully excluding them from that inheritance—by accepting of their services when we want them, and rejecting them, unrequited, when we have no farther need of them—by working them like beasts of burden in all hard, dangerous, and laborious occupations, and suffering true Protestants alone to be their task-masters—by keeping all the good things, both of this world and the next, for ourselves—by leaving nothing for Papists but poverty, misery, and exclusion for their treasons here, and damnation for their superstition and idolatry hereafter—by so exciting the execration of the whole country against them, that Englishmen shall again rank *Papistry* where it stood but a few years back in our Statute Book, with *treason* and with *murder*.

Q. How may we co-operate with the laws for preventing the growth of popery?

A. By the same means by which we are to abjure Popery, and to exclude Papists from all *power*, ecclesiastical or civil.

Q. What do the laws require us to do for this purpose?

A. Certain solemn days are set apart for worshipping the God of Charity and Truth with falsehood, calumny, and detraction upon our lips !!! (See the Service for the 5th of November in the *Book of Common Prayer*; and the real History of the Gunpowder Plot, in Lord Castlemain's *Catholique Apology*, (1674), Milner's *Letters to a Prebendary*, and Lingard's *History of England*.)

^(c) Speaking of the religious belief of a Catholic, the faithful and elegant historian of his country, Dr. Lingard, says: "His belief is not the belief of a single nation, nor

enlightened country, we are not equally at liberty with others, to enjoy the common prerogative of the Reformation, and to interpret Scripture at our will. There is no reason in such things. We must look to other causes, to account for that delusion of which we have been so long the victims; which imprints a stain upon our country; which makes us a bye-word among the nations of the earth, and converts the pride and glory we would gladly cherish, even as the degraded members of a free state, into feelings of shame and indignation. We consider ourselves, in common with a hundred millions of our Roman Catholic brethren in Europe,

the growth of a few years. It is the belief of the great majority of Christians. It is, and for centuries has been, the belief of learned and polished nations; the belief of scholars, philosophers, and divines; of generals, statesmen, and princes. Proudly as I may think of my own country, I cannot yet persuade myself that intellectual excellence is exclusively confined to this island; and when I look on the continent, and view the populous nations which there profess the Catholic faith—when I look back into past ages and behold millions of men, during a long series of generations, reckoning it as their pride and their happiness, I can smile at the invectives of its adversaries, and despise the disgrace which is heaped upon it here.”

“Catholicity, which has been this night the subject of so much abuse, has been the belief of the most extensive and enlightened nations in Europe; and of the most illustrious characters that ever did honour to the name of

to possess as strong intellectual faculties, as clear a judgment, and as upright intentions, as any body of Protestants in the world: it is, therefore, the more wounding to our feelings to be treated as an ignorant, a worthless, and an unprincipled race, which we must be, if we are the just objects of the incapacities to which we are subjected by law,—and such as every member of the Legislature calls God to witness that he believes us to be,—the abettors of superstitious and idolatrous doctrines.

The Catholic Peer is defrauded of his hereditary rights; the Catholic commoner of the opportunities which wealth or talent might afford him to serve his country, in situations of honour and of trust;—the professional man, of those objects of lawful ambition, which are the incentives and the rewards of a long life of toil and labour;—the freeholder, of the exercise of that qualification which is as dear to *him*, at the proudest distinction is to the most exalted personage;—ALL are deprived “of their fair chances in the lottery of life, and condemned hourly to the innumerable slights that wait upon political inferiority.”^(d) A painful sense

man.”—*Speech of Lord Hutchinson in the House of Lords, May 10, 1805.*

^(d) “We take from them every object of honourable ambition; we doom them to the martyrdom, as far as our laws have power to inflict it, of popular scorn from the cradle to the grave; we leave them a separate class, with-

of implied criminality, which is more galling to a well-constituted mind, than any corporeal suffering," is constantly present to our imaginations; we carry the mark of Cain upon our forehead; we drink the waters of bitterness in our journey through the desert; and though some of our fetters have been removed, the dishonourable traces which they imprinted, still remain, to bear false evidence against us.

We know it to be an incontestable truth, that the main edifice of the constitution of this country was the work of Catholic valour, talent, and perseverance; and yet we are doomed to be strangers to its benefits; to hear the principle proclaimed and acted upon, every day, that Catholics are only known to the Constitution for the purposes of pains and penalties;^(e) and that it is just and lawful to de-

out one public occupation or one aspiring hope, in the midst of a busy and ardent-spirited people."—(Lord Nugent's *Plain Statement*, &c.)

^(e) Witness, amongst others, the decisions, in 1825, of the Lords in council, upon the claims of the British Catholics for the restoration of their confiscated property, by which, though the money was actually paid by the Government of France, it was not permitted to reach its destination, under the plea that it would be employed in superstitious uses. It has since passed into a much more serviceable channel, forming a large item of the mysterious £250,000 which lately found its way, so opportunely, into

spoil us, in the land of our forefathers, of that sacred and glorious inheritance, which they so solemnly bequeathed, as his birth-right, to every free-born Englishman. We are worse than aliens in our native land, inasmuch as that an alien is under the protection of equal law, which we are not. If an alien be a delinquent, or a presumed delinquent, he is entitled to a trial by his peers, and half of those peers are his own countrymen, and of his own religion; whereas, *our* delinquency, imaginary as it is, is tried by men who have no fellow-feeling with us, and who convict us, upon evidence, collected, produced, and attested by *themselves*. We are condemned to endure the stings of insult and calumny, frequently without either the opportunity of reply, or the hope of redress by law. We are denied the privilege of the meanest malefactor, that of being confronted with our accusers. We are excluded from the places in which the most galling and most influential of the calumnies pronounced against us are uttered; and, if we dare to answer them elsewhere, our calumniators may sit in judgment upon us, and punish our audacity with imprisonment!!

When the country calls forth the Roman Catholic in her defence, his blood flows as freely

the hands of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests. For a fair statement of this grievance, see APPENDIX, No. I.

as that of his Protestant companion in arms; when our treasure is demanded, we give it in the same proportion as our more favoured fellow-subjects: but, when we ask for the same rewards, the same honours, the same privileges, the same rights,—we are repulsed with reproaches; we are rejected, as the refuse of a state which, but for her Roman Catholic subjects, might long since have been annihilated. Yes, it was Catholic blood which kept the ark of the country afloat in the deluge of perils from which we have but lately emerged, and in which, be it remembered, we may so soon be plunged again.^(e)—What must be the natural consequences of such outrageous injustice, but to wean our affections,—not from our country,—for our country we must ever love and cherish, out of respect and veneration for the memory of our ancestors,—but from the government and institutions under which we are doomed to live?

But we are weary of proclaiming our grievances:—suffice it to say, that we are treated with an inhumanity and injustice, such as I hope clearly proves, (and for the honour of human nature be it

^(e) If, previous to any one engagement during the late glorious though disastrous war, either by sea or land, the Catholic soldiers or sailors had been withdrawn, no victory would ever have been obtained. Without Irish bravery and Irish blood, neither Nelson nor Wellington had ever worn a laurel.

spoken,) that our oppressors have neither any knowledge of us, or of our sufferings, of our principles, or of our services. We must look to other causes for such a state of things, than a mere love of oppression and cruelty in our rulers. It is ignorance and prejudice, faction and interest, which alone can uphold such a system of absurdity and tyranny. For faction and interest there can be no excuse, save the darkness with which these passions overspread the mind; neither is a voluntary and cherished ignorance less culpable in men, who use it as a weapon to inflict pains and penalties on millions of their innocent fellow-subjects.—When an umpire is appointed to decide upon the most trivial affair between man and man, does he ever presume to do so, without a full and fair inquiry? Would he not consider it a flagrant injustice, to come to a decision upon partial or insufficient evidence? Yet here is a case, involving not only the well-being and prosperity of the whole empire, but, in a more intimate manner, affecting the rights, the properties, the reputation of seven millions of people; and yet both deliberative branches of the legislature,—almost without hesitation, certainly without adequate knowledge, or mature examination,—pronounce a verdict of guilty. It is wholly impossible, it is utterly inconsistent with the exercise of their rational faculties, that they can have duly weighed and

examined the question, and yet come to the decision which they do. The evidence is now so clear, so fully before the world, that whoever, in spite of it, shall shut his eyes to the light of justice, we must pronounce to stand convicted of an inveterate hardening of the heart, and a palpable blinding of the understanding. We must then conclude, that it is only by ignorance and prejudice, by faction and interest, that men are governed in this matter.

My object, therefore, is, as far as my humble endeavours may extend, to warn the thinking portion of the community from being misled by those false and malignant spirits who are so busy to poison the public mind against us; who dress us up in a hideous garb, and put upon us all sorts of deformities of their own invention, till people believe us to be any thing but what, I trust, we really are. Likewise would I guard them against the injustice which we are doomed to suffer from ignorance and credulity; an injustice of which we have, perhaps, the most reason to complain, because it is the easiest to rectify.—While every other species of learning is pursuing a rapid and triumphant career—while the press teems, almost daily, with authenticated expositions of our doctrine—and while well-informed Catholics are to be met with at every corner, ready to give evidence of our faith, is it not too much to be reduced to the alternative, of being either neglected as unworthy of attention,

or of seeing our tenets and our conduct studied only in the writings of our adversaries?^(f) The

(f) “ I believe that there are few subjects on which so many opponents are to be met with, of that very numerous class who think themselves justified in feeling strongly without enquiring deeply, who acquiesce in unexamined statements merely to fortify their own preconceived sense of the case, and who are ever recurring to defences a thousand times overthrown, and now, by universal consent of all well-informed persons, abandoned, merely because the fact of the discomfiture and surrender may have escaped their not very extensive research, or may have lost its place in their not very impartial memory. This is a serious difficulty, because with such persons it is not easy to determine at what precise period of the controversy to begin. There is, however, another class with whom it is impossible to deal: the mere shouters of “ No Popery ;” those who, without the desire of enquiry, or the capacity of reasoning, think that they see their interest or their honour bound up in a determination never to doubt any early, or accidental, or careless, impressions, to which by habit they consider themselves pledged. Such we can only leave to rejoice in their own conclusions, unquestioned and undisturbed, withdrawing ourselves from all dispute with them, as we should from the attempt to go through a proposition in mathematics with a person to whom the admission of an axiom appears to be matter of too hazardous generosity, and who accordingly, while expressing his readiness to listen to proof, feels that he owes it to his cause to refuse every preliminary concession on which a proof can by possibility turn. Until they shall

errors of the generality of mankind may, it is hoped, be extenuated, as arising from prejudices carefully instilled into the infant mind, fostered through every stage of education, and perhaps matured by subsequent habits of indifference in religious matters, or at least by a neglect of all further inquiry ; but for men who profess to make

have done what they never will do,—until they shall have enlightened themselves on the history, not of their own country only, but of some other parts of modern Europe ;—until they shall have learned what the penal laws were, and what they are now ;—until they shall know the story and condition of the Roman Catholics in this empire, and of Protestants in others ;—they must be content to be challenged as Jurors to pass upon this Question. Nay, more, —they must, till then, absolutely abstain from all customary expressions of vituperation against the Papists, on pain of convicting themselves of possessing less than they ought of common honesty, or less than most men would be thought to possess of common discretion.” Lord Nugent’s most excellent *Statement, &c. in Support of the Political Claims of the Roman Catholics*. Hookham, 1826.

The virulent abuse of that portion of the public press which is opposed to emancipation, as well in England as in Ireland, is an irritating and never-failing insult which we are daily condemned to endure, and is one of the most grievous of all our penal inflictions. As long as it is the support of that system which oppresses us, so long shall we be its victims ; but the cause which produces it being removed, it will vanish with all our other disabilities.

accurate research and profound study the basis of every opinion which they deliver to the world—men of reputed learning and of extensive literary fame—there can be no palliation, when, in the face of the strongest historical evidence, they are guilty of deliberately advancing the most gross and unfounded calumnies against their Catholic fellow-countrymen.

Amongst the many to whom these imputations apply, there is no one who offends more conspicuously than Dr. Southey. The glaring misrepresentations of Catholic history and Catholic doctrine which constitute the principal ingredients of his “Book of the Church,” though so ably exposed by Dr. Milner, Mr. Butler, and others, continue to glitter through every subsequent edition, and to diffuse their pestilential influence among the public; and that, too, at a moment when the most calm and unprejudiced consideration of the great question of the policy of establishing religious tests for the qualification to political privileges, is become necessary, certainly for the strength and stability of the country, and perhaps for the very existence of social order in the empire. The fact is now fully established by long experience and incontrovertible evidence, that no permanent peace and tranquillity can exist in Ireland under the present system of religious warfare and political op-

pression.^(g) Whatever, therefore, does not directly tend to advance that consummation so ardently desired by every friend of justice and humanity, and of the general prosperity of the State, cannot be too sincerely and too strongly deprecated. But what shall we say of him, who endeavours by the most extensive circulation of the most atrocious and most unfounded calumnies, not only to oppose a barrier to the tide of peace and good will which, sometime back, appeared to be so happily setting in upon the country, but, by wounding and irritating the feelings of those who are already harassed almost beyond endurance, as well as by alienating the friends of toleration by the false picture he draws of those whom they were endeavouring to relieve, thus augments a disunion which it should be the object of every honest man to close.

I will not weary the reader by citing instances of some of the most ungenerous calumnies that ever appeared in print, but will refer him to pp. 7 and 14 of Milner's "Strictures on Dr. Southey's Book of the Church," and to pp. 214, 253, &c. 280,

^(g) See Mr. Shiel's temperate but eloquent speech, on moving an Address to his Majesty on Lord Sidmouth's letter of the 23rd Sept. 1821, APPENDIX, No. II.; together with a few other documents illustrative of the state of Ireland, in APPENDIX, No. VI.

284, 319, &c. of Mr. Butler's "Book of the R. C. Church," and to p. 49 of the "Memoirs of Capt. Rock."^(h) There he may behold a Christian author, under pretence of promoting the cause of truth, rehearsing the most unfounded and antiquated falsehoods, a thousand and a thousand times refuted, against infinitely the most numerous denomination of Christians in the world; and, in spite of the most incontestable evidence, he will see him so wedded to his error, so enamoured of his calumnies, as obstinately to adhere to the impositions which he seems so happy to drag forth from their merited oblivion, and once more to employ for the

(h) It is astonishing that a work of such transcendent merit as this undoubtedly is, should have produced so little effect. But even unrivalled genius, allied with uncompromising patriotism, and shedding fresh brilliancy on the cause of Truth and Justice, is no match against interested bigotry. The fabrication here noticed by the admirable author of the "Memoirs of Captain Rock," was even too gross for Dr. Southey, who, on discovering his *mistake*, omitted it in his 2nd edition.

As to Dr. Southey's *Vindiciæ*, it is really too contemptible to notice, being a complete farrago of folly and misrepresentation, and only one slander defended by another; cajoling his readers with the most senseless trash, altogether beneath the notice of any honourable mind, and the very publication of which is a stain upon the literature of the country.

oppression of his fellow-countrymen and fellow-Christians.

In the Protestant *Canton du Vaud*, in Switzerland, such is the tyrannical intolerance of the government, that the Catholic clergyman is not permitted, under pain of dismissal, to explain, even in private, the articles of his religion to any one of a different persuasion, who may apply to him for that purpose. This may, perhaps, well enough answer the object of insuring a monopoly to Protestantism; but, tyrannical as it is, it is a much more charitable scheme than that adopted by Dr. Southey, who, apparently with the same views, has done all in his power to contrive, not that the people of England should be kept in ignorance of Catholic doctrine, in *his* acceptation of the term, but that they should learn it only through the misrepresentations and calumnies of his "Book of the Church." However easily and triumphantly the calumniator may be refuted, the poison is diffused through a thousand channels through which the antidote never makes its way; and, like his fellow-labourer in the same vineyard, Dr. Tomline, he has never the justice to retract his errors, and disabuse his readers of the unworthy prejudices which he has been the means of fostering in their minds against us. But, to speak truth, and to render justice, is not the object of the ascendancy faction; and, in violating both, they are acting

upon the doctrines so falsely imputed to Catholics, of keeping no faith with heretics, and of sanctifying the means by the end, when the defence of their Church is in question.⁽ⁱ⁾

Another example of extreme injustice towards his Catholic fellow-countrymen is presented to us by the Bishop of Winchester; that prelate ought certainly to have given himself the trouble of ascertaining that what he asserted was true, or he should have abstained from those assertions altogether. Ignorance, in a case like this, is no

(i) “The furious men,” says Dr. Doyle, “who now agitate this country, seem to know that the sword of the law could not have been drawn, or if drawn, could not have been wielded with such deadly effect against the holy and ancient religion of these islands, if that religion had not first been derided, abused, and maligned, until it appeared to the multitude a very moral monster. ‘From the sole of its foot,’ like its founder, ‘to the top of its head, there was no soundness in it;’ it was buffeted, abused, spit upon; it was covered with a mantle of derision; it was scourged and drenched with vinegar and gall; the waters of affliction entered into its very soul; and it was when thus disfigured by a clamorous rabble, and seemingly abandoned by God, that the bigots and the fanatics cried out to the agents of the law and of the sword—‘Away with it, away with it.’”—(*Reply to Dr. Magee.*)

I most earnestly recommend this little work to every dispassionate reader; for argument and eloquence it stands unrivalled.

excuse; no criminal escapes the punishment of the law, upon the ground that he knew not that he was infringing it. The Bishop has been guilty of many gross and unfounded calumnies upon the Catholic world,^(k) and though he has been long called upon to prove his assertions, or to retract the slanders so detrimental to the happiness and prosperity of so many millions of his fellow-subjects,—though a Christian bishop, bound by the common laws of morality to repair the injuries which he may inflict upon his neighbour in his character

^(k) See the Libel contained in Dr. Tomline's "Life of Mr. Pitt," stated and refuted in Mr. Butler's "Book of the Roman Catholic Church," p. 137;—a libel which charges us with doctrines subversive of civil government, and hostile to every principle of civilized society and Christian morality;—doctrines which we have over and over again refuted upon the most authentic evidence, and disclaimed upon oath. Such a libel would entitle any but a *proscribed* race to redress at law against such slander and defamation.

See also some very just observations on the calumnies of Dr. Tomline, in a note to Dr. Fletcher's "Comparative View," p. 15, and where this acute and learned writer is led to remark, "However, be the reason what it may, this fact is certain,—that the Protestant clergy, in their assaults of the Catholic religion, misrepresent it '*cruelly*.' It has no generous adversaries. I do not even know one (and I have read the works of multitudes of them) who combats it, either with the charity of the Christian, or with the politeness of the gentleman."

and reputation,—yet finding that he is unable to accomplish the former, he has neither the charity, the justice, nor the magnanimity to do the latter.⁽¹⁾

Controversy should always be conducted with the utmost moderation ; all harsh and offensive expressions should be carefully avoided, and nothing advanced in the way of insolent triumph. But what is the controversy to which these rules apply? a calm discussion of the *arguments* bearing on the question in debate,—accompanied with a sincere endeavour to elucidate the truth, and to avoid all irritating and irrelevant matter.—But how does the controversy of the Ministers of the Church of England with Roman Catholics, partake of this character? Instead of displaying the meek spirit

⁽¹⁾ Since the above was written, the bishop has been summoned before the bar of Divine Justice, leaving behind him £200,000 as the fruit of his episcopal labours. What would William of Wykham have thought of this? or even his Protestant predecessor, Dr. Andrews? I do not hereby impute blame to the Bishop of Winchester, but notice the circumstance merely to show the injustice of that system of ecclesiastical discipline, which allows the surplus revenues of the church to be perverted from their true purposes of repairing and embellishing the temples of God, and of satisfying the necessities of the poor ; thus imposing a tax upon the people for whose benefit those revenues were originally granted, equal in amount to the revenues so misappropriated.

of Christianity, it is full of rancour and malignity; instead of a calm, sober search after truth, it is a violent exposition of all the atrocious calumnies and falsehoods heaped upon us through three centuries of persecution. It is, in fine, no controversy at all; but a marshalling of all sorts of acrimonious invective, in the face of the strongest historical evidence, and often in absolute contradiction to the principles of those who impugn us.—Can the laws of fair controversy be applicable to such a system, (for a mere system it is become,) which vilifies and calumniates Catholics, in order to preserve the monopoly of political privileges now in possession of Protestants?—In mere matters of opinion in religion, much diversity is permitted, and must necessarily exist: in matters of faith and of fact, much discussion may sometimes be necessary, to dispel the darkness in which obscure and uninformed writers may have involved them, and to remove the difficulties with which prejudice and impiety may have encumbered them:—but to take up accusations which come only from adversaries, to receive every fact with the distortions put upon it by calumny, is to play the character of a partizan who carries on a warfare for the purposes of destruction, and who thereby places himself out of the protection of the law, and is, as it were, only to be repelled by force.

What, I will ask, can be dearer to an Englishman

than his constitutional rights, rights secured (I cannot say to *him*, but to the *Protestant* subjects of this nation) by his Catholic ancestors, the wise and spirited framers of Magna Charta, of trial by jury, and the representative system? and what can be more iniquitous than to defraud him of those rights, because Dr. Southey chooses to call him idolatrous and superstitious. Let a Poet-Laureate of England, a Prebendary of Durham, or a Bishop of Winchester proclaim us to be idolators, and a hundred and twenty millions of intellectual beings, endowed with will, memory, and understanding,—occupying the most civilized portions of the globe,—justly priding themselves upon the purity of their religion, and on the entire direction of their worship to the only One, True, Holy, Eternal, and Immutable God, hurl back the accusation with indignant defiance! If these associates in the work of libel be incapable of reflecting a ray of that light which is breaking in so fast upon the world, and if they have not the generosity to do us justice by advocating the cause of truth, at least let them cease their calumny; and in a very short time prejudice will subside, bigotry will resign her sway, and the triumph of civil and religious liberty will be, at length, achieved.

The last debate upon the Catholic question furnished a lamentable instance of misrepresentation in a quarter from which it was least expected. It

was asserted, with much parade of solemn and momentous accusation against the most unimpeachable prelacy in the world, that they were guilty of the most audacious impiety in cancelling a precept from the Decalogue; and it was at least insinuated, that they did so in order to flatter their favourite propensities to idolatry. Mr. Peel, for this purpose, quoted from an abridgment of our catechism, in which, as a purely elementary work, the heads only of each commandment are given, when he could easily have found a hundred others in which they are recited at full length; one even being produced in the house that very night. As to the ridiculous charge of curtailing the commandments, by dividing them as we do, it is utterly without foundation. We give the first and second together, and divide the last into two. The consequence is, that, in an abridgment, the heads only being given, what Protestants consider the second commandment is omitted; but then it must be remembered that this second commandment is merely an explanation of the first, and necessarily comprised in it in substance. It is astonishing that a man of Mr. Peel's character and reputation for fair dealing, should condescend to use misrepresentation when he finds argument fail him. But it only shews the extent of his delusion, and how fitted his mind is to receive impressions contrary to truth, reason, and common sense,

when his favourite prejudices are to be cherished. If that delusion only affected the individual, we should lament it, without presuming to correct him; but when the delusion of an individual stands between the happiness of millions, and that individual is the champion of a party opposed to the best interests of the empire, then indeed it is a delusion which ought to be exposed to the whole world.

(*m*) “ We know that the Decalogue consisted of *ten commandments*; we find in it *fourteen precepts*; the question is, how they are to be reduced into the ten classes which form the ten commandments? In the Hebrew and other oriental versions, and in the early Vulgates, there is no classification of the ten commandments: how they should be classed, was an early subject of dispute in the Christian Church. St. Augustin recommended the classification now used by the Catholic Church: from his time till the Reformation it was generally adopted. The early reformers made a new division of the precepts, by separating the first commandment from the second, and blending the ninth and tenth into one; but the Decalogue remained the same.

“ This was fully explained by Dr. Lingard on the *Durham Controversy*, and by the Irish Prelates in the examinations before the *Committee on Irish Affairs*. How then can the charge be now gravely made?”—*Extract from the Catholic Miscellany for May, 1827.*

“ In the division of the Decalogue, the Christian Churches are *not* agreed. That of England, and the whole of the Calvinists, with Josephus, make two distinct

I will cite another illustration in point, both as a proof of the blind fury of our opponents, and of the ignorance to which it is to be attributed; and as enabling me to present to the reader an eloquent and argumentative appeal to his fellow-countrymen, from my valued friend and relative, the present secretary to the British Catholic Association.—See APPENDIX, No. III.

Neither can I refrain from referring the reader to

precepts of verses 3 and 7, Exodus, xx.; whereas, the Roman Catholics, and the Lutherans, divide *with* Saint Austin, and make *one* commandment, of what the former make *two*; but to keep the number of ten, they split what in the other division is deemed the ninth. Every one who looks into Walton's Polyglott may see that the command not to make *sculptilia, neque omnem similitudinem, &c. neque adorare ea*, is retained in the Latin Vulgate; and surely, as to the division, it is of so *little* importance, that we may *wonder* it ever could beget a *controversy*. In the English church, not a single word is said about the interdict to the Jews against making or worshipping graven images. Nor, through the whole of our Catechism, is there *any caution* introduced against the *practice* of the *Church of Rome*. I am not then warranted in arraigning the sincerity of the Roman belief, or the uprightness of their intentions, at all events. I should be ASHAMED of urging against them any FALSE *accusations* of disingenuous *omission*, or unauthorized arrangement in the Decalogue."—*Parr's Characters of C. J. Fox*, vol. ii. page 129.

another and a very flagrant instance of misrepresentation, from the mouth of a distinguished member of the upper House, which, though of ancient date, I consider to be of very considerable importance, as tending to exemplify the dispositions of mind of those individuals in the legislature, who have so long succeeded in making us the victims of their delusion.—See APPENDIX, No. IV.

EMANCIPATION is no longer a question between two parties in the state: ⁽ⁿ⁾ it is a question between

⁽ⁿ⁾“This question had, within the last twenty years, risen from a state of comparative insignificance to one of paramount importance. It was now the question of the empire; the question which divided the people as well as the Parliament; a question which had not only divided, but had broken up, and would break up, Cabinets and Administrations. Look at the effects of the Penal Laws in this country; they had destroyed that friendly intercourse and those social habits which were, perhaps, not less essential to private and domestic comfort, than to the well-being of the community at large. They kept up a perpetual excitation and ferment in the public mind—they rendered property insecure — they prevented the introduction of capital sufficient to develop the great and hitherto dormant resources of this fine and fertile country. And to their operation alone could be attributed those occasional bursts of public commotion, which are produced by rapacity and oppression on the one hand, and by poverty and despair on the other.”

(Extract from Lord Killeen’s excellent speech at the public dinner, so deservedly given to that patriotic nobleman, by the friends of civil and religious liberty.)

two nations;—the one struggling for its liberties,—the other endeavouring to rivet the chains of slavery and oppression. This is a contest going on, and which will go on, in the very heart of the British empire, and between two people not very unequally balanced, in either physical or moral force; and is it to be supposed that this struggle is never to produce any thing but angry murmurs and irritated feelings?^(o)

(o) Nothing can be finer than the present dispositions of the whole Irish people. Mankind never exhibited a more noble instance of zeal tempered with discretion; and of suffering sanctified by patience. God grant that such dispositions may last as long as the occasion which produces them! But their own history, and the history of the whole world tells us, and *warns* us while it tells us, that there are circumstances beyond which patience will not endure, and tyranny will goad on to desperation. May heaven avert so dreadful a calamity! The following prayer, proffered by a whole nation smarting under a cruel and unjust infliction, is a noble and decisive answer to the calumnies of our enemies, and a sublime panegyric upon the religion of the people who offer it:—

“ O Almighty and most merciful God, in whose hands are the hearts and designs of men; prostrate before thy altar, we humbly and earnestly beseech thee to look down with an eye of pity upon the long continued sufferings, the unmerited privations, and severe legal enactments, under which the Catholic population of these realms are still unrelentingly doomed to complain. Our own individual transgressions against thy law, have, doubtless,

When every other nation in Europe, in which a difference of religion exists, has cemented its power,

justly drawn down upon us those heavy inflictions. Against the state, however, we have not transgressed. An inviolable attachment to the faith once delivered to the saints, is the only state crime we can be charged with—that unchangeable faith professed at this day by the great majority of thy Christian people; but such fidelity to thy sacred deposit, instead of being criminal in thy sight, O Lord, furnishes us on the contrary, we firmly hope, with a stronger claim upon thy mercies. Thou hast declared those blessed who shall suffer persecution for justice' sake. We are now suffering for it. We are suffering, and alas! have long suffered, with patience, under the influence of religion, as our ancestors have suffered.—They have generously preferred thy law, O Lord, to every earthly consideration; their example, we trust, has not been unavailing; and with thy divine assistance we are fully determined never, upon any account, or under any penal pressure whatsoever, to relinquish any one article of our holy religion. Graciously hear us, then, O merciful God; vouchsafe, in thy infinite goodness, to enlighten our Sovereign, his Ministers, and the British Legislature; that they may at length more justly appreciate our ill-requited fidelity, and adopt such prudent and wholesome councils as will unite every denomination of our fellow-subjects in one general bond of mutual charity, unshaken loyalty, and universal peace; thus securing the stability of the throne, and effectually promoting the happiness of the people: through Jesus Christ thy beloved Son, who with Thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth, one God, world without end. Amen.”

and concentrated the affections of its people, by the most enlarged system of religious toleration, it is certainly most extraordinary that we, who pretend to be the wisest and the most liberal of all, should alone continue a policy, which divides instead of uniting, which irritates instead of conciliating, and which weakens where it ought to strengthen.—That, in England alone,⁽¹⁾ that far-famed garden of liberty, the baneful weed of intolerance should flourish in such rank luxuriance;—in England, where a hundred different religions have found their way, and where there is no limit to the intrusion of new ones,—that *one* religion alone should be proscribed, and *that* the mother of the religion of the state, the foundress of all her institutions, and the nurse of all her liberties, is an enigma which no ingenuity can solve, unless we ascribe it to the effect of consummate bigotry. Our intolerant legislators of England, like the former *noblesse* of France, are endeavouring to

⁽¹⁾ Even Italy and Spain are no exceptions to the present happy diffusion of religious freedom throughout the world; for, in those countries, there are no Protestants. If there were, there can be no doubt but they would be treated with the same liberality, justice, and equality, which they now experience in every other Catholic state; whereas a British subject, *being a native of these Islands*, is the only individual upon earth, upon whom the profession of Catholicity is a penalty and a reproach.

continue their monopoly of privileges, at the risk of subverting the social institutions of the country, and of dismembering the empire.^(m) And this is the end to which the enemies of Great Britain are so anxiously looking.—In France it was said, (however absurd the idea,) that the defeat of the bills for our relief, in 1825, was owing to a combined scheme of the Jacobins of both countries, who, foreseeing that the settlement of this great question would for ever consolidate the power of England, were, therefore, determined to exert themselves for

^(m) Another and striking instance of such a disposition is to be found in the obstinate refusal of the House of Peers to make any efficient amendment in the present disgraceful state of the game laws; laws which are rapidly converting the whole country into one great arena of crime, and producing consequences at which every mind must shudder. The fate of the last bill on this subject was a complete burlesque on legislation. After the question had been vehemently agitated for many years—after repeated attempts and repeated failures—after fighting its way with extreme difficulty to a certain point, its ephemeral success was suddenly arrested by the magic power of *seven* noble lords; the division being, content six, not-content, seven!!!

N. B. Another session has elapsed, and though, through the very laudable efforts of some distinguished members of the House, the subject has excited an unusual degree of attention, yet the attempt to remedy the evil has met with a similar fate to all those which have preceded it.

its discomfiture.—To attach credit to this idea, a report was circulated, and which was actually used as an argument against the measure, by at least one member of the House of Commons, that the main object of the Catholics was the restoration of the forfeited property, now in the hands of both clergy and laity. This opinion was much strengthened by the indemnity granted to a class of men, somewhat similarly circumstanced with the dispossessed Irish. Others attributed the defeat of the measure, or, in other words, the blind intolerance of the majority of the House of Peers, to the secret agency of the Holy Alliance, which aims at nothing more sincerely than the humiliation of England; and which seeks an example, in the tyrannical conduct of *our* government towards her Catholic subjects, for the slavish principles by which *they* are guided towards their own people, and the whole world. This opinion, in its turn, was strengthened by the happy allusion to this view of the case, in the manly, convincing, and brilliant speech of the ever-to-be-lamented and intrepid Canning; a speech which has endeared and immortalized his memory, in the heart and mind of almost every Catholic in the empire.— On the other hand, the *liberals*, who looked to nothing but the well-being of both countries, lamented, most sincerely, the failure of this great covenant of conciliation, not only because it was a

sad example of tyranny, but because it might, at no distant period, serve as a precedent for their own government to enact a series of penal statutes against the Protestants of France, under the plausible pretence of disaffection to the reigning dynasty. In this view of the question, they were supported by the sometimes misguided zeal of the present royal family, and by the well-known fact, that the Protestants were never sincerely attached to any government that has ever ruled in France, save that of Napoleon. Thus, in whatever point of view it was considered, it was looked upon as a policy fraught with evil of the blackest die.—Napoleon is reported to have said; *La famille des Bourbons est la plus intolérante de la terre*: however this may have been, it is certainly not so now; the present king of France,⁽ⁿ⁾ with all his

⁽ⁿ⁾ If we compare the late speech of the King of France with that of the King of England, and do not blush at the contrast, the spirit of Englishmen is not in us.

Compare also the oath required of a legislator in France with the Test exacted amongst us. While a Frenchman swears allegiance to his king, fidelity to the constitution, and a determination to do his duty to his country—an Englishman is thought better qualified for the functions of a senator, by swearing a libel on millions of his fellow-subjects, and proscription against an extinct and departed race. For the performance of his duty to his country, no pledge is required of him; but unless he *knows* and swears a Catholic to be an idolator, he can have no pretensions to legislative wisdom or integrity.

zeal for Catholicity, having given full security to his dissenting subjects, by swearing in his coronation oath, (and it presents rather an extraordinary contrast,) to give equal rights to his Protestant *thousands*, while the king of England, upon a similar occasion, is supposed by some to swear eternal proscription against his Catholic *millions*.^(o) And what, in the event of the continuance of this system of proscription, is to be the ultimate fate of these *millions*? With the prospect of England before them, happy, prosperous, and tranquil, (that is, seen as it appears to *them*) because governed by equal laws, and in the possession of equal rights,—shall they be condemned to gaze for ever upon this blooming land of promise, and

^(o) It is a very singular circumstance, and highly worthy of remark, that precisely at the same moment in which the government of Catholic France is driven from its post, because it is not liberal enough, the ministers of Protestant England are removed from the councils of their sovereign, because they are too liberal for the age!! For this, after all, seems to be the truth.—Neither may it be unfair to observe, that, while the Catholic hierarchy of France have lately displayed their wisdom and virtue, by refusing the political privileges with which their sovereign was desirous of investing them, there is no instance upon record, in which the Protestant hierarchy of England have ever evinced a distaste for the power and possessions which have fallen to their lot.

yet be always doomed to linger in the desert? Are they to be eternally consigned to pauperism, and coerced by military law? Are they to be always told, that they are unworthy to be received as members of the state; that to participate in the general prosperity of the commonwealth, is too great a blessing for them?—that they shall be for ever accounted as aliens and outcasts,—that their only inheritance shall be, from one generation to another, to be hewers of wood and drawers of water? —Oh! the shame and the disgrace of England, to allow her bigotry to place her in such a situation, that perhaps the best and only hope of one third of her people, is to look for the weakness and humiliation of their oppressors:—for the day of England's prosperity, has never yet been a day of grace or justice to Ireland. The hour of atonement, however, has not yet past.^(p) In the name of heaven, let it not be neglected.—May the timely

^(p) Neither is the degrading system carried on in Ireland, under the name of *Reformation*, likely to mend the matter; a system of immoral, unprincipled, and corrupting persecution, practised upon a half-starved population, “beginning with the child in the cradle, and only ending with the aged and forlorn, upon the bed of death.”—Good God! where have these lords and ladies, prelates and parsons, these Apostles of Ireland's reformation, where have they learned that charity consists in bribing a man to perjury

and happy settlement of this great question (in common with other important amendments in our sys-

and apostacy—to sell his birth-right for a mess of pottage—to commit crimes that cry to heaven for vengeance, and lose his soul for the sake of saving a starving body for a few years of misery and infamy! We see that these, and these only, are the fruits of this fanaticism, since every day brings back these converts of the Reformation; not one in twenty remaining obstinate in his apostacy. But the people of England know little or nothing of all this. Almost all that the London papers ever tell us of Ireland, is, that a riot or a murder has been committed, and that numerous and notable conversions are daily made to Protestantism: but any, who will take the trouble to inform themselves, through the medium of the Irish papers, will see how false and exaggerated are the statements made in England.—How much more good might Parliament do, by spending a few thousands a year in a liberal system of education in Ireland, than by lavishing the same sums in *charter-house grants*, on the principle of excluding the great body of the people from the benefits of education.

Do they think to achieve, by such means as these, what the long continued efforts of the most horrible system of destruction that ever disgraced the character of civilized man, were incapable of accomplishing? History, “which is philosophy teaching by example,” tells us, that the monsters whom regenerated England employed to govern Ireland, have mown down whole generations of Papists at a stroke, ravaging the field with fire and sword, in the hopeful expectation that a harvest of Protestants would arise: when lo and behold! in lieu of Protestantism,

tem of government) cement together every portion of the empire, in eternal union, and elevate us

Popery springs up again,—but only to be cut down once more, and to be cast again into the fire. Still the crop of Protestants never once grew up: the land was obstinate and intractable; and, in spite of every new system of experimental cultivation, has continued as barren of Protestantism, and as fertile of Popery, ever since. Practically convinced of the utter vanity of their attempt, let them at length rather endeavour to make them good and faithful subjects, than bad and dangerous Christians.

There is a passage in the very brilliant speech of Mr. Shiel, upon occasion of a foul conspiracy against the character of a Catholic Priest, which was got up last year, I think in the county of Cavan, and which is so much to my purpose, that I will take leave to transcribe it. After observing, that in no other country but miserable and wretched Ireland, would any set of men have embarked in such an adventure, and after painting in strong and feeling terms the calamitous condition to which religious dissension had reduced the whole island, from which it has entirely banished that perfect amity in which Catholics and Protestants live together in foreign states, he proceeds to say: “Let calumny do its worst, it will not detach the people from their clergy. They are too closely bound by mutual sufferings ever to be rent asunder. Their piety, their simplicity, their meekness, and their very dependance upon their flocks, have endeared them beyond the power of our modern reformers to tear them from each other. And if the effort were successful, what would be gained? In Heaven’s name, where is the benefit to be obtained by

higher upon the pinnacle of glory, happiness, and prosperity, than any Christian nation has ever yet attained to.

shaking the creed of the people? You laugh at them because they believe in Transubstantiation. Suppose you teach them to reject it, are you sure that they will stop where you think it proper? Is there any *ne plus ultra* of incredulity where they will stand and pause? Is not a man's faith a dangerous thing to tamper with? Touch one mystery, and the whole fabric of religion may crumble into dust.—Protestant reformers! have a care, lest you should go beyond your intents, and precipitate seven millions of the Irish people into infidelity. The shining heights of faith are contiguous to the dark and deep gulfs of incredulity, and a Roman Catholic passes into the Deist by a single step. Do you want to make a nation of philosophers?"*

The Catholics, who are styled the enemies of education, oppressed and impoverished as they are, have at this moment 420,000 children under tuition, in schools established and supported by *voluntary* contribution; and happy I am to say, that many liberal and humane Protestants have most handsomely seconded their exertions by grants of land, as well as of money; † and, in return,

* For some account of the new reformation in Ireland, see APPENDIX, No. V., for extracts from Mr. Ensor's *Letters*, a writer who has strongly and faithfully depicted the folly and impiety of a system, of the workings of which, he has been himself a witness.

† The Duke of Devonshire is a noble example of liberality in this respect, having lately, amongst a hundred other similar donations, given an acre of land and six hundred pounds, to erect a

God knows how far we are from such a situation at present ! And amongst the numerous evils

the children of Protestants are educated indiscriminately with Catholics, and this without any attempt at proselytism, the religious instruction being given separately. Many of these schools are supported by a religious order of lay brothers, not uncommon upon the continent, but lately introduced into Ireland by Dr. Doyle and other prelates. The sole intent of this society is the education of the poor ; and those who are not engaged in teaching, maintain themselves by manual labour ; yet all assistance from Government is refused *them*, while large sums are lavished upon places where, when a school-house is erected, no scholars can be found to occupy it.

Extracts from the Catholic Journal.

PROGRESS OF LIBERALITY.

The following letters will be read with unmixed satisfaction. The Rev. Mr. Nicholson, to whom these letters were addressed, is in London, collecting subscriptions for a Catholic *Cathedral*, and Free Catholic Schools, to be erected at Tuam :—

“ MY DEAR SIR, “ *Mansfield-st., June 30, 1828.*

“ I have had the pleasure of receiving your letter rela-

Catholic Chapel, at Dungarvon. *Felix faustumque sit, tam donanti quam accipienti!*

Lord Donoughmore has given £100, and a site for a new chapel, in the parish of Grange, near Clonmel.—The Hon. Robert Chaloner laid the first stone of a new chapel at Tomacork, county Wexford, and contributed £20 towards the building.—A new chapel is to be erected in the parish of Kilfeacle, county Tipperary, towards which Lord Llandaff has contributed £100.—The Hon. Robert King, M. P. for Roscommon, has subscribed five pounds towards the Roman Catholic Cathedral building at Tuam.

that afflict us, there is none greater than the miserable condition of Ireland, which will, in part, be

tive to your mission, for the purpose of collecting funds for the completion of your projected Cathedral at Tuam. I assure you that I am most anxious to promote it; and as the law *compels the Catholics* to pay for the erection of *Protestant* places of worship, I think that the least *we Protestants* ought to do, is to subscribe largely and willingly towards the completion of *Catholic churches*. I must candidly own, that I regret that no portion out of the very large sums levied on the Catholic population of Ireland, is applied to building places of worship for that religious communion; but as such is not the case, I again repeat that we ought to make it up out of our private purses.

“ I have so many duties to fulfil in my own immediate neighbourhood, that it exhausts most of my resources; I shall, however, be most happy to offer a subscription of one hundred guineas towards the objects of your mission. I had intended to have paid it by four annual instalments; but as I am anxious that the building may proceed rapidly, I beg to inclose you a cheque on Messrs. Latouche’s for my second instalment, and will next year pay my third and fourth. Wishing you every success in the object of your undertaking, which, I must say, I think ought to be one of especial interest to every Connaught man,

“ I remain, with much esteem,

“ My dear Sir, your faithful servant,

“ SLIGO.”

“ The Rev. F. J. Nicholson,
39, Gloucester-street, Queen-square.”

“ DEAR SIR,

“ *Norwich, July 23, 1828.*

“ It will afford me a very sincere pleasure to have an

seen in the following extract from a printed circular, dated Mansion House, Dublin, Jan. 17, 1828.

opportunity of cultivating your acquaintance and friendship, at any time and any place; and during the course of next winter, (if I live so long) I shall probably have this opportunity, should you then be in London, where I propose to fix myself from the 1st of November to the 1st of May.

“ With respect to the appeal of that highly-gifted and exemplary prelate, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam, to ‘ the People of England ;’ there is not, I trust, a single individual among us, under whatever denomination of Christians he may come, who will not readily admit that an appeal from such a man, upon such an occasion, is entitled to the earnest attention and the cordial support of every one who has at heart either private happiness or public prosperity ; and in a more especial manner of every friend to unhappy, injured Ireland. Coming, as I certainly do, under the latter description, it grieves me much not to have it in my power to evince the sincerity of my sentiments in a more effectual manner than by requesting your acceptance of the enclosed trifle, which his Grace will be so good as to consider as a mark of my personal regard for him, and of my attachment to the great cause of general education, and of public religious instruction, whether in church or chapel.

“ Believe me, dear Sir,

“ Sincerely yours, &c.

“ H. NORWICH.”

“ The Rev. Francis J. Nicholson,
39, Gloucester-street, Queen-square, London.

“ SIR, “ *Castle Dawson, Ireland, July 25, 1828.*

“ Your letter of the 19th followed me here, and as I did

“ The present distressed and impoverished state of the country having given occasion to the con-

not receive it till this morning, you must excuse me for not having answered it before.

“ The contents are highly satisfactory, and I most sincerely hope that you may get a good subscription for your chapel. I shall have great pleasure in becoming a subscriber in the sum of twenty pounds, and I will give direction to pay that sum to your credit into the Branch of the Provincial Bank of Ireland at Galway.

“ In sending you this subscription, I can only say that I am doing an act most gratifying to my own private feelings, in which I never will allow political opinions to be mixed up. In the evidence given before the Committee, in the year 1825, by Dr. Kelly, I was very much struck, and I will add, distressed at the account which he gave of the miserable condition of the places of worship for the Roman Catholics in his diocese; and in recalling that evidence to my mind, I derive a pleasure from thinking that I am humbly contributing my mite to aid praiseworthy endeavours to provide suitable places of worship of our common Father.

“ Amidst the political tempests which agitate our unfortunate country, there is at least some consolation in finding that Protestants and Roman Catholics, opposers and supporters of the question, can find one point in which they can agree and unite, and which may lead to a better state of feeling, namely, in the cause of charity; and of showing homage to the Divine Being, to whom, in common, we all owe every thing. It is with such impressions that I now offer you my small assistance, and I need only add, that I have the greater pleasure in giving

vening of a public meeting in this city, in order to devise measures for endeavouring to avert the

it, on account of the very becoming and praiseworthy manner in which you have asked it.

“ I have the honour to be, Sir,

“ Your most obedient servant,

“ GEORGE R. DAWSON.”

“ The Rev. F. J. Nicholson,

39, Gloucester-street, Queen-square, London.

We feel great pleasure in adding an extract from a letter addressed to the Rev. Mr. Nicholson, by His Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, enclosing a subscription of ten pounds; as also a letter to the same purport from a celebrated dissenting minister:—

“ *Kensington Palace, August 6, 1828.*

“ I have perused with considerable interest, the letter which you addressed me on the 16th of July.

“ It affords me great satisfaction to learn, that the district of Ireland immediately under your care, has continued in a comparatively tranquil state. One of the most important duties of the teachers of religion, after providing for the happiness of their flocks in a future state, is the regulation of their conduct in this world, by circulating the principles of obedience and subordination to the laws of the country under which they live, thereby becoming the firmest support to the throne and the constitution.

“ As I am convinced that education, combined with religion, must materially contribute to so desirable an object,

consequences that *must* result from its continuance, &c. &c., I hope that your presence and in-

I feel great pleasure in contributing my mite towards the support of your schools. Were I a richer man, I would do more ; and therefore, my good will must make amends for what my poverty prevents me from doing. I am satisfied in my own mind, that a good Roman Catholic will always be as firm a supporter of our constitution, as any other of His Majesty's subjects, under whatever denomination he may come. With regard to the compliment you have so kindly paid me, believe me, when I assure you, that my happiness as well as my remuneration, consists in the conviction that I am, and can be, of use to my fellow-subjects.

“ I am,

“ With consideration and esteem for your

“ personal character,

“ Your very sincere well-wisher,

“ AUGUSTUS FREDERICK.”

“ MY DEAR SIR,

“ *Hackney, August 16, 1828.*

“ On my return from a tour in Wales, I find your interesting, but too flattering letter ; and I am anxious in my reply to suggest, as I have done, the reason of my long silence.

“ Most cordially do I welcome, and most gladly do I return, all your expressions of christian brotherly love. Had this been from the beginning the language of the Ministers of the Gospel of peace and salvation, how different at this day would have been the state of the church and the state of the world ?

“ My name cannot avail you in your labour of love, but I cheerfully give my mite towards the scheme of educa-

fluence will not be wanting on this occasion to aid in devising and promoting such measures as shall be deemed most effectual towards rescuing the country from its present *alarming* condition, and for rendering its resources available towards the improvement of the great body of the people, and the prosperity of the empire at large.”—Such was the *alarming* condition of Ireland on the 17th of January, yet on the 29th it was wholly unknown to his Majesty’s ministers. For it is not to be supposed that such a state of things should be known to exist, and yet no notice be taken of it in the speech from the throne. As if foreboding inefficacy to their prayers, instead of applying to parliament for assistance in their distress, and appealing to the wisdom and good feeling of the legislature, they seem to throw themselves in despair upon the charity of individuals! Parlia-

tion patronised by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam, in a manner so worthy of his station and character. May God Almighty prosper this and every plan, whether amongst Catholics or Protestants, for the promotion of true knowledge and genuine piety.

“ I hope we shall some day be known to each other personally, and in the mean time, I pray you to believe, that

“ I am, my dear Sir,

“ Your Christian friend and brother,

“ ROBERT APSLAND.”

“ The Rev. F. J. Nicholson,

39, Gloucester-street, Queen-square, London.”

ment has devised one scheme of emigration after another—has expended thousands in charter-school grants, and thousands in the draining of bogs; but misery still reigns predominant, and threatens, as it would appear, the very existence of the country. But parliament is to do no more: the efforts of individuals are to supply those of the great council of the nation. The administration of public affairs is to be a sinecure in regard to Ireland. She is to be abandoned in her greatest need to the frantic reign of Bible Societies, of reformation crusaders, and perjured conspirators. She is to be given over to a malevolent faction, which “like a raging lion, goeth about seeking whom it may devour;” which not only preys, but gorges upon its victims; a faction against which innocence is no protection, and a verdict of *not guilty* is no acquittal: and to brighten her prospects for the future, her avowed and determined enemies are placed at the head of the Government in England! Good God! when will the folly of our rulers cease? They drive the people into wretchedness by a long continued system of mal-administration, and then insult and mock them in their afflictions by the most obstinate and contemptuous silence. It is both sending them the sword, and giving them the arm to wield it!^(q) Till the Catho-

^(q) When Scanderberg sent his sword to Mahomet II.

lic peasant be taught to regard the law as his protector, by finding himself on an equality with his Protestant neighbour—till all cause of irritation be removed, and the spirit of bigotry be laid, by rescinding all penal distinctions—no permanent tranquillity can be expected; and till tranquillity be established on a solid basis, to invite the investment of capital for the employment of the people, Ireland will be poor, and wretched, and miserable. It is a well known fact that, during the discussions upon the Catholic claims, in 1825, very large sums of money were only waiting for the security which the final settlement of that great question would afford, to be immediately embarked for Ireland. It has probably been lent to Mexico, and been lost; for in the present situation of things, our surplus capital finds a readier channel for investment in the remotest corners of the world, and upon the most shallow security, than in calling into action the fertile but latent resources of our own immediate provinces. Those yearly droves of ragged and hungry peasants—a faint portrait of the still greater misery they leave behind—who traverse the country in search of a precarious subsistence, ought to speak more feelingly to the

at the request of that monarch, Mahomet returned it, saying, that though he had sent him his scymetar, he had not sent him the arm that wielded it.

minds of Englishmen than they do.^(r) In wretchedness they outvie those “Papists of the East,”

(r) Nothing can be more unjust than the outcry raised against the Irish labourers who have followed their landlords into this country, to seek for that employment here, which the absence of these, their natural protectors, has prevented them from obtaining at home. Surely, it is but reasonable that they should be allowed to partake of the benefits dispensed amongst the people of England by their absentee countrymen, especially when it is considered that it is by the labour of these very men that the incomes thus expended have been raised. Besides, much of the food consumed by the English labourer is the produce of Ireland, and it is unjust to complain because the Irish peasant comes to eat here what, but for the unnatural union of the two countries, he would be able to enjoy at home. Independent of which, the necessaries of life would be much scarcer, and consequently much dearer to the English labourer, were it not for the supply afforded him from the superabundant produce of Ireland. But the spirit which actuates this feeling of hostility amongst the peasantry of England, to the poor, wandering, expatriated sons of Erin, is the same which has ever governed the higher classes in their treatment of that unhappy country. To say nothing of days long since gone by, the bare memory of which harrows up the very soul, let us cast a glance at the history of times so recent as to be within the recollection of all, and when neither ignorance, nor barbarism, nor any fancied provocation to vengeance can plead an excuse, or even offer a palliation, for the wrongs we have inflicted. No details are requisite to illustrate

the very Greeks themselves, without being equally fortunate in attracting the compassion or good-

the picture : the shades are so deep, and the general gloom which pervades the whole piece is so profound, as to be visible to all : goaded into rebellion by the wily policy of a wicked and ambitious minister, then terrified by the atrocities committed in her subjugation, she was inveigled into a renunciation of her rights, and a resignation of her independence. While thus captivated by bribes, overawed by threats, and deceived by promises, in an evil hour did she consent to throw herself upon the mercy of her relentless master. She has never ceased to repent her folly ; for she has been a slave instead of a handmaid,—a servile dependant instead of an honourable partner. Though full seven and twenty years have elapsed, since her marriage articles were signed, and she became legally betrothed to her imperious lord, during which period she has ever most religiously comported herself as a dutiful and submissive consort, she has never yet been permitted to solemnize her nuptials but by mourning and by sorrow. As the note of gladness has never yet dwelt upon her ear, nor happiness ever settled on her brow, neither has she yet been decked in her bridal dress, nor partaken of her bridal banquet. The fruits of a happy union have never yet appeared ; neither was it to be expected that they should ; for there was too much of fraud and violence necessary to effectuate the marriage contract,—there was too wide a departure from the principles upon which alone a happy alliance could be founded, ever to allow her to look to other consequences than those which have rendered this union so abortive of good, and so prolific of evil

will of the nation.^(s) The Greek dies nobly in the field, and his death is sweetened with the compas-

Being only a union of words and not of hearts,—of force and not of affection,—deficient in all those qualities requisite for a lawful marriage, she has just cause to demand a dissolution of that tie, which could only have been valid and effectual by the free consent of the contracting parties, and by the strict fulfilment of the stipulated conditions. Let those conditions be fulfilled, and the union may still be happily consummated.

^(s) “But why do I mention these things, and what have we to do with the Greeks? What, are we not Greeks also—western Greeks—(*cheers*)—and has not a sort of Turkish rule oppressed us also, and trodden on our rights, and robbed us of our national glory, and prosperity, and security, and made us a bye-word amongst the other nations of Europe, and——but I correct myself;—the Greek was not always under the blighting shadow of his oppressor. There were islands, which I have visited, where Greeks governed Greeks; and though ill-governed, no doubt, were at least their own governors, and ruled and obeyed after their own will, and for their own interests and use. The pacha came once a year, took his tythe, and church-rate, and cess, and then went home to sleep in his haram, till the appointed season for the spoil or the contribution should come once more. But with us the Turk has been always present, at our fire-side, beside our chamber-grate, by the cradle of our children, on the grave of our fathers; within us, above us, about us; every where we have met the persecutor; at the very altar, where, with a blasphemy not to be endured by modern civilization, he interposed

sionate regard of the whole civilized world—while the victim of English bigotry pines out a miserable existence, or sinks under the slow but deadly poison of disease and famine, with scarcely a heart to lament him.⁽¹⁾ If we steel ourselves to every

his cruel arm between man and his God, and drove back the afflicted victim from the only consolation which was left him, the communication of his sufferings to the Father of the injured, and the Judge of the oppressor.—(*loud cheers.*)—Such, sir, we have been : but in one point only we have over Greece a very glorious advantage ; our struggle is not one of brutal or physical force ; not one of a fleshly and coarse arm—but one not less of might and power ; an arm which is of the spirit and of the mind,—an arm which is wielded by the intelligence, and morality, and constitutional vigour of an unanimous people ;—an arm of which indeed we are proud ; temper, discretion, open and generous warfare, by every honest means, against all that is narrow, and exclusive, and selfish amongst mankind.—The fates of the nation are not in the hands of the drivelling torturers of the last century ; the bad genius of '98 is, I thank God, for ever exorcised from the land.—Against the cries of the orgies of Dublin, I give you a glorious talisman—let our watch-word be, not blood, but peace to all men—civil and religious liberty all over the world.—(*Loud and long continued cheering.*)—*Mr. Wyse's* speech at the dinner of Munster.

⁽¹⁾ It is not intended to depreciate the generosity of, perhaps, a large portion of the *people* of England, in the succour they have so often given to arrest the ravages of

sentiment of compassion for the sufferings of Ireland, as they regard *herself*, let our own interests, at least, excite us to reflect upon the consequences to *us*. In proportion as Ireland is poor, so will England be the victim of that poverty. Hitherto the voice of Ireland has been heard only in the distance; she now comes in person to tell us of her afflictions; she sends forth her people like swarms of locusts upon the land, to devour and to make sterile: wherever she bends her course, famine and misery are attendants in her train; the original proprietors are dispossessed, or sink to the same level of wretchedness with the miserable intruders. Such has frequently been the result, to a greater or a less extent, in all those districts which have been more immediately the rendezvous of the Irish emigrants; the poor rates having, in many instances, absolutely exceeded the whole rental of the property on which they were levied. Though the consequences to other parts of the kingdom have been less perceptible, they have been every where real and considerable.

famine amongst the poor of Ireland. The hand of individual charity has been bountiful, and has met with a proportionate return of gratitude. But, as a nation, we perpetuate those scenes of misery by blinding ourselves to their causes, and while we apply the balsam with one hand, we open the wound again with the other.

The evil is one which, under the present system of government in Ireland, must not only exist, but must necessarily increase; and who shall say whether it will terminate before the whole of England be consigned to the same dreadful condition of miserable poverty, to which she has so woefully contributed to reduce that unhappy country? It is now nearly a month, since the distressed and impoverished state of Ireland has rendered her condition *alarming*; and though this has been officially announced for the same period, it does not yet appear to have attracted the notice of the legislature, or even of the English journals. Really to judge from the contents of our public press, the details of a fashionable party, the birth of some unnatural monster among the animal creation, or even the flowering of a primrose in January, is of more importance to the people of England, than are the most vital interests of the sister island, the possession of which has alone elevated us above the rank of secondary nations, by furnishing us with almost unlimited resources—by supplying half our navy, and more than half our army.^(u)

^(u) Since the above was written, nearly another twelve-month has elapsed, during which circumstances have occurred, which will, at length, force the situation of Ireland upon the attention both of the government and the people of England, and which prove more strongly than

I hope a few words may be permitted me (and I speak them with all due respect) to the Right Rev.

ever the absolute necessity of bringing to a final and happy adjustment, that question which still agitates one country, and still paralyses the other. The war which is actually raging, and the rumours of others, are sufficient to convince any but an obstinate and imbecile government of the policy of marshalling our resources, and husbanding our strength; while the late events in Clare have exhibited, in all its energy, the power with which the enemies of emancipation have to contend. That that power *must* prove irresistible is certain; if it lead to good, they who brought it into action have all the merit and all the glory; but if to evil, they who have unjustly, unconstitutionally, and wickedly opposed it, though they will share the misfortune with others, will alone be burthened with all the responsibility and all the dishonour. They who cry violence against O'Connell and Shiel, and shelter themselves in their intolerance under the disingenuous pretext of turbulence on the part of those whom they are pleased to style the Irish demagogues, would *they* support emancipation upon any terms or under any circumstances? There are men who know nothing of Catholicity but what they have learnt from the Protestant's Catechism—who know nothing of Ireland but what they glean from the liberal and enlightened columns of the Standard, or Dublin Evening Mail;—men who allow themselves to be carried away by a spirit of vengeance, and who, in their pride and obstinacy, are ready to sacrifice millions of their fellow creatures to the fancied guilt of a few individuals. They call for passive submission to their tyranny; words of sweet-

Bench of Bishops.—Gratitude alone should induce them to act differently from what they do ; for

ness for their insolence ; gratitude for their injustice. It is their will and pleasure, that what is now demanded as a right shall be sued for as a boon,—that we should learn to speak with honied lips,—that instead of holding ourselves erect, we should crawl upon the earth. They tell us that, when we are less eager in the pursuit, and when our relish for freedom is less keen, or, in other words, when we are become abject in our slavery,—silent under unmerited reproach, and willing victims at the shrine of bigotry ;—when that blessed day shall arrive, which they know full well will *never* come ;—*then* it is that, in their hypocrisy, they say, that the light of liberality shall shine in upon them ;—that, when tamed into servility by misfortune, we are unfitted for any noble deed or any honourable employment, that *then*, forsooth, they will put us into possession of all our desires, having first deprived us of every capacity to enjoy them ;—that *then* they will open to us the paths of fame, when we are so crippled as to be unable to advance in them.

“ Cease to agitate, and perhaps something may be done,” is the language of him who governs the politics of the day. I do not accuse the Duke of Wellington of such views as those I have just described, much less of such a disposition of mind ; I trust his soul is too noble ever to have harboured such ideas ; but being constrained by circumstances, and obliged to humour a party, he is compelled to use expressions which, with little meaning in themselves, may be so construed as to chime in with the opinions and conduct of men whom he is not at liberty to

they have certainly never yet repaid the obligation under which they were placed by the votes of the

offend, and who are thereby honoured and supported in their miserable policy and their paltry subterfuges.

Let us refer to what passed at the anniversary dinner at Derry, and let us judge to which party the accusation of outrageous violence should attach. The violence of the Catholics is a violence of zeal in the cause of justice and of right—a violence of wholesome indignation against the tyranny which oppresses them—a violent desire to emancipate their country from the evils that afflict her. But the men of Derry are outrageous, because the reign of bigotry is drawing to a close—because the tyrannical ascendancy which they have enjoyed for centuries, is about to be overthrown—because their monopoly of liberty, of political power, of the sweets of dominion, of all that men hold most dear in civil life, is to be broken down—because those, who have a right to be their equals, are to be raised to a level, and *only* to a level, with themselves—because one of their own brotherhood, more wise and more honest than the rest, has done himself immortal honour, by yielding to circumstances, instead of clinging, with obstinate bigotry and selfishness, to a cause, which, if allowed to run its course, instead of leading to a continuance of those delights which they are so reluctant to share with others, must inevitably bring ruin on themselves, together with the rest of the empire. This, and this only, is their apology for calling for the blood of the people !

If such language as was heard at Derry, had ever been delivered in the Catholic Association, with a numerous body of armed men to echo it back, what invectives would

26 Catholic Peers, who, in 1661, united in restoring them to their seats in the Legislature (from which the persecuted sectaries had driven them,) nor required the good offices they had previously received from the Catholic Peerage, in 1641. No greater proof than these facts present, can be given of the sincerity of those professions which we make, in case of justice being done us, to rank ourselves amongst the constitutional supporters of the established church ; and yet, she opposes emancipation, to secure her temporalities ! One while, she argues that Catholics will thrive so fast on freedom, that they will overrun the whole empire.

it not have called forth, what horror would it not have excited ! The cry of rebellion would have sounded from one end of the kingdom to the other ; the whole power of government would have been invoked to stifle the monster in its birth !—But it is well that the Orangemen of the North have unmasked themselves. They exhibit to the world the vitiating principle of that unhallowed cause with which they are identified, and prove themselves the true originals of those startling and terrific portraits, which we now perceive to have been sketched without exaggeration by the Catholic leaders. From being our most dangerous enemies, we may in future consider them as our best friends.

N. B. For a few illustrations, hastily collected from the public journals, of the actual condition of things in Ireland, see APPENDIX, No. VI.

they have certainly never yet repaid the obligation under which they were placed by the votes of the

offend, and who are thereby honoured and supported in their miserable policy and their paltry subterfuges.

Let us refer to what passed at the anniversary dinner at Derry, and let us judge to which party the accusation of outrageous violence should attach. The violence of the Catholics is a violence of zeal in the cause of justice and of right—a violence of wholesome indignation against the tyranny which oppresses them—a violent desire to emancipate their country from the evils that afflict her. But the men of Derry are outrageous, because the reign of bigotry is drawing to a close—because the tyrannical ascendancy which they have enjoyed for centuries, is about to be overthrown—because their monopoly of liberty, of political power, of the sweets of dominion, of all that men hold most dear in civil life, is to be broken down—because those, who have a right to be their equals, are to be raised to a level, and *only* to a level, with themselves—because one of their own brotherhood, more wise and more honest than the rest, has done himself immortal honour, by yielding to circumstances, instead of clinging, with obstinate bigotry and selfishness, to a cause, which, if allowed to run its course, instead of leading to a continuance of those delights which they are so reluctant to share with others, must inevitably bring ruin on themselves, together with the rest of the empire. This, and this only, is their apology for calling for the blood of the people !

If such language as was heard at Derry, had ever been delivered in the Catholic Association, with a numerous body of armed men to echo it back, what invectives would

26 Catholic Peers, who, in 1661, united in restoring them to their seats in the Legislature (from which the persecuted sectaries had driven them,) nor requited the good offices they had previously received from the Catholic Peerage, in 1641. No greater proof than these facts present, can be given of the sincerity of those professions which we make, in case of justice being done us, to rank ourselves amongst the constitutional supporters of the established church ; and yet, she opposes emancipation, to secure her temporalities ! One while, she argues that Catholics will thrive so fast on freedom, that they will overrun the whole empire.

it not have called forth, what horror would it not have excited ! The cry of rebellion would have sounded from one end of the kingdom to the other ; the whole power of government would have been invoked to stifle the monster in its birth !—But it is well that the Orangemen of the North have unmasked themselves. They exhibit to the world the vitiating principle of that unhallowed cause with which they are identified, and prove themselves the true originals of those startling and terrific portraits, which we now perceive to have been sketched without exaggeration by the Catholic leaders. From being our most dangerous enemies, we may in future consider them as our best friends.

N. B. For a few illustrations, hastily collected from the public journals, of the actual condition of things in Ireland, see APPENDIX, No. VI.

If so, Protestantism, deep-rooted as it is, must indeed be a meagre plant, to be expelled the soil by a new half-starved comer. Others say, the Catholics thrive well enough as it is. True : they do so : they gain in wealth, in numbers, in importance daily ; and, in proportion as they thrive, so do they become more discontented with their political situation.—Every day, their condemnation weighs more heavily upon them ; the object which they seek becomes of more value, in proportion to their increasing capacity to enjoy it ; and every day their exertions will be redoubled, with the power they possess, towards obtaining the redress of their grievances, and the objects of their lawful ambition. In any case, emancipation must and will be achieved, and better in peace and quiet, than in war and tumult—better in the day of prosperity, than in the hour of distress. Thank heaven ! the time is past when the system of persecution by which we are oppressed, was pursued to its full extent ; but though its power is broken and enfeebled, its spirit is not yet fled. We still suffer directly in our privileges and our rights, and even in our fortunes ;^(z) while our reputation, both as subjects

^(z) Witness the *double* land tax.—I am most happy in this opportunity of publicly testifying the sense which the Catholics of England must ever entertain of the very handsome manner in which Mr. Bankes has come forward to relieve his fellow-countrymen from this very oppressive

and as Christians, is still loaded with the defamations of nearly three centuries. If the State seeks for protection from such measures, she cannot find it: she is only erecting a barrier against her best friends. If the Church looks for defence from such weapons, she only combats against herself, by alienating the good opinion of those who would otherwise be sincere in supporting her.

The Protestant is now the Established Church. Let her rest satisfied with this advantage. It gives her all the splendour, and power, and influence of worldly state, with the largest ecclesiastical revenues in Christendom to support them; thus insuring her as complete an ascendancy over every other religion as can with justice be desired. But if her prelates and ministers provoke the exposure of her errors—of the false principles on which she separated from the Church of Rome, and of the iniquity in which she was cradled—by calumniating the religion of those whom they have dispossessed,

tax; but, notwithstanding all his efforts, and though the paramount injustice of the thing has long been acknowledged on all hands, and an act of Parliament was passed, in 1791, to relieve us from the burden (but which unfortunately proved inefficient for its purpose), it is still permitted to continue from year to year, as a proof of the little attention paid to Catholic affairs, and the little interest excited by our grievances.

and by continuing against them a system of unmerited condemnation, as well as against all who dissent from them; *they themselves* are answerable for the consequences. The firebrand with which they are still desolating the victims of their bigotry and their fears, may be hurled back into their own quarters, and the golden harvest which they are now reaping in such abundance, may be blasted and destroyed for ever!

The Church of England should ever recollect, that she has already once fallen in conflict with her enemies; and perhaps it would be well for the Sovereign to remember, that the monarch fell too: she has seen her hierarchy destroyed, her benefices usurped, and her religion reduced in its turn to the melancholy condition of a persecuted sect.^(*) And is she not fearful of a second contest? Can she hear that one half of her followers have deserted, and not tremble lest they should raise

(*) "I went to London," says Evelyn, in his Memoirs, "to receive the blessed Sacrament, the first time the Church of England was reduced to a chamber and conventicle, so sharp was the persecution. The parish churches were filled with sectaries of all sorts, blasphemous and ignorant mechanics usurping the pulpits every where. Dr. Wilde preached in a private house in Fleet-street, where we had a great meeting of zealous Christians, who were generally much more devout and religious than in our greatest prosperity."

the standard against her? Is it not folly—is it not madness, to learn these tidings, and not cease to irritate and offend? While she has yet the power to give—before she loses the ability to refuse, let her shew herself worthy of her cause, by her generosity, her justice, and her wisdom: let her doff the blood-stained armour of persecution, and clothe herself in the spotless garments of clemency and moderation, and, like a meek and humble disciple of Christ, let her meet her enemies with the kiss of peace, and inscribe on her standards, GOOD WILL TO ALL MEN. Clemency and moderation will attach a large and zealous body to her interests. We should support her,—not as a church possessing purity of doctrine, but as a teacher of good morals, and as a member of the great edifice of the constitution. Conciliation is her best and only resource: let her desist from her miserable and petty persecution of the dissenters, and her vigorous and determined warfare against the Catholics.^(a) This would place her

^(a) Happily, since the above was written, the disabilities of the Dissenters have been removed; the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts has been achieved; one great bulwark of bigotry and intolerance has been thrown down; and the march of religious freedom has triumphantly advanced. It has, however, been strenuously insisted on, even by some of the boldest advocates of emancipation, that the principle of this measure has no con-

on a proud pre-eminence, and be unto her a tower of strength; and if ever hereafter, in the

nection or analogy with what is termed the Catholic question; but a cursory analysis of the divisions upon the two cases, will at once overturn this assertion. Out of 237 members of the House of Commons, who voted for the Dissenters, only 23 voted against the Catholics; while out of 193 who voted against the Dissenters, only 24 voted for the Catholics, the greater part of whom were either actually in office, or so connected with Government as not to be considered as free agents when the question of the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was brought before them. These 24 were in no respect the enemies of religious freedom, but, on the contrary, they stated their opposition to the Dissenters to arise solely from the apprehension that the adjustment of *their* claims might impede the more important affair of the emancipation of the Catholics, and the pacification of Ireland. If, therefore, we add these 24 to the 237, we have 261 voices in favour of the Dissenters, out of whom only 23 are to be found who are enemies to general relief from religious disabilities. Does not this prove the principle of the votes to have been generally the same in both cases? In regard of the Irish members it was remarkably so: out of the 33 who voted in favour of the Dissenters, not one voted against the Catholics; and out of the 21 who voted against the Dissenters, only three (and those known friends of religious freedom, but in office at the time, and therefore necessitated to follow the leader of the administration) gave their voices for emancipation. It seems difficult to comprehend how there can be a principle ap-

vicissitudes of things, it should be her fate to fall, she would at least fall with honour and regret ;

plicable to the relief of the Dissenters, or what argument it is that can be advanced in their behalf, which will not apply to Catholics with double force. Will those who assert the contrary, avow the motives upon which they acted? It was said, I believe, that the grievances of the Dissenters were imaginary ; that they only asked to hold that *de jure*, which they had long enjoyed *de facto* ; and, therefore, that there was no longer any thing to concede. But why, after looking upon the question in so very different a light for so many years, did they, all of a sudden, conceive it to be necessary to grant the prayer which they had so long refused? Why were the Dissenters to have *de jure*, what they had so long held *de facto* ? If it were not upon the principle of justice and sound policy ; if it were not upon the principle that civil distinctions on account of religious opinions were incompatible with the spirit of the times, and inimical to the best interest of the country, we must look to some other accounting cause ; and in so doing, we can see nothing to which to ascribe this mighty change, but to the magical effect of a just and powerful intimidation. That ministers, and men who had for years strenuously opposed every adjustment of these claims, should, by the force of a strong majority against them, suddenly discover the propriety of granting *de jure*, what they had so long declared ought not to be conceded upon that title ; and that right reverend and learned prelates, with their attention continually turned to the subject by the very nature of their daily avocations, should only then see for the first time, the guilt of sacri-

at present she would meet her ruin deservedly and unlamented; and as long as the question be,

lege and profanation in what had so long been passing under their own eyes as a harmless pastime, must be attributable to some very novel and all-powerful cause; a cause which had no immediate connection with the general question of religious liberty. Surely, it was not that they suddenly discovered that the Dissenters were, and ever had been, more exemplary for their loyalty and attachment to both king and state, than their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects! Surely, it was not that these religionists had taken a retrograde movement in their doctrinal belief, and had made approaches towards the 39 articles! No; it was the unconquerable spirit of these men that dissipated prejudices, that taught wisdom to folly, and liberality to bigots; that overwhelmed every opposing power, and rendered resistance fruitless.

Such, too, ere long, will be the effect of that formidable and undaunted front which Ireland now presents to her enemies. Hitherto, the ascendancy faction has ever taken a most ungenerous advantage of the tried and deep-rooted integrity and loyalty of the men, whom they are ever ready to vilify as possessed with a spirit of outrage and rebellion, that only seeks for an opportunity to revenge her wrongs. I know of no feature in the whole history of their insolence and oppression, which throws a darker shade over their conduct, than this hypocritical denunciation of the existence of a state of things, in which if there had been any truth, they had never dared to pursue their tyranny and injustice to the extremities to which they have done; or having pursued it, which would not have produced

whether the Church of England shall perish, or seven millions of the king's subjects be emancipated from civil thralldom, we shall not hesitate to exclaim, *Fiat justitia, ruat cælum.*^(b) As the established religion, like the Greek schism, began by a simple act of separation, so, saving this exception, has she deviated less widely from the parent church than any other, and so, in proportion, will she find the professors of the ancient faith more ready and willing to defend her, when they can do so with advantage to the country, and with honour to themselves : they are now the most numerous of

very different consequences. Let them learn, however, that no system of unjustifiable coercion, especially one which offends the sensibilities of a highly-gifted and generous people, can long be pushed to extremities without recoiling upon its authors. Though the people of Ireland may not have power to slay and to conquer, they may yet have strength enough to pull down the temple upon our heads as well as upon their own. A wise government would not provoke them to it.

(b) "What is it but the consciousness of injustice, or the innate weakness and inconsistency of any church, which can require in the present times that she be fenced in with laws and terrors, and rendered secure, not by her own truth and virtue, but by the oppression and humiliation of those who refuse to bow down and worship her like some golden calf. Let the church perish that thrives by oppression, and visits with temporal penalties the consciences of men !?"—(*Reply to Dr. Magee.*)

her enemies, and may be easily transformed into the most powerful of her friends. But if she is obstinately bent upon her present course of injustice, at least let her cease to make us the victims of calumny and misrepresentation ; for it is calumny and misrepresentation alone that have reduced us to what we are. As credulity is one of the prevailing weaknesses of human nature, it is no wonder that the unjust accusations of our enemies should have been so successful in deceiving ;—that, while our religion remains pure and untainted as when it emanated from the revelations of heaven, it should be condemned by the credulous and the ignorant as superstitious and idolatrous ;^(c)—and that, though we remain as loyal members of the state as when we enjoyed our inheritance in full, we should be regarded as the disaffected and ill-omened of the creation. It is through interested defamation, working upon extravagant fears, that we have been brought to *this*, that almost all who speak of us, deride and insult us—all who write of us, calumniate us—all

(c) See a few specimens of the hideous calumnies in vogue against us, in the 32nd Letter of *The End of Religious Controversy* ; calumnies which have reached the cottages of the poor as well as the houses of the rich, and which no one can read without blushing to belong to the religion of the men who propagated them, or to the society of Christians who receive and believe them : and they are still to be met with in almost every publication of the day.

who read of us, or hear of us, imbibe the poison, and reject the truth. How many, by the abuse of Catholicity, have paved their road to preferment both in church and state; and have found ample gain in so disgraceful a traffic. How many prelates have forfeited the title of CHRISTIAN by their anti-christian illiberality! How many statesmen have abandoned their dignity and honour by prostituting their talents in the cause of cruel and unjustifiable oppression! But at the same time that we find many to condemn, it is a pleasure to find others to commend. How illustrious are those many virtuous and patriotic senators, who have scorned to be any thing but the honest advocates of religious toleration;—how benign amongst his colleagues is that venerable member of the Prelacy, who, in the true spirit of a Christian bishop, has ever known how to unite charity and benevolence with a dissent in religious tenets—who is now calmly journeying to the grave, eminent in wisdom and virtue, and who, when he is removed from amongst us, will, perhaps, leave Charity to seek in vain for another associate amongst the hierarchy of the establishment.^(d) Would to God

^(d) That charitable and benevolent individual, who a few years ago so laudably signalized his zeal, and exerted his talents in the cause of religious unity and peace, also bears most ample and liberal testimony in our favour. “By the reflecting members of the Church of England,” says this

that such truly Christian sentiments as this amiable prelate has always professed, were common among his Protestant brethren ; but the reverse is too generally the case ; their judgment is distorted by prejudice, and their charity is converted into rancour by the force of falsely conceived opinions both in regard to us and to themselves. They weigh with impartiality every thing but Catholicity. They see others in their true colours, but

amiable writer, “ who consider themselves a second branch of the Catholic church of Christ, the Church of Rome has never been denied to be of the true church : ” and again ; “ There is among the Roman Catholics a fixedness in their religious principles which will have influence ; there is a decided attachment to their faith, which comprises all the genuine doctrines of the gospel ; and amidst the sad diversity and alarming indifference generally prevailing among Protestants, some consolation may be derived from a hope, that, in reward for the zealous affection of Roman Catholics for their religion, that respectable and numerous body may, under divine providence, become purified from error, and be the honoured means of conveying the true faith to the remotest generations.”

“ I am pained,” says the late Dr. Parr, “ by the outrageous invectives that are thrown out against the Church of Rome ; and I must further confess, that they appear to me not only unjust, but even inhuman.”—“ I hope,” he says in another place, “ to find a better way of showing myself either worthy to live, or fit to die, within the pale of the Church of England, than by insulting Roman Catholics with the opprobrious imputations of superstition and idolatry.”

they look at Catholics only through a jaundiced medium. They fasten the crimes of individuals upon the whole body, and the virtues which they are sometimes forced to admit and to admire, they confine to individual merit. Thus, whether we be good or bad—whether we be dark or lightsome, we are always wrong. There is a general perversion of opinion against us, and, in the quaint language of former times, “no wood comes amiss to make arrows for our destruction.”^(e) We are

^(e) The Bishop of Chester (in his *Letter to Mr. Butler*, 4th edition) observes: “Most sincerely do I wish that religious controversy could always have been carried on in that tone of mildness and moderation which, a few instances only excepted, pervades your answer to Dr. Southey’s *Book of the Church*.”—Shortly after, he says: “You have yourself, in strong terms, deprecated the unfairness of imputing to the principles of a church, the individual obliquities of a few of its members;” and yet the very next moment, forgetting, in the ardour of his zeal, his own regulations for polemic warfare, he buckles on his armour, seizes the *firebrand* with one hand and the *poisoned arrow* with the other, and with slander on his tongue, rushes headlong—not against his antagonist in single combat—but into the midst of the whole camp of the enemy. “It affords, cries the bishop, “a most *clear* and *indubitable* evidence, that there is something in the spirit of the Roman Catholic religion which neither time nor experience can alter;”—and with the charitable intention of slandering, he only pronounces an honour-

deemed both foolish and criminal for adhering to our religion, in opposition to more modern and

able eulogium!—But increasing in rage as he advances in the conflict, he exclaims, “which contains the germ of intolerance and persecution:”—if the aggressor were here met with “the cruel arms of retaliation,” he would be instantly beaten from the field.—Let him, however, proceed in his attack: “Which poisons the fountain of truth!!!” Whatever truth there be in Protestantism, whence does it come? The Catholic Church most assuredly had the keeping of the fountain of truth for 1500 years before Protestantism was heard of; and supposing the poison to have been thrown in only a thousand years before, the stream must have been so woefully impregnated, that it is no presumption to surmise that the God of purity and holiness, would have employed more able and less dishonest workmen in its purification than a Luther or a Cranmer, a Henry or an Elizabeth; who were sure more thoroughly to pollute and embitter, instead of restoring, its sweetness and transparency. Like unhandy workmen on a masterpiece of art, they only deformed where they pretended to embellish; like unskilful alchemists, they only tainted what they undertook to purify. They encountered the certain punishment of presumption; and what in their vanity, their folly, and their impiety, they chose to designate as blemished and contaminated, was only proved to the world to be more beautiful in its form, and more excellent in its quality. That all-consummate work which the hand of God himself had fashioned, was not to be improved by the presumptuous labours of created man.

more convenient opinions; no credit is given to us for our motives, and we are accused of a dere-

But, *supposing* the fountain to have been poisoned, can the Bishop of Chester tell us who or what effected the miracle of its purification! If it ~~was~~^{were} not the wonder-working sceptre of an immaculate Henry, was it the fury and impiety of Luther? If it ~~was~~^{were} not the supremacy of Henry, was it the repeated doctrinal amendments of the child Edward? If it were not the amendments of Edward, was it the worldly-wise and more deliberate improvements of Elizabeth? If it were not the forty-two, why should it be the *thirty-nine* articles? Is there such magic in numbers? Is there such virtue in fitful and evanescent doctrine?—But, the spleen of the Bishop not being yet exhausted, he thus completes the climax of his slander: “which obscures and blunts the most sagacious intellect, and represses the natural movements of a just and ingenuous mind!!!” We benighted Catholics being all too blunted to be capable of any reply to this specimen of Protestant acumen, the Bishop surely will not object to our taking an auxiliary into pay, from his own ranks, to fight this intellectual battle for us; to do so, would be to oppose the natural movements of a just and ingenuous mind. “But I must here confine myself (says our auxiliary) to this charge against the Catholic religion, of being unfavourable to *genius, talent*, and, in short, to *the powers of the mind*. Those who put forward this piece of rare impudence, do not favour us with *reasons* for believing that the Catholic religion has any such tendency. They content themselves with the bare assertion, not supposing that it admits of any thing like *disproof*. They look upon it as

fiction of our duty in seceding from the service of our country, because we will not conform to Pro-

assertion against assertion; and, in a question which depends on mere *hardness of mouth*, they know that their triumph is secure. But this is a question that does admit of *proof*, and a very good proof too. The "Reformation," in England, was pretty nearly completed by the year 1600. By that time, all the "monkish ignorance and superstition" were swept away. The monasteries were all pretty nearly knocked down; young Saint Edward's people had robbed all the altars; and the 'virgin' queen had put the finishing hand to the pillage. So that all was, in 1600, become as *Protestant* as heart could wish. Very well: the *kingdom of France* remained buried in "monkish ignorance and superstition" until the year 1787: that is to say, 187 years after *happy* England had stood in a blaze of Protestant light! Now then, if we carefully examine into the number of men remarkable for great powers of mind, men famed for their knowledge or genius; if we carefully examine into the number of such men produced *by France* in these 187 years, and the number of such men produced *by England, Scotland and Ireland*, during the same period; if we do this, we shall get at a pretty good foundation for judging of the effects of the two religions with regard to their influence on knowledge, genius, and what is generally called learning.

"But how are we to ascertain these numbers? Very well. I shall refer to a work which has a place in every good library in the kingdom; I mean, the "UNIVERSAL HISTORICAL, CRITICAL, AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY." This work, which is every where received as

testantism. Though the presumption is both uncharitable and unjust, yet too many imagine that

authority as to facts, contains lists of persons of all nations celebrated for their published works. But, then, to have a place in these lists, the person must have been *really distinguished*; his or her works must have been considered as worthy of universal notice. From these lists I shall take my numbers, as before proposed. It will not be necessary to go into *all* the arts and sciences: eight or nine will be sufficient. It may be as well, perhaps, to take the ITALIANS as well as the French; for we all know that they were living in most shocking ‘monkish ignorance and superstition;’ and that they, poor, unfortunate and *unplundered* souls, are so living unto this very day!

“ Here, then, is the statement; and you have only to observe, that the figures represent the number of persons who were famous for the art or science opposite the name of which the figures are placed. The period is, from the year 1600 to 1787, during which period France was under what young GEORGE ROSE calls the ‘*dark despotism of the Catholic Church*,’ and what BLACKSTONE calls “*monkish ignorance and superstition;*’ and, during the same period, these islands were in a *blaze of light*, sent forth by LUTHER, CRANMER, KNOX, and their followers. Here, then, is the statement:—

	England, Scotland, and Ireland.	France.	Italy.
Writers on Law	6	51	9
Mathematicians	17	52	15
Physicians and Surgeons	13	72	21
Writers on Natural History ..	6	33	11
Historians	21	139	22
Dramatic Writers	19	66	6

we remain firm to the ancient faith, merely through a blind attachment to the prejudices of education

	England, Scotland, and Ireland.	France.	Italy.
Grammarians	7	42	2
Poets	38	157	34
Painters.....	5	64	44
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	132	676	164
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

“ Here is that very ‘SCALE,’ which a modest Scotch writer spoke of the other day, when he told the public, that, ‘Throughout Europe Protestants rank *higher* in the *scale of intellect* than Catholics, and that Catholics in the *neighbourhood of Protestants are more intellectual* than those at a distance from them.’ This is a fine specimen of upstart Protestant impudence. The above ‘*scale*’ is, however, a complete answer to it. Allow one third more to the French on account of their superior populousness, and then there will remain to them 451 to our 132! So that they had, man for man, *three and a half times* as much intellect as we, though they were buried all the while in ‘monkish ignorance and superstition,’ and though they had no Protestant *neighbours* to catch the intellect from! Even the *Italians* surpass us in this rivalry for *intellect*; for their population is not equal to that of which we boast, and their number of men of mind considerably exceeds that of ours. But, do I not, all this while, misunderstand this matter? And, by *intellect*, does not the Scotchman mean the capacity to make, not books and pictures, but *checks, bills, bonds, exchequer-bills, inimitable notes*, and the like? Does he not mean loan-jobbing and stock-jobbing, insurance-bookings, annuities at ten per cent., kite-flying, and all the ‘*intellectual*’

and parentage; that we are content to sacrifice our country's good to an obstinate perversity of

proceedings of 'Change Alley? Ah! in that case, I confess that he is right. On *this scale* Protestants do rank *high indeed!*"—*History of the Protestant Reformation*, p. 17.

As to the charge of the Catholic religion being opposed to "the natural movements of a just and ingenuous mind," I will only reply through another and a very eminent *auxiliary*, that "Catholicity has been the belief of the most illustrious characters that ever did honour to the name of man," and leave the bishop to seek the solution of his problem where and how he may. I refer not to the long catalogue of saints, of martyrs, and of apostles; to men who, at the risk of their lives, and with the sacrifice of every temporal comfort, have carried the light of the gospel to all the nations of the known world:—I refer not to a More, a Fisher, a Boromeo, a Turenne, a Fenelon:—I refer not to those hundreds of individuals, who, in every Catholic province of the universe, devote every faculty with which God has blessed them, to the sublime occupation of doing deeds of charity to mankind:—I refer not to *them*; for *I* am too blunted to see, and the Bishop is too *enlightened* to believe, that all these were, or are *Roman Catholics*.

With the Bishop's permission, however, I will say one word more in my own person. This is not the place, neither is it my province, to follow the right reverend prelate into the arena of polemic history. Mr. Butler's reply being entirely out of print, I have been unable to procure a copy of it, and therefore know not whether that gentleman

mind, and are only resolute in maintaining ourselves to be right, because it might appear degrad-

has triumphantly refuted the Bishop's historical assertions, as I am sure he is so capable of doing; but which it was not necessary that he should do, as they have long since been ably confuted by others. I will, however, observe in passing, that Dr. Blomfield's annotations upon the creed of Pius IV. would shame the meanest tyro in theology;—that his application of the decree of the Council of Constance relative to Huss, is wholly and entirely perverted;—that he every where confounds discipline with doctrine, and doctrine with discipline;—that he cites the opinions of councils without waiting to discuss their validity, or without distinguishing the unratified decrees of an unauthorized few, from the authenticated decrees of an œcumenical assembly of the pastors of the church. As long as the Bishop's historical facts rest only upon his *ipse dixit*, the *ipse dixit* of any other man is as good to refute them: but, *satis superque*.

My object has been to show that his Lordship can sometimes convert the sword of the spirit into a sword of steel; and that, neither *the fire-brand* nor *the poisoned arrow* are weapons so entirely disused by ministers of the establishment, as he would wish us to suppose. (The Bishop refers his readers to “A comparative view of the Churches of England and Rome.”—I beg to refer them to Dr. Lingard's convincing answer to that publication.)

How effectual is example! In a charge delivered last year, in the diocese of Chester, and published at the request of the Clergy present, we find the following extract from a bull of the present Pontiff:—“We also, venerable

ing to acknowledge ourselves to be wrong. But I should wish it to appear that we have other

brethren, conformably to our apostolical duty, exhort you diligently to occupy yourselves by all means to turn away your flock from these *deadly pastures*; [i. e. the Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue]." The Archdeacon of Richmond here proves himself a worthy subaltern of his diocesan commander. Nay, we are free to confess that the servant has outdone the master; if not in the boldness, at least in the impudence of his slander. What will be the astonishment of the reader, when, instead of *these deadly pastures*, referring to *the Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue*, he sees that these expressions relate to what shall be described in the Pontiff's own words:

"What shall I say more? The iniquity of our enemies has so increased, that, besides the deluge of pernicious books, contrary to the faith, it even goes so far as to convert to the detriment of religion the Holy Scriptures, which have been given us from above for the general edification. You are not ignorant, venerable brethren, that a society, commonly called *the Bible Society*, audaciously spreads itself over the whole earth; and that in *contempt of the traditions of the holy fathers, and contrary to the decree of the Council of Trent*, it exerts all its efforts, and every means, to translate, or rather to corrupt the holy Scriptures into the vulgar tongue of nations, which gives just cause to fear that the same may happen in all the other translations, as in those already known—namely, that we shall find in them a bad interpretation; instead of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the gospel of man, or rather the gospel of the devil. Behold, venerable brethren, whither

motives for not deserting an ancient cause, a cause in which we have endured so long and so cruel a

it tends, omitting nothing to accomplish its impious purpose; for it glories, not only in printing its translations, but even in going about to towns and distributing them among the people: sometimes it sells them, and sometimes, with perfidious liberality, gives them away.”—*Rescript* of May 3, 1824.

Such are the *deadly pastures* mentioned in the “Rescript,” and not, as the Archdeacon unblushingly asserts, *the Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue*. But such are the extravagant and disgraceful impositions by which the people of this country are deluded,—by which Christianity itself is brought into disrepute,—and by which the rights and characters of innocent men are sacrificed.

Is there not, also, some reason for the vigilance and restrictions of the Bishop of Rome, as to reading the Scripture in the vulgar tongue? In one of the regulations of the Council of Trent, it is declared as a matter of discipline; “That since the ~~promiscuous~~^{indiscriminate} allowance of the Bible in the vulgar tongue has been proved by experience to do more harm than good, it is determined that a discretionary power should be invested in the curate or confessor, to allow such versions to be read by those only who would suffer no detriment from the reading, but would receive an increase of faith and piety.” There has long been an authorized translation of the sacred writings in the Italian language, which till lately was open to every one; but in consequence of the eager and intrusive circulation of the corrupted translations of the Bible Societies, the restrictions of the Council of Trent, originally framed under similar circum-

martyrdom, than the shame of being branded as apostates; and that, circumstanced as we are, it

stances, were again imposed: but the regulations are not binding on the Catholics of this country, nor indeed, do they extend beyond Italy itself. We have every where editions of the bible in every size, from the folio to the duodecimo, and have full liberty to read as we list, with proper dispositions, and a due regard to the annotations annexed for the interpretation thereof. In Ireland, the circulation of the Scriptures among the Roman Catholics has been very great, particularly of late years. Two editions of the New Testament are now lying before me, one dated 1821, and the other 1826; the latter is a stereotyped and a very cheap edition. It is prefaced by the following approbation of the Archbishops:—

“ We approve of this stereotyped edition of the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, being according to the Douay version; and we authorize Richard Coyne, of Capel Street, Dublin, to print and publish it.

“ Given at Dublin, December 16, 1825.

PATRICK CURTIS, D.D. &c.

ROBERT LAFFAN, D.D. &c.

DANIEL MURRAY, D.D. &c.

OLIVER KELLY, D.D. &c.

So that though the Pontiff has been pleased to style the Bibles of *the Society* deadly pastures, yet the salutary food of the word of God, *translated into the vulgar tongue*, whatever the Archdeacon may say to the contrary, is still freely permitted, with an almost nominal restriction in the Papal States, to the whole of the Christian world.

“ As to reading the Scriptures in an authorized version,

is both ungenerous and unjust to accuse us of being supine and indifferent to the public interest. In arduous times, in periods of political danger, if a man is not found at his post, he should be able to give a good excuse for his absence. It is this which I profess to undertake: I profess to prove that the fault lies with those who impose the restrictions, not with those who submit to them; and that, by acting otherwise than as we do, we should only incur the guilt of a ~~sin~~^{criminal} subserviency to our temporal interests, and make a sacrifice both of our honour and our conscience. Such are the motives for the publication of the following REASONS: they are convincing to me, and I hope they may prove so to others. ^(f)

there is no restriction in Ireland; yet our Bible Missionaries are continually telling us the contrary; not that they do not know their assertions to be false, but that they intend their lying speeches to be circulated among the people of England."

Extract from a Letter from Dr. Doyle.

^(f) I feel another inducement to this undertaking. Charity urges us to use every reasonable expedient and exertion to do good to others; to diffuse those blessings which we enjoy ourselves; to impart a knowledge of the truth which we believe, and bear testimony to the faith we have received from our forefathers.

But, to those who believe not in the necessity of any fixed and *steadfast* faith—who, far from esteeming heresy,

As I have written nothing in a spirit of animosity, so I trust none will be offended with that freedom

schism, and dissension in matters of religion, as *works of the flesh*, and suggestions of Satan, allow themselves to be tossed about by every wind of doctrine, heedless whither they are carried;—to those who peruse the Scriptures, believing what chimes in with their ideas, but rejecting what displeases them, (though both the one and the other rest equally upon the same authority, and are often to be found together in the same page;)—to those who, in contradiction to the opinion of St. Peter, imagine that none are so little learned as not to be fit interpreters of the law, and expounders of the sacred doctrine, and that all are so wise and stable as to be proof against the enemy of truth, in his endeavours to induce us to wrest the words of God to our own *destruction and perdition*;—to those who are unwilling to submit their reason *to the obedience of faith*, but are resolved to emancipate themselves altogether from ecclesiastical authority; upon which resolution, both in theory and in practice, every religious establishment may be said to have been founded, even at the moment of its separation from the parent Church; to those who have no faith in the promise of Christ, that the Spirit of truth shall abide for ever with his ministers; to those who take religious faith to be a belief in what requires not the exercise of faith, namely, a belief in what they can comprehend with their own reason, and see with their own eyes; instead of, what St. Paul terms, *the evidence of things which are not seen*, and the remedy to that state of intellectual darkness to which *original sin* had reduced

of discussion which the nature of the subject required: none will be so unjust as to deny us the

mankind, (a doctrine itself as inexplicable and incomprehensible as any that the Almighty has revealed to man, but which, if we do not believe, we are no longer Christians);—to those, in fine, who look upon religious faith as a matter of indifference, who, knowing that two contradictory propositions cannot both be true, yet fancy that each is equally pleasing to the God of truth, and equally satisfactory as a foundation on which to build that *steadfast faith without which we must be condemned*,—who laugh at error as a play-thing with which we may amuse ourselves as long and in what manner we will, without being answerable for the consequences,—and who consider delusion in controverted points as a matter of no importance whatever:—to all such, I am well aware that my REASONS, considered in reference to religion, will appear vain and unmeaning.

I address myself to those only who, while they believe in the doctrines of Revelation, are willing to take them in their approved and established sense; to inquire sincerely in what manner they were received in the first ages of the Church, and what authority has been appointed to interpret them,* and who, while they acknowledge the divinity of our Saviour, are also ready to believe and follow his Gospel. How can we say we believe in

* In the Introduction to Mant's Book of Common Prayer, is the following passage:—"As it is established by ecclesiastical authority, those who separate themselves and set up another form of worship, are schismatics, and consequently are guilty of a grievous sin, which no toleration granted by the civil magistrate can authorize or justify," &c.

right of displaying the motives of our conduct with candour and with truth.

Christ, without believing in his *doctrines*? surely the one is incompatible with the other.

It will be seen that I have touched but slightly upon the evidence tending to establish the truths of Catholicity. I have only done so incidentally; merely taking advantage of the opportunities afforded for that purpose, in the arguments I have undertaken to advance against some of the doctrines of Protestantism. The controverted points, however, enumerated in the parliamentary oaths, naturally gave a greater scope to that portion of the subject. In undertaking the defence of Catholicity, the difficulty must always be, rather to avoid a redundancy of evidence, than to produce strong and convincing testimony of its truth. The descent, the parentage, and the birth of our religion; her infancy, her youth, and her age; her troubles and her misfortunes; her success and her triumphs: every period of her history, and every event of her lengthened existence: every prophecy of ancient days, and every revelation which accompanied her announcement to the world: the wickedness of a few, and the eminent sanctity of numbers of her pastors: the zeal of her friends, and the malignity of her enemies: the perfidiousness and apostacy of some of her most distinguished champions; the open revolt of thousands of her own rebellious children: the learning and the piety of her faithful followers; the countless multitudes whom she has ever embraced within her fold: *all*, in their various and respective ways, proclaim the power and the truth of Catholicity, as well as the fostering care of a superintend-

Much more might have been offered in exculpation ; more reasons adduced, and more objections refuted : but it is not the intention of the writer to enter into a long and elaborate discussion, (that has been often done by abler hands than his ;) it is only hoped that sufficient has been brought forward to stimulate inquiry upon a most important, but most perverted or neglected question ; to remove some, at least, of the causes which keep alive a spirit of hostility towards us ; to do justice to our motives, and to promote unity, peace, and harmony among Christians. Let us indulge the hope, that *the night is past, and that the day is at hand* ; and that the darkness of prejudice may at length be dispelled by the force of the light of truth.

Catholics are often accused of seeking the redress of their grievances with intemperance ; but let Protestants fancy themselves in the same circum-

ing Providence, that cherishes and marks her as his own. It cannot, therefore, be for want of materials that I have confined myself within such narrow limits, in treating of the Roman Catholic Religion ; but, because it was not necessary for my purpose to say more.

If there should be any inconsistency in arguing at one time, upon the ostensible articles of the Church of England, and at another time as if she had no articles at all ; the inconsistency must rest with the Church that places herself in such a predicament, and thereby affords only another proof of her insufficiency.

stances in which they have placed *us*, and if they are not indignant at their wrongs, their sensibilities are little to be envied. Is it imagined that the length and ferocity of the persecution we have endured, have so daunted the spirit and lowered the pride of its devoted victims, that men of high rank and ancient name,—of honourable feeling and of untainted reputation,—that the descendants of many who have deserved well of their country,—that the lineal representatives of the barons of Runymede, will hang their heads and hide their faces, when a vial of slander and defamation is poured out upon them? Are we to afford credit to the imputation, by silence, or are we to confront our accusers, and repel the slander, to the shame of those who gave it birth? It is no satisfaction to hear that we are accused as a body, and not as individuals: since, as members of the same religion, we are all so linked together, by that unity of faith which is the very essence of Catholicity, that what is true of the body, is true also of the individual. No man can be a Catholic, who does not hold each doctrine of his Church whole and entire;—no man can be a Catholic, who rejects one single tenet which the Church has proposed to his belief, as a revelation from heaven. If he does so, he separates himself from the great community of Christians, and ceases to be a Catholic. What the Church teaches as an article of

faith, we must believe as such; if she holds a doctrine, we must hold that doctrine also, or we are not Catholics. It is therefore impossible to separate the community from the individual, or the individual from the community. The Church is not an immaterial being, nor a creature of the imagination, but an immense congregation of individual members, all holding one faith and one baptism; all united in one fold, under one shepherd. Neither the Pope, nor the college of Cardinals, nor the court of Rome, constitutes the Church, but that immense society of Christians, dispersed throughout the universe, yet bound together by a spiritual obedience to the same supreme but spiritual head of the Christian world.^(g) As *Christians*, the various sects by which we are surrounded and assailed, make no impression on us; but, as *men*, we are equally influenced by the freedom or despotism of civil governments—we partake, in common with others, of the evils of unjust oppression, or of the benefits of wise and liberal legislation. I wish, therefore, to be understood to make a distinction between speaking politically, as the degraded member of a free state, with the remembrance of all our wrongs, and the miseries of

(g) It must always be remembered, that this spiritual head is *much more* restrained in the exercise of his spiritual sovereignty, than are the civil rulers of the freest states in the use of their temporal power.

Ireland present to my mind,—and speaking as a Christian, dispassionately discussing a mere point of religious controversy, without reference to its political consequences. In either case, I trust I have advanced nothing in a spirit unbecoming the subject, though I have said much which I am sorry to have been obliged to say. In justice, I might have said much more. I will take this opportunity of stating, that I am confident we are not actuated by any selfish or private views, in thus strenuously and warmly advocating our rights; but that we look mainly to the general peace and prosperity of the empire; which can never be true to herself, or great in the eyes of foreign states, till she cancels every trace of that barbarous code which has so long disgraced her statute book, and thereby drives that spirit of bigotry from the world, which has chosen England for her last and solitary haunt.

REMARKS ON THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH'S LATE CHARGE.

THE charge of the Bishop of Peterborough, delivered in July of last year, and printed at the request of his Clergy, having within these few days fallen under my observation, and conceiving it to be a document of importance at this juncture, I beg leave to offer the following observations upon it.

The Bishop observes that Roman Catholics are excluded from parliament “*not* because they believe in Transubstantiation, but because they who believe in that doctrine, believe *also* that a foreign Potentate hath or ought to have jurisdiction in the dominions of his Majesty, King George.” His Lordship, however, does not show how this *practical principle*, as he calls it, affects the allegiance of Roman Catholics to their sovereign, or the exercise of their duties as civil members of the state. He does not state it openly, and I trust he does not mean to insinuate that, in violation of their oaths, Roman Catholics acknowledge any but a *purely* spiritual jurisdiction in the sovereign Pontiff. Hence, we have not to prove, that the jurisdiction of the Pope is *only* spiritual, but that this spiritual jurisdiction is not a *practical* doctrine, hostile to the liberties of those countries in which it is exercised, and incompatible with those civil duties which, as subjects, we owe the state. Now, if the doctrine itself be not considered a sufficient guarantee—if the renunciation, by all Catholic Divines, of every iota of temporal sovereignty, either directly or indirectly, in the supreme head of the Church; and the duty of civil obedience to every form of government under which our lot may be cast, as inculcated by all Catholic moralists—be not enough to satisfy the most timid and the most prejudiced; let us examine the machinery

of this *practical principle*, and see how it works, and how it has worked, ever since the deposing power, (which was a temporal and not a spiritual power,) was abandoned by the general concurrence of Christendom. The spiritual authority of the supreme head of the Church neither entitles him to dispose of the endowments of a single Bishopric, nor of a single Curacy—gives him no power over any portion of the temporalities of the Clergy—nor any right to interfere with the discipline or government of any national Church:—it only invests him with a general superintendance over the Christian world, in spiritual concerns, and places him under an obligation, as far as in him lies, to see that the doctrines and morality of the Gospel are both preached and practised by his subalterns in the hierarchy. He rules not as a despot, but regulates his conduct by the canons of the Church; he possesses no power of punishment, but that of suspension from the performance of *spiritual functions*;—no power of removal from *temporalities*, but with permission of the sovereign, or commonwealth. In point of fact, I believe it to be true, that not a single instance is upon record, in any state, whether Catholic or Protestant, in which any inconvenience has arisen from the exercise of the spiritual supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. The Protestant states of Prussia, Holland, Hanover, Germany, Switzerland, &c. have all entered into a

concordat with the Pope, for the exercise of his spiritual supremacy amongst their respective subjects. They all, as well as Russia, retain accredited agents at the court of Rome; leaving England a solitary example of the infraction of the common rules of propriety and courtesy, in the intercourse between civilized nations. We send ministers to the Turk and the Idolater, to the worshippers of the sun, and perhaps to the votaries of Juggernaut, while we esteem it a crime, worthy of punishment by the laws of the land, to hold any communication whatever with the most ancient and most dignified sovereignty in Christendom!

But, to pursue our argument;—what is no treason in Prussia, Holland, or Hanover, cannot surely be treason in England. If the exercise of the spiritual supremacy of a foreign Potentate neither tarnishes the lustre of those crowns, nor impairs their authority, what is to infect it with its blighting and destructive quality the moment it arrives within the atmosphere of the British Isles? Does the Bishop of Peterborough suppose that his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Hanover bear him a divided or qualified allegiance, because he has placed them upon an equality with their Protestant brethren, and legally permits the exercise of the spiritual supremacy of the head of their Church amongst them? Or does such a supposition exist in the minds of any one of the Protestant sovereigns of

continental Europe, who have all been wise enough to act with the same good sense and liberality? Are they not rather assured, thereby, of the increased affections and loyalty of their people, of the augmentation of their strength, and of the stability of their government? Are the same tried and sacred principles to be true every where else, and false only in England? Are the feelings and dispositions of men to be regulated here by the laws of contrariety? Are wisdom, justice, prudence, benignity, and mercy, to be virtues in Germany, and follies in Great Britain? While the experiment has been found to fail every where else, is England alone expected to thrive upon the heart-burnings, jealousies, humiliations, and contentions, growing out of unjust and invidious legal distinctions between man and man? Are religious feuds and domestic strife to be the eternal, cherished, and hopeful inheritance of these realms? Is England, and *only* England, to be that cursed hot-bed of intolerance, which shoots up her rank and poisonous herbage, to the very infecting of the air we breathe; which nourishes that baneful spirit which almost every where openly insults us in public; which, ill-concealed even in the domestic circles of society, taints the charm of private life; which disturbs the mind, and preys upon the heart?—It is absurd to attempt to explain it; and for this reason, I suppose, it is that the Bishop of Peter-

borough does *not* attempt to explain how a system of justice and liberality is to weaken the allegiance and alienate the affections of the people;—how this *practical* doctrine of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope is thus to run riot amongst Englishmen, while it passes soberly through the imaginations of the Dutch, the Prussians, and the Hanoverians. Really it would seem to have become an axiom amongst us, that, while the rest of the world were triumphantly advancing in the science of legislation, *we* were compelled, as a matter of duty, to retrograde, for the sake of preserving an example of the perverse fatuity of man: and, as if a period of almost unparalleled political embarrassment, together with the common ills of mortality, were not sufficient to torment us, that we must needs try our strength and our patience, with the frightful evils of religious persecution. It would appear that the time was come when the wisdom of our neighbours ought to supersede our own; that old principles and old adages, which had been the pride of our ancestors for centuries, were to be reversed; and that it was now befitting the character and reputation of an Englishman to look with envy and complacency on the civil and religious liberties of foreigners, and even of Frenchmen!—But this spiritual supremacy is, and has been, and *will* be, exercised in these realms, in spite of laws, opinions, and penalties; and that,

too, amongst an irritated and insulted, though a *loyal* people. Even in the very worst of times, under the most cruel and trying persecutions,^(h) and when an assumed and presumptuous power in the spiritual head of their Church endeavoured to mislead them, the Catholics of this country, as a body, were never drawn into one single act of disloyalty to the state. On the contrary, they were ever remarkable for an inflexible and conscientious fidelity to the sovereign. And, in times nearer to our own, it is a singular fact, that the most influential members of the rebellion in Ireland, which was any thing but a *Catholic* rebellion, were all Protestants who disowned allegiance to this spiritual authority, and not Catholics who acknowledged it. Is it not, then, better that this spiritual supremacy should be exercised in an open, regular, and legal manner, than, as it is now, by stealth, and in opposition to the laws? Would the sanction of government to this practical doctrine make it more dangerous in its nature, or more hurtful in its consequences?⁽ⁱ⁾

^(h) Persecution never yet consolidated the interests of any country, but has invariably had the effect of weakening, by the discord, turbulence, and even rebellion, which it has occasioned; neither did it ever yet gain a willing and sincere convert to its cause. Yet do we find both statesmen and divines who are still enamoured with it.

⁽ⁱ⁾ "It cannot be necessary to enter into the history of

The Bishop of Peterborough, having thus far contented himself with merely stating a reason

Catholic affairs during the present reign. With the replies of the foreign universities to Mr. Pitt's queries, and the oaths taken by Catholics according to the acts passed in their favour, the reader must be acquainted. I shall, therefore, content myself with asking whether the oaths and protestations contained in the preceding pages, do not fully bear me out in the assertion, that the great body of the British Catholics has never been accustomed to acknowledge in the Pope any temporal authority, or to consider the deposing and dispensing powers as parts of its religious creed. But if this be true of Catholics in former times, it must be true of those of the present day; nor do I see how any man can rationally accuse them of partiality to the doctrines they have disclaimed, or fear that they should adopt them at any future period. The fact is, that there exists not within the United Kingdom, nor within any kingdom in Europe, a body of men whose religious opinions with respect to civil government are so accurately ascertained. They have not only explained their sentiments; they have sworn to the truth of their explanation. They have made their allegiance doubly secure: they are bound to it by their religion; they are also bound to it by their oath.

“ In conclusion, it may be observed, that the statute-book at present is, on this subject, in contradiction with itself. Whoever peruses the preambles to the statutes, from the pressure of which the Catholics pray to be relieved, will learn that they were enacted against persons described as traitors to their country, supposed to hold that faith is not to be kept with Protestants, and to believe

for our exclusion, without any attempt to prove its justice, proceeds to absolve the opposers of eman-

that the Pope could lawfully depose princes, and absolve subjects from their allegiance. By the acts passed during the present reign in favour of Catholics, it is admitted that those who take the oaths prescribed therein, do not come under this description. Of course, they are not the men against whom the penal statutes were enacted; why then are they still made to suffer under them? Certainly justice and consistence require that this contradiction should no longer exist; but that all who bear true allegiance to the king—all who abjure the temporal superiority of every other prince or prelate—should be admitted to the common rights and distinctions of British subjects.’

—(Dr. Lingard’s *Tracts*, pp. 290-1.)

N.B. This “Collection of Documents to ascertain the sentiments of British Catholics in former ages respecting the power of the popes,” and Dr. Lingard’s excellent Observations thereon, ought to be the study of every legislator.

“But it is said, and from high authority too, that to a king who is not a Roman Catholic, they cannot bear other than a divided allegiance. I say the charge is unsupported by fact; and, if it were true, would not be a very discreet charge to make against more than seven millions of people, now living within the allegiance of the king of this empire. I say, further, that it is disproved wherever Roman Catholics are admitted (and that is every where but here,) to a full enjoyment of civil rights under sovereigns not of their creed. I say that it is disproved in Prussia, disproved in Denmark, disproved in Sweden, disproved in Hanover, disproved in the Netherlands, disproved throughout the Russian Empire, and proved nowhere.

ipation from the charge of bigotry and intolerance, which is brought against them, by asserting that

“ It is a charge not imputed by the laws of England, nor by the oaths which exclude the Catholics: for those oaths impute only spiritual errors. But it is imputed, which is more to the purpose, by those persons who approve of the excluding oaths, and wish them retained. But, to the whole of this imputation; even if no other instance could be adduced; as far as a strong and remarkable example could prove the negative of an assumption which there is not a single example to support,—the full, and sufficient, and incontestable answer is Canada. Canada, which, until you can destroy the memory of all that now remains to you of your sovereignty on the North American continent, is an answer practical, memorable, difficult to be accounted for, but blazing as the sun itself in sight of the whole world, to the whole charge of divided allegiance. At your conquest of Canada, you found it Roman Catholic; you had to choose for her a constitution in Church and State. You were wise enough not to thwart public opinion. Your own conduct towards Presbyterianism in Scotland was an example for imitation; your own conduct towards Catholicism in Ireland was a beacon for avoidance; and in Canada you established and endowed the religion of the people. Canada was your only Roman Catholic colony. Your other colonies revolted; they called on a Catholic power to support them, and they achieved their independence. Catholic Canada, with what Lord Liverpool would call her half-allegiance, *alone* stood by you. She fought by your side against the interference of Catholic France. To reward and encourage her loyalty, you endowed in Canada

as we have now complete religious toleration,^(k) the question at issue regards not *religious liberty*, but *political power*; at the same time observing, that a “claim to civil power must be founded on civil relations.” Now, it is precisely upon this ground that we rest our claim. We swear civil allegiance to the sovereign, not by force, but freely and willingly, and as a matter of conscience; we pay taxes, even in a greater proportion than others; we contribute to poor-rates, tithes, and church-rates; we

bishops to say mass, and to ordain others to say mass, whom, at that very time, your laws would have hanged for saying mass in England; and Canada is still yours in spite of Catholic France—in spite of her spiritual obedience to the Pope—in spite of Lord Liverpool’s argument—and in spite of the independence of all the states that surround her. This is the only trial you have made. Where you allow to the Roman Catholics their religion undisturbed, it has proved itself to be compatible with the most faithful allegiance. It is only where you have placed allegiance and religion before them as a dilemma, that they have preferred (as who will say they ought not?) their religion to their allegiance. How then stands the imputation? Disproved by history, disproved in all states where both religions co-exist, and in both hemispheres, and asserted in an exposition by Lord Liverpool, solemnly and repeatedly abjured by all Catholics, as of the discipline of *their Church*.”—Lord Nugent’s *Statement*, &c.

^(k) It is only mockery to talk of *tolerating* a religion, as long as penalties and disabilities are made the necessary appendages to its profession.

serve the army and the navy ; we perform every civil duty demanded of us, and even ask leave to perform more. If this does not place us in a situation of *civil relationship* with the state, what can? It is not *our* fault that we do not serve our country as senators, &c., or hold offices of trust or power ; if therefore we be deficient, it is bigotry and intolerance which make us so. If it was no crime in St. Paul, or in our Saviour, to dissent from the religion of the state, because they knew it to be false ; it is no crime in us : and as long as the religion of the state requires us to forswear ourselves, before we can serve that state as senators, or in offices of trust and power, I am confident we are not wanting in our civil duty for refusing to do so. We do not ask for political rights as *Roman Catholics*, but we ask for them as good subjects of the king, as useful members of the state, and as fulfilling all the duties of *civil relationship* towards the government and the institutions of the country, of which the Protestant church-establishment is one. Neither do we ask, as the Bishop of Peterborough would imply, for *offices of trust and power*: these, the sovereign must always bestow or withhold at his pleasure. We ask only for those rights which belong to us in virtue of the constitution of our country,—for *eligibility* to office,—for those privileges which belong to our respective states,—for that liberty to serve our fellow-subjects which

all others of our own class in the commonwealth possess:—in fine, for that, and that *only*, which we should enjoy, were we *not* Roman Catholics. Is it not, then, bigotry and intolerance to deprive us of our birth-right, not because we are bad subjects, but because we conscientiously differ from the religion of the state? It is much rather the opposers of emancipation that are deficient in their civil relationship to the government, by disfranchising many whom the constitution invests with senatorial rights; by circumscribing the prerogative of the crown in the choice of its officers; and by defrauding the state of her intrinsic right to avail herself of the worth and talent of every individual member of her community. While the accusation, therefore, will not stand, as far as it regards *us*, it applies with double force against our political opponents.

If, however, there be not bigotry in this, there is, at least, selfishness and injustice in the next position in which the Bishop places himself, as the enemy of the civil rights of Catholics. “And if the clergy,” says he, “in particular, have reason to apprehend that additional power conferred on the Roman Catholics, would endanger their own Church, they are surely entitled, without being branded as bigots, to petition the legislature against measures injurious to themselves.” This is a candid, manly avowal, doing equal credit

to the Bishop with the general temperance and propriety of his language, which forms so pleasing a contrast with the rhapsody and abuse which too often has been, and still is, poured out upon us by the dignitaries of the Established Church. I have long thought that the fancied danger to their own Church, and the risk of seeing "themselves and their families reduced to beggary," had, at least, an equal share in the very active opposition we met with from the prelates and ministers of the establishment, with the desire which they must necessarily have, as members of the "True Church, to support it for its own sake." Are they not here acting the part of the chief priests and Pharisees, gathered together in council, and saying to themselves: "What shall we do? if we let these men alone, all will believe in their doctrines, and they will come and take away our place and nation."⁽¹⁾ If the property of the Church were only proportioned to its necessities, or if its surplus revenues were voluntarily applied, as formerly, to the erection and endowment of hospitals and colleges, and the establishment of other useful institutions, we could not fairly prefer an accusation of selfishness from the avowal of such a motive: we could only say it was unjust. For it is undoubtedly unjust to sanctify the means by the end, when

⁽¹⁾ St. John xi. 47, 48.

those means are a direct penalty upon one half of the population of the empire, and a visible deterioration of the well-being and prosperity of the whole state. Even supposing the premises to be true, that emancipation would endanger the temporalities of the establishment, it must surely be unjust to defend them by such means as these; but when, even in the opinion of their present possessors, it is only problematical, it amounts to tyranny and injustice of the very first order, to punish men for crimes, not only before they have committed them, but of which it is not known that they will ever be guilty. They might as well arrest every poor man in the kingdom, and throw him into prison, lest he should be tempted to rob his richer neighbour upon the first opportunity. But I trust to show, that, far from there being any reasonable ground of danger to the establishment from reinstating the Catholics in their civil rights, it would equally be our interest and our inclination to uphold the honours and temporalities of the Church of England.

In the first place, we most solemnly disclaim even the most remote idea of ever being repossessed of the temporalities of the church in these realms; and in proof of the sincerity of this disclaimer, we state both the utter impossibility of the thing, and the probable inexpediency of it, even were it possible. It is impossible, from the

present state both of religious and political parties in the country. Supposing emancipation to introduce eight Catholics into the House of Peers, and ten or twenty into the Commons; what is this against hundreds? Catholicity must indeed work by enchantment, to gain the ascendancy over such an opposing mass; at least it would be a novelty in the history of mankind. It is equally improbable that we should unite with the dissenters for the purpose of *despoiling the establishment*, and dispossessing "a party which," it is said, "will then [when the cause of religious liberty shall be achieved] have lost its ascendancy, and have become a sect among sects." The Bishop of Peterborough cannot surely be serious in asserting that as long as the establishment retains her temporalities, with the influence necessarily attached to them, together with the Universities, and her paramount political privileges, that she can ever fall from that immense ascendancy which she now enjoys over every other religion in the state. The only ascendancy she would lose, is a hateful lording it over all who presume to differ from her; an ascendancy which teaches her to insult and oppress those whom, in her fears, she fancies to be her enemies; an ascendancy that marks her for the scorn and pity of her victims. I am sure that every true friend of the establishment will acknowledge, that the sooner she falls from such an ascendancy as

this, the better. But what object can Catholics have in uniting with the dissenters to *despoil* the establishment? We most cordially unite with them in our common endeavours to obtain the most perfect religious freedom; and we rely upon those common endeavours for success. The Church of England, “if more numerous than any *single* sect, is less so than the others united:”^(m) and does she expect still successfully to oppose the energies of such antagonists, bound together by a similarity of grievances, with justice to embolden them in their career, and with so noble and glorious an object in view? The thing is impossible.⁽ⁿ⁾ “The removal of civil disabilities can alone remove all cause of contention—can alone restore harmony between

^(m) Vide *Charge*.

⁽ⁿ⁾ Has the feeble opposition made by the Establishment, either in or out of Parliament, to the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, been calculated upon the Machiavelian maxim, *Divide et impera*? If it has, I am sure the calculation will be defeated by the strenuous assistance which the dissenters will continue to give to the great work of Emancipation. They were signally aided by the concurrence of the Catholics in the prayer of their petition, and they are too generous, too wise, and too just, not to desire that others may be released from a much more galling servitude than that which they themselves found so oppressive, and from which they are now so happy to have escaped.

the Church of England and other religious parties." And all cause of contention being removed, the union which was cemented by their common grievances, is at once dissolved. When the passions are calmed, and the interests of every class are amalgamated by equal laws and equal rights, the present lamentable discord and animosity will cease, religious harmony will be restored throughout the land, and Christians of every denomination will be linked together by the bonds of charity and goodwill alone. In every country in Europe, in which Catholics and Protestants have been blended in a community of interests by an equality of rights, such has been the happy result. The Church of England might then enjoy her revenues and her privileges in peace and comfort, without the hatred or envy of her neighbours; exchanging the fierceness of the vulture for the meekness of the dove; being no longer a domineering mistress, or an insulting tyrant.—The only point of union between Catholics and dissenters, is the great cause of religious liberty. That being accomplished, no further alliance can either be required or expected. The dissenters have invariably departed infinitely further from the parent Church, than the members of the Establishment. What, therefore, should we gain by uniting with them to despoil that Establishment? They, united, being infinitely the stronger party,

would, in case of success, take every thing for themselves. I speak not of Ireland : any spoliation of the Established Church *there*, must proceed either from a convulsion in the country, or from the will and power of the Protestant landholders. There are no sectaries of sufficient force and numbers in that portion of the empire ; and, as I said before, ten Catholic representatives must be more than destroying angels, to accomplish such a work. The redress of the most grievous of the clerical exactions, and a moderate competency from the Government to the Catholic clergy, operating with the late amendments in the tything system, and equal laws and equal rights, would so far satisfy the people, as to remove every idea from their minds of despoiling the Establishment.^(o) To shew

^(o) Upon the expediency and practicability of a state maintenance for the Catholic clergy of Ireland, I beg to refer the reader to Dr. Doyle's very able remonstrance with the Duke of Wellington, in APPENDIX, No VII. For myself, I never presumed to offer an opinion upon this question, otherwise than conceiving it to be well-calculated to afford relief to the laity, especially to the labouring poor. For an admirable essay on the Tythe System, see APPENDIX, No. VIII., for an extract from *Letters to a Friend in England on the actual state of Ireland*. (Letter 4th.) London, Ridgway, 1828 ; which, for depth of reasoning, strength and elegance of diction, together with an intimate and practical knowledge of the

the probable inexpediency of Catholics repossessing themselves of the Church property, even if they had the power to do so, we have only to look to the history of Europe to satisfy ourselves that every church which has yet fallen, has fallen under the weight of its own riches. Those riches first produced a laxity of morals among the clergy, before they became the envy, or excited the cupidity, of the laity. Suffice it to say, that they effected the downfall of the church which possessed them. As zealous members of our religion, we ought not, therefore, to desire to see her again exposed to similar hazards and temptations; and I am sure there is not a Catholic in the country who would not infinitely sooner see his religion with a decent competency, (such as we could give her ourselves, if the laws permitted it,) yet free and independent, than again breathing the air of courts and palaces, and luxuriating in all her former riches. The Catholic Church of Ireland, with all her poverty, is probably a purer and a better church (I mean as to morals and sanctity, for her faith has been always the same,) than she ever was in the days of her prosperity. For herself she desires nothing more than she enjoys at present, save the

subjects under discussion, demands the earnest attention of every man interested in relieving the miseries of Ireland, and in promoting the cause of civil and religious liberty.

cessation of calumny and persecution against her children : she has all the authority she could desire over her people, because she rules them with a paternal solicitude, and receives their affectionate attachment in return : she sees and knows that riches are not requisite for the establishment of the kingdom of God,—that rather covetousness is the root of all evils,—and seeing this, she cherishes her poverty as her best and surest support.

But the great security of the Protestant Establishment would consist in the alliance which it should be her inclination to form with her Catholic brethren. Though we differ from her on points of faith ; those points are not many, and have, all of them, at one time or other, been warmly defended by some of her ablest Divines. Her ministers have frequently acknowledged that the Catholic religion contains nothing contrary to salvation—nothing that should prevent her from being considered as a true Christian Church,^(p)

^(p) “ I must accept,” says Thorndyke, “ the Church of Rome for a true church ; as in the Church of England I have always known it accepted ; seeing that there be no question made but that it continueth the same visible body, by the succession of bishops and laws that were first founded by the apostles*. There remaineth, there-

* Dr. Fletcher, in a note to this extract, observes : “ It is true, indeed, (but this is one of those contradictions which we so often meet with in the rolls of error)—it is true that the instrument

and such has been more solemnly and frequently avowed by Protestant Divines upon the continent.

fore, in the Church of Rome, the profession of all the faith necessary for the salvation of Christians to believe, either in point of faith or morals." (*Epil.* p. 146.) "It is acknowledged on all hands," says Mr. Davis, "that the Church of Rome, in its original state, was apostolical and pure. And even at the present day, it has persevered in which, after the thirty-nine articles, is of all others the most sacred in the eyes of the established clergy,—the Book of Homilies,—denies most positively this preservation of the apostolical delegation. This book, which these men, by their oaths and superscriptions, are solemnly bound to revere as containing, according to the thirty-fifth of the articles, 'a godly doctrine necessary for these times,'—this book distinctly states, that the whole Church had perished. For 'the whole Church,' it declares, 'had, for upwards of a thousand years, been sunk in idolatry, &c.' Now, whence this contradiction in a point so vital? Whence the circumstance that, whereas the most enlightened members of the Establishment do positively attest, that the Church, its government, and its ministry have subsisted regularly through every age,—this most important testimonial of the public faith just as positively declares the contrary? To reconcile the two things together is, indeed, impossible. But, what, then, is the cause of the inconsistency? Why, it is this:—the Protestants have regulated their maxims and their language exactly as the nature of their wants required them. At the beginning of the Reformation, it was necessary for them to pull down the ancient Church, ere they could erect a new one. Therefore, they then maintained that the Church had perished: and this, as the article states, was the doctrine 'necessary for these times.' Ere long, they succeeded in rearing the new edifice upon the ruins of the ancient one. Therefore, they now contended, that the Church had not perished. On the contrary, they now declared it to be imperishable and immortal: maintaining even that their own pastoral ministry, by being linked to the chain of the Catholic priesthood, is, hence, apostolical and divine. Such is the conduct, and such the character of error; for ever changing its maxims with the change of circumstances, and its language with 'the necessities of the times.'"—Dr. Fletcher's *Comparative View*, &c. p. 60.

Her discipline is nearly, her constitution is precisely, the same as ours. In our Liturgies, in the

all the fundamental articles of the true, and Christian, faith. And the sacraments ordained by the gospel, are here administered by a priesthood, which derives its appointment by an uninterrupted succession from the apostles, and its *authority* from our Great Master.'—'The commission,' says Dr. Daubeny, 'originally delivered by Christ to his apostles, has been handed down in regular succession. Under the authority of this commission, the religion of Christ was introduced into this country, at a very early period; and the appointment of ministers, under the sanction of the divine authority, has been uniformly received and preserved in the church, wherever it has existed, for fifteen hundred years.' In short, even those fierce enemies of every thing Catholic,—the authors of the *British Critic*,—admit, that 'the church government maintained by the Church of Rome, has been traced, without a single break in the chain, up to the immediate successors of the apostles; and the chain of the episcopacy was unbroken for fifteen hundred years.' "

"It is difficult to imagine," observes Dr. Fletcher, from whose valuable work these quotations are taken, "how a church, which had retained the sacred privilege so long, should, since that time, have forfeited it. Because, not only during this whole length of interval has she always continued to be, what she had constantly been before—unaltered both in her faith and constitution; but there has been issued no fresh mandate from heaven annulling her former titles."

"Such is the abridgment of our faith," says the Con-

administration of the sacraments, we approximate. But the great uniting link between us, is her code of morality. The insufficiency of man ; the atonement for sin ; the divinity of Christ ; the necessity of good works for our acceptance before God, and of repentance to obtain forgiveness of our sins ; the application of the merits of Christ for our sanctification, by means of the sacraments ; the Decalogue of the old law, and the moral precepts of the new, are all points in which Catholics and Protestants are thoroughly united. Is it not, therefore, natural, that we should support the establishment, should we see it invaded by Calvinists and Levellers ? Catholics, most assuredly, have nothing to anticipate from the downfall of the Church. As long, however, as she is unjust and intolerant, we shall oppose her ; but the mo-

fession of Augsburgh, the most authentic and most solemn act of the Lutherans, “in which nothing will be discovered contrary to Scripture, or to the Catholic church, or even to the Roman church, as far as we can know it from its writers. The dispute turns upon some few abuses which have been introduced into the churches without any certain authority ; and should there be found some difference, that should be borne with, since it is not necessary that the rites of the church should be every where the same. (*Art. 21, Anno 1530.*)” For many similar acknowledgments, see the work from which this is taken, *An Amicable Discussion*, Vol. I. p. 59, &c.

ment that the support of her cause becomes sanctified by moderation and justice, she may rest assured of our assistance.^(q) An Established Church has ever formed a part of the constitution of the country ; she is the promoter of learning, the preserver of the splendid memorials of the piety of our ancestors ; she is now become the encourager of the arts ; she “ discharges many im-

^(q) “ At the same time, sir, I must protest against its being imputed to me that I am hostile to the establishment in this country. You would wrong me by such an imputation ; I have no unfriendly feeling towards it when it does not exceed its constitutional limits ; but as an Englishman, viewing with conscious exultation the proud pre-eminence of my country, founded on her free institutions ; I execrate, with unfeigned reprobation, every attempt to trench upon the civil and political rights of the meanest individual in the community, be his oppressors who they may. And if a church establishment, of any form of worship, in any country, requires the sacrifice of the recognized rights of the subject to uphold its power, in my opinion it cannot fall too soon. A church distinguishing itself by the apostolical virtues of its leaders ; by its abstractedness from earthly pursuits, and preaching peace and Christian concord, serves well the cause of good government, and might, not only with safety, but with great benefit, be closely allied to it. But establishments, like most other things, must stand each on its own merits : they may be blessings, or they may be curses.” (*Letter of Edward Blount, Esq. to a Protestant Gentleman ; published in the Catholic Miscellany for February, 1828.*)

portant duties besides those of her immediate vocation, and supplies what would otherwise be a chasm in the administration of public justice." The property of the Church in the hands of laymen, or in possession of the sectaries, neither would nor could be half so advantageous to the country as it is now. I have already said why we have no wish to see it in our own. The sacrifice of the Church Establishment is, therefore, a sacrifice which we neither desire as Christians, nor as members of the State.^(r) While in all this I deliver only the sentiments of an individual, at

^(r) There is certainly some difference in the relative connection between the Church and the State, in Catholic and in Protestant England. In Catholic times, the Church was invariably the opposer of the encroachments of the crown, and, in many cases, the able and effectual supporter of the liberties of the people; whereas, the system of translating from one bishopric to another (a system which exists in no other Christian state) and which has been subsequently introduced, has entirely altered the character of the Episcopacy, by destroying its independence, and by depriving it of the power of throwing its weight where it might be serviceable to the interests of the country. But this is an abuse, which, great as it is, the crown has always the power to remedy. It is the Minister, and not the Church, who is the greater delinquent; and we must hope to see the day when England shall possess a premier, virtuous enough to overturn this system, which marks her prelacy as a dependant class,

the same time I believe that I speak those of the body to which I belong; at any rate, I am sure that what I have said, I have said in the sincerity of my heart.

I have one word to offer upon a circumstance which is frequently advanced as a mark of the liberality of the times, and as a proof that the question of Catholic Emancipation is now permitted to stand upon its own merits, and to be decided by the unbiassed judgment of the public—I mean the neutrality of the Cabinet. This has long been a mere delusion, sounding plausible in theory, but absolutely contradicted in practice; since THE WHOLE of the Church patronage has ever been showered down *exclusively* upon the professors of ascendancy principles. For it cannot be supposed that it has all fallen by accident on those only, who see imminent danger to the Establishment in equalizing the distribution of civil rights throughout the country, and of satisfying all classes of the people, that they have no longer any thing to fear from ecclesiastical tyranny. We know—and for the honour of the Establishment be it said—that

and which certainly is not calculated, either to promote dignity in the hierarchy, or respect towards it in the people.

individuals do exist in this kingdom in sufficient numbers, of irreproachable conduct, and of competent learning, to fit them for the most elevated order of the hierarchy, and yet believing that emancipation from civil thralldom would neither make Catholics nor dissenters more dangerous to the revenues of the Established Church; nay, who think that a generosity of conduct on her part, would altogether overcome the hostility of both. Is it therefore probable, that, while the existence of such men is known to all others, the first Lord of the Treasury alone should never be able to discover them? But, till he does accidentally light upon them, or, rather, till every vacant see be filled with a liberal candidate, until the episcopal bench be equally divided in opinion upon the question of emancipation, there can be no virtual neutrality in the Cabinet. It is mere mockery to talk of the hopes of emancipation from the neutral qualities of the ministry, while we see every particle of Church patronage thrown with force into the scale against us, and while bigotry is still the chief climbing ladder to preferment; for it is now self-evident that the bishops, and the bishops alone, are the bar to our success. We are confident that it will soon appear that we have the House of Commons with us; ^(s) we have

^(s) This prophecy has been happily fulfilled.

a decided majority amongst the Irish members ; we should even triumph in the Lords, if the bishops would but give us their *six-and-twenty* votes. We only ask them to repay in kind what twenty-six Catholic peers so freely gave *them*, in 1661. They have enjoyed the fruits of this liberality for upwards of 150 years, without making any acknowledgment in return ; and the repayment now, instead of costing them any thing, would be a gain to *them*, as well as to us. It would assure them a firm and lasting support, founded on the solid basis of reciprocal generosity. As it is, they provoke us to hostility, not only by a violent and ungenerous opposition as spiritual peers, but as spiritual pastors, by deserting their duty to their own people, to attend to us, who belong not to them ; — they abandon their flocks to the wolf, while they go in pursuit of an imaginary foe ; they put on the helmet instead of the mitre, — sieze the lance in lieu of the crozier, — and the pulpit, which ought to breathe peace and charity, resounds with the angry notes of war and slander.⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ The subdued tone of most of the Prelates who took part in the late debate upon the Catholic question, and the absence, as far at least as I am acquainted, of all those virulent *Charges*, which, for so many years, have been considered the necessary and appropriate fruits of a diocesan visitation, are happy omens of coming liberality ; and I sincerely trust, that a continuance of these signs will obli-

Would it not much better accord with the vocations of their ministry, to strive more earnestly against that torrent of crime and immorality which is gaining so rapidly upon the country, than to

terate the memory of the past from our recollection, or at least consign the circumstances which I have here stated to the keeping of history, to be noted only as beacons to warn us against a recurrence of that state of things which produced them. The question seems now to be narrowed to one of *securities*: but what security can be desired, where there is no danger? When the union with Scotland admitted 45 Presbyterians into the Commons, and ~~16~~¹⁶ into the Peers, the outcry was, that the Church of England would be overthrown. The anomaly of ~~63~~⁶³ Presbyterians legislating for an episcopalian Church, terrified the imaginations of the bigots of the day; but, so little were the prophecies of danger fulfilled, that these very men soon became a proverb in support of Church and State, and have so marvellously sustained this character ever since, that, to give dignity and independence to the Scottish peerage, it was thought adviseable to introduce a bill into parliament, during the last session, to render its representatives eligible for life! Where then is the justice or necessity of requiring securities from the Catholics which were not demanded of the Presbyterians? The great objection to securities of any kind is, that they serve to mark us with suspicion, and to imply a danger which does not exist. If they go so far as to curtail us of our privileges, they become anomalies in the constitution; they will keep alive the remembrance of all our former wrongs, and form an after-piece to those very grievances, from which we are seeking to be wholly and entirely relieved.

waste their energies, as they do now, in a mad crusade against Catholics? It is a notorious fact, that the hostility of that portion of the people who are opposed to us, is to be ascribed almost entirely to the influence of the clergy; the apathy of those who are indifferent, proceeds from ignorance of Irish and of Catholic affairs; while we have good reason to hope that the great body of educated men are favourably inclined to emancipation, from policy as well as principle: and it is much more to the extension of this feeling that we must ultimately look for success, than to any pretended neutrality of the cabinet.^(u)

^(u) “Unwillingly assenting to the fact, that no dissolution of this dangerous body [the armed Orangemen of Ireland] has ever been designed by his Majesty’s government, it is not easy to express our uneasiness at the avowal of a truth so ominous and unwelcome. We have long since affirmed, that in the northern yeomanry were to be found the chief incendiaries of the Orange faction; and the thing is notorious every where. It may further be taken as a well-known fact, that few, if any, of the yeomen still embodied, are other than sworn Orangemen. Is it then, let us ask, the intention of our government, to arm an equal proportion of red-hot Catholics, reeking from the association, or from the ‘simultaneous meeting’ rooms? And if such be not the ministerial purpose, where is the system of neutrality between factions?—where the even-handed justice?—where the equal favour to all the king’s servants, whether

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON THE ADVOCATE OF EMANCIPATION.

After many anxious vicissitudes of hope and fear; after passing through a trying variety of tempera-

Protestant or Catholic, for which credit has been emphatically claimed? Here are two sets of men in Ireland, one of whom confines itself, on principle, to such means of asserting and establishing its rights as are prescribed by the forms of the constitution, congenial to its spirit, and preservative of the public tranquillity. The opposite party never meets or moves without denouncing vengeance, by armed violence, against the Catholics; challenging its enemies to open combat, and exclaiming against the king's government for *persecution* of the Protestants, and treason to the State, the moment it ceases to go all lengths with these 'exclusive loyalists,' as they call themselves, in their hatred and oppression of the great majority of the people. Thus the Catholics who cry out for peace, whose necessary policy is a strict adherence to the law, and a scrupulous, though vigorous, exercise of a lawful privilege for a purpose in which the most enlightened and exalted Protestant body abet them,—the peaceful Catholics are deprived of the use of arms, while the Orangemen, who have *no game left* but that of war, are equipped with musket, bayonet, and ball-cartridge; and this is to pass upon mankind as a system of equal justice and paternal government! Verily, the Catholic is but a step-child! It is said, however, that lord Angle-

ture—the political horizon appeared to have settled in almost unclouded sunshine upon the Catholics

sea will be able to carry on the government and administer the laws in spite of any or all who may seek to disturb by arms the peace of the community. We doubt not that the noble marquis will enforce the executive authority, like a brave and upright representative of the king. But is there no wisdom in weighing well the burden of embarrassment which surrounds a kingdom, and no prudence in diminishing its pressure? If lord Anglesea be competent to keep down the armed violence of the Orange faction, would he not be still more competent to repress the same violence if *unarmed*? Would not, indeed, the spirit of outrage be apt to evaporate in mere noisy demonstrations, if the implements of a more noxious species of atrocity were once taken away? We are more decided than ever in our belief, that no means of actual warfare ought to be suffered to exist in Ireland, except in the hands and under the control of Government, and on the responsibility of those to whom the defence of the public peace is officially and by law confided. It is not,—need we say so?—for the detached welfare of the Catholic body, that these observations are offered to the people of Great Britain. The line of demarcation deepens every day between the two classes of the king's subjects in the sister island. The quarrel assumes every hour a character more complex, inveterate, and appalling. It is not merely religion by itself, or civil liberty, that is at stake; but the contest is one for Catholicism, embittered by Hibernicism, and fermented by the growing leaven of democracy, against Protestant pride—Protestant power—Protestant avarice—Protestant insult—Protestant menace: at last, rendered

of the empire ; when, to our dismay and horror, it is now again suddenly darkening around us.^(x) We cannot but fear that the appointment of the Duke of Wellington as premier, is a fatal omen to our cause: for hitherto he has but too often ranked amongst the most signal of our opposers. If the Duke of Wellington be the bigot which many imagine, our fate is sealed as long as his counsels prevail. But we are willing to hope against hope ; to anticipate the strength of argument, and the influence of wisdom and expediency ; and to expect that the new circumstances in which the destinies of the empire are again placed in his hands, will elevate his mind to the level of those beneficent and liberal ideas, by which the affairs of a great nation ought alone to be guided.

When the Duke of Wellington looks back to the brilliant scenes of his eventful life, he will see that the time was, when he thought it no dishonour

desperate, it is aimed against Protestant heresy ; — all painted more hideous to the Hiberno-Catholic eye, because they wear the colours of England, the traditional and irreclaimable oppressor. To this complexion things move onward rapidly. The 40s. freehold — that God-send of 1793 — has left one chance of saving the empire, by shewing the Catholics that they hold in their grasp a weapon which cuts mortally, but sheds no blood.—*Times*, Aug. 1828.

^(x) Jan. 1828.

to hold command under Catholic sovereigns,—to receive the reward of his services from *them*, and even to place himself, on very many occasions, under singular obligations to those whom he has since declared to be unworthy of their hire. Were it not for his Catholic troops, the Duke of Wellington had never gathered one solitary laurel—for all the laurels which he wears have sprung from their valour, and have been watered by their blood;—but for the confidence reposed in him by Catholic governments, he had never been carried forward in his career;—but for the honours heaped upon him by Catholic monarchs, his breast had never blazed with half that brilliancy which beams upon it now; and many of those high-sounding titles, which so loudly proclaim his glory to the world, would have been mute.

If justice, gratitude, and wisdom still dwell upon the earth, we trust that the day will soon arrive when the Duke of Wellington, from the elevated station which he now holds, a station far more enviable than that of the commander of the proudest army in Europe, will stand forth to remove that blemish from his political life, of having hitherto left unrequited the services which his Catholic fellow-countrymen have so eminently rendered him. And I think we are justified in this expectation, by the noble sentiments which his Grace, not many months ago, expressed in par-

liament upon the subject. The Duke of Wellington still holds the situation under the crown^(y) which he is reported to have said to be “so consonant to his feelings, liking it, as he did, from the opportunities which it gave him to improve the condition of his old comrades in arms which enabled him to recommend to the notice of his Majesty *all* his former friends and companions, and to reward them, according to their merits, for the exertions which they had formerly made, under his command, in the field.”^(z) Now,

^(y) This was written when the Duke of Wellington was both commander-in-chief and first lord of the treasury.

^(z) The following public testimony which history has transmitted to us, of the Duke of Wellington’s opinions on the propriety and justice of “cementing a general union of sentiment among all classes and descriptions of his Majesty’s subjects, in support of the established constitution,” ought certainly to inspire us with the confident expectation, that the same *wisdom and liberality*, which distinguished his views of Irish politics, thirty-five years ago, will likewise constitute the characteristics of his grace’s administration of similar affairs *now*.

On the 16th of January, 1793, the House of Commons being met, a message was brought from his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, which contains the following passage:—“I have it in particular command from his Majesty, to recommend it to you to apply yourselves to the consideration of such measures as may be most likely to strengthen and cement a general union of sentiment among all classes and descriptions of his Majesty’s sub-

all that we ask is, that the Duke, as a just, a grateful, and an honourable man, will redeem this pledge,—How would it not brighten all his fame, and crown all his honours, thus to address the House, (upon the first occasion of a debate on the question of Catholic emancipation,) as the champion of that ill-fated land, for whose welfare, equally with that of every other portion of the empire, his sovereign has now placed the reins of state in

jects, in support of the established constitution ; with this view, his Majesty trusts, that the situation of his Majesty's Catholic subjects will engage your serious attention, and in the consideration of this subject, he relies on the wisdom and liberality of his parliament." After this message had been read, an address, which was an echo of the sentiments contained in the recommendation from the throne, was agreed to. The speech of the Hon. Gentleman [now Duke of Wellington,] who seconded the address, is in page five of the 13th volume of the Irish Parliamentary Debates, and is thus reported:—" In regard to what has been recommended in the speech from the throne, respecting our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, he could not repress his approbation on that head : he had no doubt of the loyalty of the Catholics of this country, and he trusted that when the question should be brought forward respecting that description of men, that they would lay aside all animosities, and act with moderation and dignity, and not with the fury and violence of partisans." (*See Mr. Shiel's speech at the late aggregate meeting of the Catholics of Ireland.*)

his hands ; a land which, while it gave *him* birth, has also the merit of having been the fostering parent of those companions in arms of whose services he speaks so feelingly, and for whose reward he is so impatient.

“ My Lords ; in presenting myself to your lordships as the advocate of the measure now proposed to your consideration, I am only indulging in the pleasing task of discharging a debt of gratitude, which has long weighed heavy upon me ; for, independently of the indisputable policy of uniting all classes of his Majesty’s subjects, in a common participation of the blessings of the constitution,—and for other reasons, which I leave to be argued by other noble lords,—I owe too much, as an individual, to the Catholics of this empire, and to those of several foreign states, not to avail myself with eagerness of every opportunity of advocating these claims, as a measure of justice to the one, and as a grateful return of enlightened liberality towards the other. It is already well known to your lordships, that of the troops which our Gracious Sovereign did me the honour to entrust to my command at various periods during the war ; a war undertaken expressly for the purpose of securing the happy institutions and independance of the country ; that at least one half were Roman Catholics. My lords, when I call your recollection to this fact, I am sure all

further eulogy is unnecessary. Your lordships are well aware for what length of period, and under what difficult circumstances, they maintained the empire buoyant upon the flood which overwhelmed the thrones, and wrecked the institutions of every other people; how they kept alive the only spark of freedom which was left unextinguished in Europe; and how, by unprecedented efforts, they at length placed us, not only far above danger, but at an elevation of prosperity for which we had hardly dared to hope. These, my lords, are sacred and imperative titles to a nation's gratitude. My lords, it is become quite needless for me to assure you, that I have invariably found my Roman Catholic soldiers as patient under privations, as eager for the combat, and as brave and determined in the field, as any other portion of his majesty's troops; and in point of loyalty and devotion to their king and country, I am quite certain they have never been surpassed. I claim no merit in admitting that others might have guided the storm of battle as skilfully as myself: we have only to recur to the annals of our military achievements to be convinced, that few indeed of our commanders have not known how to direct the unconquerable spirit of their troops, and to shed fresh glories round the British name. But, my lords, while we are free to acknowledge this, we must also confess, that without Catholic blood and Catholic valour,

no victory could ever have been obtained; and the first military talents in Europe might have been exerted in vain, at the head of half an army. My lords, if on the eve of any of those hard-fought days on which I have had the honour to command them, I had thus addressed my Roman Catholic troops: "You well know that your country either so suspects your loyalty, or so dislikes your religion, that she has not yet thought proper to admit you amongst the ranks of her free citizens; if, on that account, you deem it an act of injustice on her part to require you to shed your blood in her defence, you are at liberty to withdraw:" I am quite sure, my lords, that, however bitter the recollections which it awakened, they would have spurned the alternative with indignation; for the hour of danger and of glory, is the hour in which the gallant, the generous-hearted Irishman, best knows his duty, and is most determined to perform it. But if, my lords, it had been otherwise: if they had chosen to desert the cause in which they were embarked; though the remainder of the troops would undoubtedly have maintained the honour of the British arms; yet, as I have just said, no efforts of theirs could ever have crowned us with victory. Yes, my lords, it is mainly to the Irish Catholic that we all owe our proud pre-eminence in our military career; and that I, personally, am indebted for the laurels with which you have been pleased

to decorate my brow,—for the honours which you have so bountifully lavished on me,—and for the fair fame (I prize it above all other rewards) which my country, in its generous kindness, has bestowed upon me. I cannot but feel, my lords, that you yourselves have been chiefly instrumental in placing this heavy debt of gratitude upon me, greater, perhaps, than has ever fallen to the lot of any individual; and however flattering the circumstance, it often places me in a very painful situation. Whenever I meet (and it is almost an every-day occurrence,) with any of those brave men who, in common with others, are the object of this Bill, and who have so often borne me on the tide of victory; when I see them still branded with the imputation of a divided allegiance, still degraded beneath the lowest menial, and still proclaimed unfit to enter within the pale of the constitution, I feel almost ashamed of the honours which have been lavished upon *me*: I feel that though the merit was theirs, what was so freely given to *me*, was unjustly denied to them; that *I* had reaped, though they had sown; that they had borne the heat and burden of the day, but that the wages and repose were *mine* alone. My lords, it is indeed to me a subject of deep regret, that of the many brave officers of the Roman Catholic persuasion, some of whom I have had occasion to bring to the notice of the country, in relating the honourable

services they have performed, not one has risen to any eminence in his profession. It is not to be supposed, that either talent or merit is the exclusive privilege of Protestantism : attached as I am to the Reformed Church, I cannot give her that monopoly. No man, my lords, has had more experience to the contrary than myself. Entrusted with the command of two Catholic armies, I soon found that, with similar advantages, they were quite equal to our own. The same hatred of tyranny, the same love of liberty, the same unconquerable spirit, pervaded both the soldier and the peasant of those two Catholic states. I even found amongst them Irishmen, whom the intolerance of our laws had driven to shed the lustre of their talents over a foreign clime.

“ It now becomes me, my lords, to speak of the liberality which I experienced from their hands. Notwithstanding that I dissented from the religion of the state, it was never made a preliminary that I should abjure my own creed, and conform to another ; (and why should I demand this sacrifice from those who are now only petitioning your lordships for similar opportunities of serving their country?)—neither my known denial of the doctrines of Transubstantiation, and of the supremacy of the Pope, presented the smallest obstacle to my advancement ;—neither my merit nor my capacity were weighed in the scale of speculative belief in

religious tenets : it was my country, and not my faith, that was my title to approval :—I was an accredited delegate from the British empire, and *that* was sufficient. I was entrusted with the supreme command of all their forces ; I was admitted to their councils ; I was called upon for my opinion in the senate ; and for the services which I was fortunately enabled to render them, nothing could exceed the prodigality of the reward. The highest honours, the most munificent donations, and perhaps the most splendid presents that ever were bestowed upon a subject, were all showered down upon me, with the most generous profusion. Every succeeding service was met with a fresh eagerness of reward ; and, in countries super-eminently Catholic, I was loaded with benefits only equalled by those bestowed upon me by our own Protestant legislature. Indeed, there was not a Catholic state in Europe, which was not emulous to overpower me with honourable distinctions, and to place me under an imperative obligation to it. I feel it, therefore, my lords, to be an act of the purest justice on the one side, and of only reciprocal liberality on the other, to lend my most fervent and cordial support to the measure now before you—to open to my Catholic fellow-countrymen the same road to preferment along which *I* have been so generously borne ;—and to display to continental Europe our determination to follow the example she has set

us, by putting an end to the reign of bigotry and exclusion for ever. My lords, it is a great additional gratification to me, to advocate these principles, in conjunction with a distinguished member of my family, so lately at the head of the government of his native country; a country ever dear to me from the recollections of my infancy, the memory of her wrongs, and the bravery of her people. I glory, my lords, in the name of Ireland, and it is the highest pleasure I can ambition, to be thus united with the rest of my kindred, in the grateful task of closing the wounds which seven centuries of misgovernment have inflicted upon that unfortunate land."

September, 1828.

The brilliant opportunity has occurred, but has been suffered to pass, without placing the civic crown upon the laurelled temples of the premier. He has invited us, however, to sport in a gleam of hope, and to direct our views to brighter prospects. "Cease to agitate, and perhaps something may be done," certainly indicates the possibility of an adjustment. It proclaims to us that the war is no longer one of extermination; the flag of truce is sent forth into our camp, and we are summoned to consider upon the preliminaries of peace. If the offer be not made in a spirit of munificent liberality, the invitation to a parley shows at least

a willingness to withdraw, with what advantages they may, from a position which they begin to find incapable of defence.

There is a degree of chivalrous generosity in yielding to the prayer of a people in the attitude of supplication: justice receives additional lustre when she moves without the impulse of necessity; wisdom is adorned, and prudence is exalted in value, when, at the first appearance of danger, the remedy is applied without waiting for the hazards of accumulated evil. But the period when such deeds as these might have been achieved, is gone, never to return. The prayer of supplication so long preferred, but so long slighted and rejected, is converted into a stern demand: where justice should have stepped in unbidden, she is now dragged in by force: where danger was only discernible in the distance by the keen and watchful eye of prophetic wisdom, she now stalks forth in giant form, rending the air with her forebodings, and filling the whole soul with apprehension. Oh! that we may heed the warning which she proclaims so loudly and so distinctly.

The hand of the Orangeman is on his sword, threatening to uphold by force what he does not even pretend to defend by argument. Should he have the temerity to draw it, not a drop of Orange blood will be left in Ireland. Its stain alone will remain to cry vengeance upon the heads of those

of our rulers who have urged on the catastrophe, and especially upon that of the Duke of Wellington, who will have been principally instrumental in leading this contest to such an issue. Neither is it surprising that, in their expiring efforts, these men should have betrayed to us the inmost recesses of their hearts: *Quem perdere vult Deus, prius dementat*. They have told us that they would prefer the arrogance of dominion over the remnant of a nation,—over a few surviving slaves after a scene of carnage and devastation,—to the tranquil and extended happiness of millions, when that happiness is to be won by an equality of rights, and by the extinction of an odious monopoly. They have told us that the light of justice shall never pierce their hearts; that they will never listen to the voice of peace; that they will never conquer their ruling passion, but will satiate it to the full. They tell us, in fine, that the people are to be slaves, and they are to be tyrants; that the people are to pay, and they are to receive; that the people are to sow, and they are to reap,—as long as there are slaves to labour, and tyrants to be task-masters. It is in their true character that they have now appealed to the people of England, who have only needed this uplifting of the curtain, to behold them in their real forms; and in their folly and presumption, they court the gaze of the whole world, while they fill up the measure of their

iniquity, and consign themselves to the execration of mankind. But the people of England will have no part with them,—they will never consent that the blood of the brave should flow in such an unhallowed cause,—they will never believe it to be their interest to devastate one-third of the empire with sword and famine, to annihilate their resources, to waste their strength in internal dissensions, to expose themselves defenceless to the contempt and hostility of their neighbours. No; they will sooner decree the extinction of Orangeism; they will rather aid the gigantic efforts of a whole people, grown too big for their chains, and too strong for their bondage, to overturn that proud, selfish, obstinate, vindictive, and tyrannical ascendancy, which has so long been the bane of England and the curse of Ireland. The conquest will be easy: let us not calculate the strength of the ascendancy faction by its apparent tenacity of life. The dying struggles of a reptile are more convulsive than the expiring agonies of a lion. That a handful of miserable bigots, besotted with indulgence and blinded by self-love, should strut, and fret, and vapour in the impotence of their rage, is only consistent with the folly by which they have so long been guided. Whether this innate folly is to accomplish their ruin by an act of *felo de se*, or whether the Duke of Wellington is to have the honour of adding one more to his

triumphs, by annihilating this pigmy race at the sound of his voice, a few coming months will determine. But the merit of destroying *them*, happy as the achievement would be, would fall infinitely short of the glory of restoring a whole nation, sick with the fatal malady of tyrannic misrule, to liberty and life. This splendid triumph is still within the grasp of the gallant duke : if he desire immortality, he may now insure it. In the joy of her liberation, Ireland will forget that she was ever straitened;—in her new-born happiness she will cease to remember that she was ever miserable;—the reign of love will obliterate the dominion of terror;—an exuberance of generous feeling will absorb all the bitter recollections of her former wrongs; and the rising generation will hail him as their deliverer and regenerator, and hand him down to posterity, not only as the first captain of the age, but as the SAVIOUR OF HIS COUNTRY.

REASONS,

&c. &c.

REASONS,

&c. &c.

As those parts of the Oaths and Declarations required of members of Parliament, which touch upon controverted points of Religion, form the basis of this discussion, I will begin with the tenets recited therein, taking them in the order in which they are there introduced.

The Oaths and Declarations to which we object, are as follows :—

“And I do declare, That no Foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath, or ought to have, any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Pre-eminence, or Authority, Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, within this Realm.”

THE TEST DECLARATION.

“I, *A. B.* do solemnly and sincerely, in the Presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, That I do believe, that in the Sacrament of the Lord’s

Supper, there is not any Transubstantiation of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at or after the Consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever; and that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin *Mary*, or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of *Rome*, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, That I do make this Declaration, and every Part thereof, in the plain and ordinary Sense of the Words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by *English* Protestants."

I will observe, in passing, that we are hereby called upon not only to renounce Catholicity, but to swear to a belief in doctrines, *in the sense in which they are commonly understood by English Protestants*; hence the necessity of not only shewing—Why we cannot renounce our own Faith, but also—Why we cannot renounce it in favour of other tenets, which we are called upon to embrace in its stead.

I. In the first place, therefore, I cannot either conform to Protestantism, or take the Oaths in question, inasmuch as both call upon me to declare, that *no Foreign Prelate hath, or ought to have, any Spiritual Jurisdiction or Pre-eminence, within this Realm*: Whereas, I do solemnly and sincerely profess, and am ready to attest it with an

oath, that I firmly and truly believe in the Primacy of the successor of St. Peter, as regulated by the usages and Canons of the Catholic Church.

The spiritual supremacy over the Christian world was conferred upon St. Peter, by these words of our Saviour:—*Thou art Peter [a rock], 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.*^(a) and again: *Feed my lambs, feed my sheep.*^(b) There is scarcely any instance in which St. Peter is mentioned in the sacred writings without a marked pre-eminence being shown to him over the other apostles; and consequently over the church of Christ, which they then constituted, or at least represented. He is the only one to whom the keys, the emblems of authority and jurisdiction, were given,—the only one for whom Christ prayed *singly*, that being stedfast in his faith, he might confirm his brethren, as if upon him the whole fabric of Christianity reposed;—he alone is designated a Rock, the foundation, as it were, of a great edifice;—he alone, by special and divine appointment, is entrusted with the duties

^(a) *St. Matt.* xvi. 18, 19.—N. B. The texts and references from Scripture will be found to correspond with the Douay version of the Bible.

^(b) *St. John,* xxi. 16, 17.

of a shepherd, commanded to feed the lambs and the sheep of Christ, and to guide both the priesthood and the people. This supreme dominion, this spiritual superiority (and I beg the reader to bear in mind that it is only *spiritual*, since *the kingdom of God is not of this world*,)^(c) to which St. Peter and his successors were regularly inducted by so many titles, consists in a right of general superintendence over all orders of the hierarchy; it is an authority to see that the faith which is preached, is that which was revealed by the Almighty and delivered to us by his Church: it is a commission to guard the purity of religion, the morality of its pastors, and the integrity of its discipline. "The visible head is for the preservation of a visible unity,"—to continue and connect the chain of faith, for the discovery and condemnation of heresy, and for the due observance of canonical discipline. This, and this alone, is the spiritual supremacy by divine institution, and that only to be exercised in the manner prescribed by the acts of general councils and the canons and usages of the church.^(d) To the bishop of Rome we owe a spiritual obedience as to the successor

^(c) *St. John*, xviii. 36.

^(d) On this head of the *primacy* of the Roman bishop, the Council of Trent issued no ordinance; but because in the general Council of Florence, convened in 1439, in order

of St. Peter, not an allegiance as to a temporal sovereign ; and that spiritual obedience is limited to the points just mentioned. Our temporal obedience to magistrates and rulers is commanded and regulated by the same authority^(e) which imposes

to unite the Greek and Latin churches, the point was fully decided, I shall here insert the decree of that council.

“ Moreover we define, that the holy apostolic see, and the Roman bishop, has the primacy over all the earth ; and that he is the successor of the blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole church, and the father and teacher of all Christians ; and that to him, in the person of the blessed Peter, was committed by our Lord Jesus Christ, the full power of feeding, directing, and governing the universal church in such manner as it is contained in the Acts of general councils, and in the holy canons.”* *Definitio S. Œcumen. Synod. Florent. Conc. Gen. T. xiii. p. 515.*

^(e) “ Let every soul be subject to higher powers ; for there is no power but from God :.... And they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation.” *Rom. xiii. 1, 2.* “ Be ye subject to every human creature for God’s sake ; whether it be to the king as excelling, or to governors as sent by him.” *1 Peter, ii. 13, 14.* “ Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.” *St. Matt. xxii. 21.*

So strongly is the duty of civil obedience enjoined by the law of God, and by the same law which commands

* Καθ’ ὃν τροπον και ἐν τοις πρακτικοις των οἰκουμενικων συνοδων, και ἐν τοις ἱεροις κανοσι διαλαμβανεται.

a spiritual obedience to spiritual superiors; to both we owe a like submission, but both are separate and independent of each other.^(f) As the church was built to endure for ever, *even to the consummation of the world,*^(g) so, unquestionably, the government which Christ appointed for it, was to be co-existent with it. A supreme head, a centre of unity, is indeed much more necessary now to preserve *one faith and one baptism,*^(h) in the midst of heresy and schism, than when the world was filled with inspired teachers in the persons of the apostles. It is the exercise of this supreme spiritual authority, which has handed down to us both the faith and morality of these disciples of our Saviour, pure and untainted through a course of more than 1800 years; and it is the want of this power, lawfully obtained and authoritatively administered, that has produced all those mad and foolish heresies, the prolific growth of protestantism, which, like so many poisonous plants, have banished almost every wholesome fruit from those portions of the garden of Christianity in which they have taken root. There is no blasphemy however

our spiritual obedience to the church: "*He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican.*" *St. Matt.* xviii. 17.

^(f) See APPENDIX, No. IX. for some excellent observations on the Spiritual Supremacy.

^(g) *St. Matt.* xxviii. 20.

^(h) *Ephes.* iv. 5.

wicked, no immorality, however monstrous, but, at some period or in some country, it has formed part of the faith and practice of sectarianism. Into such absurd impieties has the *reasoning pride of man* beguiled him, and into such excesses has he been hurried by his disobedience to legitimate authority!

But to confine our remarks to the Church of England.—So necessary did her founders and her patrons consider a spiritual supremacy in their church “to support the unity of faith and the integrity of Christian discipline,”⁽ⁱ⁾ that they established it in the person of the sovereign. But so strange an anomaly as spiritual jurisdiction in a layman, a child, or a woman, and that too usurped from those to whom it had been formally entrusted by the divine authority, could never answer the purpose of repressing error and reforming abuses. Unlawful authority seldom enforces submission. From the moment that the monarch forcibly wrested this power from the successor of St. Peter, and placed it in his own rapacious hands; from that moment all unity disappeared. The chiefs of the state, entangled as they generally are, *with the cares, the riches, and the pleasures of this life,*^(k)

⁽ⁱ⁾ *Preamble of several Acts of Parliament. See Sermons after Pentecost, with illustrations, &c. Vol. i. pp. 140. &c.*

^(k) *St. Luke viii. 14.*

had the weakness to acquiesce in so glaring and monstrous an usurpation, and the whole nation became, like the great multitude mentioned in the Scriptures, *as sheep not having a shepherd*. (*St. Mark* vi. 34.) Each individual ranged at large in the fields of speculative belief—he spurned at the ridiculous assumption of spiritual pre-eminence by a civil magistrate, and instead of obeying his mandates, each one, in imitation of the monarch, took the same authority upon himself, and thereafter placed the foundations of his faith upon the tottering basis of private interpretation. The evils which followed have been thus forcibly described by a learned and eloquent pastor of the Catholic Church:—

“ Spite of royal mandates, of royal canons, and royal censures, error in every varied, versatile, and frightful form, continued to erect new temples ; and the nation presented to the astonished world a scene of folly, bigotry, and superstition, striking and preposterous, as any that curiosity can trace in the lengthened annals of fanaticism. Such were the consequences of pretending to enforce unity of belief by means which Revelation has not sanctioned.” (*Sermons after Pentecost*, p. 142.)

Such were the miserable effects of the usurpation of unlawful power, and of rebellion to just authority. The almost universal conflict of religious opinions, and the swarm of meeting-houses of every description which still continue to spring

up around us, will enable us to judge whether time has diminished the fruits of such a system.

But, fully satisfied of my utter inability to offer any thing in illustration of this doctrine of the spiritual supremacy,—a doctrine so important in itself, and against which the Test is so pointedly directed,—at all equal to the following eloquent and spirited argument of the titular Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin: I will insert the observations of that talented and learned Prelate, without further comment.⁽¹⁾

“ But where,” says he, “ there is question of the promise of the keys to Peter, and of the command given to him to feed the lambs, the sheep, the whole flock of God, then antiquity, like a torrent, sweeps away all opposition, every obstacle which a perverse sophistry would, at any period, oppose to the supremacy of this Apostle. All the Fathers, for I know of no exception, consider him as representing the whole Church, and receiving from Christ, in his own single person, the keys or power of its government, to be exercised by himself and by his brethren, with due subordination to him as chief or head.”

Here the writer introduces his authorities; for

⁽¹⁾ See also an admirable and elaborate disquisition on the supremacy of St. Peter, and on the temporal and spiritual authority of the Popes, in the 2nd Vol. of *Evidences of the Catholic Church*, by the Right Rev. Dr. Machale, another highly talented prelate of the Irish Church.

which I must refer the reader to the work itself, as they are too numerous for insertion here. He then proceeds :

“ But why is this venerable host of primitive pastors and doctors drawn forth in order to prove the primacy or supremacy of Peter? Why, because for my purpose, it is necessary to bring back the minds of readers to the primitive form of the Church, and to the ground-work of Christianity, which in these times of religious intemperance and fanaticism, seem to be entirely overlooked. Political economy, or the art of founding joint-stock companies, are scarcely the subjects at present of less rational speculation than the Testament or religion of Jesus Christ...One creates a company for the conversion of the Jews, another for enlightening the Hindoos, a third undertakes to instruct the Blacks who border on the Cape, a fourth will emancipate from spiritual despotism the slaves in Barbadoes, or the more miserable Irish ; one proclaims the necessity of Prelates, and boasts of the beauty of his liturgy ; a second says, liturgies embarrass the spirit in its flight, and why should those made free by Christ be subjected to the rule of Bishops? One system of religion is suited to the wealthy and the proud, having order, pomp, and ceremony ; the other, coarse, irregular, and loud, fitted to the peasant or mechanic. The word of God, the Bible, is on the lips of all ; the right and power of private judgment are

unreasonably extolled—the sacraments are neglected—the ministry superseded—and whilst fanaticism thus burns on the surface, immorality weighs upon the heart, whilst infidelity, secretly and silently advancing, prepares to erect its standard on the ruins which this fanaticism will have made. If men do not return to first principles, and arrest their minds in their present course; if they do not review the Christian religion, not as presented in the passing declamations of the day, but as it was originally established by the Spirit of God, no gift of prophecy is required to foresee how lamentable are the results which press upon us. To bring back the public attention, then, to the consideration of the leading maxims of the primitive Church, is deserving at least of an effort, but besides this motive, it was necessary for my special purpose to show how unity (so essential to the kingdom of Christ,) was preserved in the immense society of true believers.

“ It was with this view principally that I endeavoured to demonstrate that a primacy was given to St. Peter—a prerogative which vested him with power as extensive as the Church, and which might, and ought when necessary, be exercised over every sheep within the fold of Christ, of whatever rank or order.

“ The language of the Redeemer, as quoted by

me, from the 16th chapter of his gospel according to St. Matthew, shews of itself that the authority given to Peter was to last as long as the Church, for if he were made the foundation of it after Christ, the rock on which it was built, it is perfectly obvious, that as long as the superstructure lasted, the foundation could not be removed; in other words, that as long as a Church was to remain on earth, the authority given to Peter should continue to it,—that so long as the kingdom of heaven or city of God, continued in this world, so long should some person be vested with the keys of government,—that as long as there would be a fold of sheep and lambs, so long there should be a pastor to feed them in the place of Peter;—in fine, that as long as the faithful were to be one body, saying the same thing, and not having divisions among them, so long there should be some person vested with power to enforce obedience—to collect the sentiments of the body—to publish its acts—to institute or sanction its officers—to preach and cause to be preached the doctrines of Christ—to dispense and cause to be dispensed the mysteries of God, that so the people might obey their prelates and be subject to them, that the prelates might not lord it over the people, but be made patterns to them from the heart; in fine, that all might have one faith, and not be tossed

about by every wind of doctrine, but be kept united in that common charity, which is the great source, as it is the bond, of perfection.

“ But this consequence, however plain and necessary—however spontaneously flowing from the very source of Christianity, yet it has been contradicted, and seldom more violently, or at least less temperately, than at the present day. The furious men who now agitate this country, seem to know that the sword and the law could not have been drawn, or, if drawn, could not have been wielded with such deadly effect against the holy and ancient religion of these islands, if that religion had not first been decried, abused, and malignèd, until it appeared to the multitude a very moral monster. ‘ From the sole of its foot,’ like its founder, ‘ to the top of its head, there was no soundness in it;’ it was buffeted, abused, spit upon; it was covered with a mantle of derision; it was scourged, and drenched with vinegar and gall; the waters of affliction entered into its very soul: and it was, when thus disfigured by a clamorous rabble, and seemingly abandoned by God, that the bigots and the fanatic cried out to the agents of the law and the sword,—‘ away with it, away with it.’

“ But as there was no tenet of this religion more opposed to the machinations of those furious and designing men, nor again, no tenet more strongly

supported by argument, by the practice of the Church, and an undisputed possession of fifteen hundred years, than that of the supremacy of the successor of St. Peter, so there was no tenet against which their sophistry, their misrepresentations, their violence, their rancour and persecution were so unceasingly directed. To such extremities did these men proceed, as not only to confound the power claimed by some few Popes of Rome over the temporal interests or rights of kings and kingdoms, with the spiritual jurisdiction of St. Peter's successor, but, in addition to this misrepresentation, they actually designated not one or other, but a whole series of those successors, as Antichrists, and excited the deluded multitude to hate them and curse them as the capital enemies of our Lord and Saviour. Yes, the very men who maintained from the beginning, and still maintain, against an infidel or Arian world, the divinity of the Son of God; the very men who designate themselves as the last of his servants, and who, without any doubt, have caused his name to be published and adored throughout nearly the whole Christian world, these men, who never ask any thing of the Father except through the Son, and identify him in their daily prayer with the King of Ages, the immortal and invisible God, to whom alone are due and given all honour and glory, these very men have been called, by the ferocious leaders of the revolt, 'An-

tichrists'!! and the Church in which they have always presided, and whose faith was from the beginning, and still is spoken of throughout the entire world,—this Church they called ‘ Babylon,’ and the ‘ great apostacy,’ with all manner of opprobrious and insulting names.

“ To the present day, this warfare of calumny is continued for the same purposes, and by the genuine successors of the wicked men who first commenced it; hence it necessarily enters into the design of these observations, that I endeavour, not to dissipate the cloud of calumny which still prevails, (a task to which I confess my incompetency), but to prove, in addition to the argument adduced by me, that the supremacy given to Peter has passed to his successors, the bishop, for the time being, of the See of Rome.

“ This is a truth, like many others, connected with a matter of fact, and a fact which, as it commenced with the demise of Peter, cannot be found recorded in the Holy Scriptures; but it is, at the same time, as we have seen above, a truth flowing necessarily from the institution by Christ, of the primacy in the person of that apostle; and all antiquity, as it attests the existence of that primacy in Peter, so it attests the transmission of it to his successors in the See of Rome.

“ The law of nature sanctions a presumption in favour of him who has the peaceable possession of

any thing, and he is supposed to have acquired it justly, until his title to it is disproved. The burden of proof lies on him who questions the right of possession, and not upon him who holds it; but when we Catholics call for this proof against the title of Peter's successor to the spiritual supremacy which he enjoys, we are replied to by loud declamation, by angry invective, or by visionary speculations on the Apocalypse. If we refer to historical records to show not only the possession, but also the exercise of this supremacy in every age from the apostolic times, we are told that Mosheim (the faithless Hume of the Protestant Churches,) says, that the early Churches, like the Greek republics, were all independent one of the other, and their councils like the amphycyonic assemblies. To refute this folly we refer to Eusebius, to Fleury, to Natalis Alexander; we present the long and accurate catalogue of cases compiled by Cardinal Perron for the information of King James the First, to shew that no Church was ever independent of the head of the episcopacy,—that he exercised in every quarter of the known world a jurisdiction commensurate with the exigency of the case which required it. We exhibit the appeals made to him from each of the three great patriarchates, as well as from all parts of his own in the West, and refer to the decisions pronounced by him—we mention the names and the sees of the

bishops whom he acquitted or deposed—the nature of the discipline which he sanctioned or reprovèd—the errors and heresies which he condemned. We refer to the councils in which he presided, either in person or by his delegates, from the time when councils were first held ; we produce copies of his instructions to his legates, whether proceeding to the East or to the West ; his confirmation or rejection of the whole or of a part of their proceedings ; his spiritual pre-eminence asserted by him, and for him, and admitted with acclamation by all the orthodox, whether in council or dispersed, and never disputed except by the wicked, the refractory, and the rebellious—the successors of Core, of Dathan, of Jannes and Mambre. We appeal to argument and common sense ;—but the spirit of the *great revolt* from the just authority established by Christ in his Church, answers to us, saying ; “ Obedience, that great virtue by which all were justified by one, is no more to be practised ; there are no longer judges in the Church, every believer is to judge for himself ; he who separates himself no longer sins by so doing ; the man who chooses for himself, setting at nought the judgment of those appointed to teach all nations and rule the Church, is no longer condemned by his own judgment ; no man is obliged to hear the Church as if Christ spoke through her ; every old man and silly woman is now competent to de-

cide on all controversies; a man may think on religion as he pleases, and speak as he thinks; nor is there any one entitled to reprove him and cast him out among the heathens. The day of gospel liberty is at length arrived; we have been freed, not from the yoke of Jewish observances, which neither we nor our fathers could bear, and made the children of God, under the dominion of Christ and of his heavenly grace, but we have been freed from all restraint upon our will or passions, upon our reason or fancy, and totally exempted from all obedience to those pastors who were formerly appointed to watch, so as if to give to God an account of our souls. We want no teacher, for the unction of God teaches us all things, even the most contradictory, illusive, and impious; we may now without danger be tossed about by every wind of doctrine; no unity of belief is required of us; we need not worship at the same altar, nor partake of the same sacraments, nor hear the voice of the same pastor; the body of Christ has undergone a thorough reformation; it is now a mass of heterogeneous, discordant, and conflicting members, the head and the foot and the hand each goes its own way, and performs its own function independent of the other; in a word, there has been *a great and entire revolt* from the mutual dependence, the well regulated obedience, the singleness of faith, the uniformity of discipline, the brother-

hood of charity which was originally established, and prevailed. Formerly, the believers had but one heart and one mind, now no two of them are of the same mind; formerly all said the same thing, nor were there any schisms among them, now no two persons say the same thing, and schisms are multiplied without end or number; formerly there was but one Church, one font of baptism, one altar in the town or village, now there are as many Churches or conventicles as streets, some with, and some without an altar, some having a font for baptism, others having no such means of regeneration; in this only are we all agreed—to condemn the faith of our fathers, and to dissent from each other in all things else.

“ We speak sometimes about essentials and non-essentials, but incapable of ascertaining what should be designated by those terms, we say the Bible, and the Bible alone is our religion (a tolerably sized one, it must be confessed), and in its interpretation we seek only a justification of discord and the condemnation of unity.

“ But leaving this view of the subject, painful, and at the same time ludicrous, if the follies of Christian men could be a just subject of ridicule, let us proceed with a sketch of the doctrine of antiquity, relative to the supremacy of the See of Rome.”

Here again follow the citations, and for which,

as they are copious, I must again refer the reader to the work.—He then continues :

“ I have selected these few passages from the acts of councils holden in the Eastern or Greek Church, composed almost exclusively of Bishops residing outside the western Patriarchate, which was still more closely connected with the Pope, and more faithful at all times in adhering to the apostolic doctrine, and to that centre of union by which it is preserved. I have referred to those councils, because they are admitted as general and orthodox by all ; because matters of the greatest moment were discussed and decided in them, such as dogmas of faith, and the guilt or innocence, not of ordinary individuals, or Bishops, but of two great patriarchs, the one of Constantinople, the other of Alexandria ; I have referred to them as to large mirrors, in which may be clearly seen the faith and discipline of that pure and primitive Church, which sectaries pretend to revere ; and introduced them as the depositaries of the doctrine which prevailed throughout all the orthodox churches of the then Christian world ;—as bodies of Pastors and Doctors, declaring, not by their language alone, but by their conduct, on the most important occasions which could occur, that the Pope of Rome was the successor of Peter, and, as such, the head of the whole Church, possessing the right to preside in synods wheresoever held, to

give judgment in matters of faith, whether provisionally or finally, and to try, punish or acquit the most exalted of his colleagues.

“ I was about to cite, as in the case of Peter’s supremacy, the testimony of the ancient Fathers, Greek and Latin, in support of the doctrine maintained at Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, but I find those preliminary observations have already extended to a greater length than I anticipated. The opinions on this subject of SS. Irenæus, Dennis of Alexandria, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and of Theodoret, all Greeks :—and of the Latins, Tertullian, SS. Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Optatus, Augustin, Fulgentius ; of Vincent of Lerins, and the others up to St. Bernard inclusive, may be read, in any of our books of theology ; so that, as far as human testimony can add security and stability to a right evidently founded on the power, and wisdom, and will of Christ—a right essential to the preservation of unity in the faith and integrity in the Church—a right confirmed by an undisturbed, how-often-soever-assailed possession of eighteen centuries, so far is the spiritual supremacy, and no other, of the Pope, eminently supported and secured ; so far is the Church of Rome the head and mistress of all other Churches, the depositary of christian truth, the guardian of discipline, and the centre of unity, to which, in the language of Ire-

næus, 'all the faithful, wheresoever dispersed, should come in Christian harmony and with one accord.' Nor can we more appropriately conclude these few general observations on the nature and doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church, whose authority is so reviled by furious men, than with the following striking passage, extracted from the Pastoral Instructions, addressed, in 1824, by all the Irish Catholic Bishops to their flocks. These prelates, instructing the Catholics of Ireland, observe: 'but above all to protect you against these men who *are erring and driving into error*, you have the infallible testimony of the Church of God, which Jesus Christ appointed the depository of his doctrine, to preserve it, to explain it, to teach it, promising her that she would always be animated and directed by the Holy Ghost, and that he himself would be constantly assisting her till the end of time; that the gates of hell would never prevail against this bulwark, which, as an Apostle says, 'is the pillar and ground of the truth.'⁽ⁿ⁾ The Redeemer foresaw how great would be the inconstancy, the rashness, the pride, the rebellion of the mind of man, and that many even of those who would venerate the holy Scriptures, would, in searching into their depths, lose the anchor of

⁽ⁿ⁾ 1 *Tim.* c. 3. v. 15. See also *Matt.* 16. v. 18, and *John* 14. v. 16, 17.

faith, see vain things, and prophecy lies, saying, and persevering to say, ‘the Lord speaketh,’ when as Ezekiel saith, ‘the Lord had not sent them.’^(o) He foresaw that such men would create dissensions, bring in sects and broach heresies, would oppose authority, contradict the truth, fluctuate in a chaos of unsettled opinions, be tossed about by every wind of doctrine, condemn each other, and yet all cry out, ‘*so saith the Lord, ait Dominus*,’ whilst they all rejected what the Lord had said. He foresaw that these sects, turbulent and licentious, known, and scarcely known, by the names of their founders, would break the unity of his mystic body, which is the Church, of which he himself is the Head; of that Church which has but ONE FAITH, as she has but ONE SAVIOUR, ONE BAPTISM, and ONE LORD; and hence it was that he vested in her an infallible authority, which, like a light always shining, could dissipate the darkness of error, remove every doubt, interpret faithfully the Word of God, and conduct mankind into the haven of truth and salvation. And where can this Church be found, unless it be she which was built on the Apostles, which received from them the true sense and meaning of the Scriptures, and which, at her very commencement, decided the disputes and settled the doubts which arose amongst

^(o) *Ex.* ch. 13. v. 6.

the faithful, whilst the Holy Ghost dictated her decision; ‘It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.’^(p)

“Where can this Church be found, if it be not she who from that time to the present, has subsisted and been governed by an uninterrupted succession of pastors?—she who was always unchangeable in her faith and morality, and who, like her divine Founder, was yesterday, is to-day, and will be always the same, till the consummation of ages; that Church, which amongst all the sects which have sprung up about her, or proceed from her bosom, has always, as the pagan Celsus testifies, been known by the name of THE GREAT CHURCH;—that Church, which has condemned all other Churches, which, like withered branches, were lopped off from the ancient and living trunk, whose root is Christ; that Church which has triumphed over so many persecutions excited against her by the Jews, by the Pagans, by the impious, by all the enemies of her doctrine; a Church always assailed and never conquered! In a word, where can this Church be found, if it be not she which is extended throughout the entire world, which alone is one, which alone can glory in the title of CATHOLIC—a title which she has borne from the Apostolic times, which her

^(p) Acts, ch. 15. v. 8.

enemies themselves concede to her, and which, if arrogated by any of them, serves only to expose their shame.

“ In this Church, dearly beloved brethren, you possess the fountain of all true knowledge, and the tribunal where God himself presides. He speaks to you by the mouths of all her pastors, whom, when you hear, you hear him.⁽⁹⁾ Never deviate from her decisions, they are the decisions of the Holy Ghost, who governs her, and always preserves the purity of her doctrine. Never attend to any voice but to her’s; she is the tender mother who has brought you forth, who has nursed you in her bosom, fed you with milk from her breasts in your infancy, and now furnishes you with strong food. She watches unceasingly over the deposit of the faith which has been confided to her by her heavenly spouse ; she is always armed against every error, against every impiety, always shining in the midst of the disorder and confusion of this world, like the morning star from the midst of the clouds, to direct her children in the ways of truth and salvation. Watch, therefore, we again beseech you by the mercy of God, remain firm, do not fall from your stedfastness, be constant in the faith ; repel with meekness, but with the zeal of God, all the assaults of those who

⁽⁹⁾ *Luc.* 10. v. 16.

would seduce you ; be strengthened and animated with the aid of divine grace against all the ungodly, against all enthusiasts and impostors ; *watch, stand in the faith, act manfully, and be comforted.*"^(r) 1 Cor, ch. 16. v. 13.

II. In the second place, I can neither conform to Protestantism, nor take the Oaths required, because both call upon me *to profess, testify, and declare, solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God*, not merely that I do not believe in Transubstantiation, but that I *believe* there is no such thing as Transubstantiation ; and moreover, that what I do believe on this point, I believe in the sense in which it is *commonly* understood by *English* Protestants : not after the definition of any Christian Church ; not in any precise terms, such as might be intelligible to the understanding ; not from any authority remote or recent, but according to the sense in which it is commonly understood by a body of men who own no authority in matters of faith, but their own judgment ; who think on all controverted points as their fancy may dictate ; and who have no standard of ortho-

^(r) *Reply to the Most Reverend Dr. Magee, by J. K. L. pp. 35-56.*—See also a learned Examination of the Supremacy of St. Peter, in Dr. Lingard's *Tracts*, in answer to Dr. Burgess, bishop of St. David's.

doxy to refer to for the explanation of their doctrine. The thirty-nine articles, and the Church Catechism, independent of the little estimation in which they are held, are both incompetent to the purpose, since, in this case, it appears to remain quite undetermined whether we are to believe the body and blood of Christ truly and really present in the sacrament, or not. At least, I think no one will be bold enough to attempt to define, in any thing like intelligible terms, what *is* the doctrine of English Protestants on this head. Is it not then most unreasonable to require us to swear to a belief in doctrines, the exposition of which we really know not where to find? While the thirty-nine articles and the Church Catechism leave us quite in the dark as to what we really are to believe, the Prelates of the Establishment do not at all elucidate the matter by their discordant and contradictory opinions, leaving us still to guess at what is the common belief of English Protestants upon the doctrines to which we are required to swear. If we look to the earlier periods of the history of English Protestantism, we shall find some of its most distinguished Divines holding the following opinions :^(s)

^(s) See *The Faith and Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church proved by the Testimony of the most learned Protestants*. Dublin, 1813.

“ We agree as to the *object* ;” says Dr. Andrews of Winchester, “ the *whole* difference respects the *modus* or *manner* of the presence.... We believe a real and a true presence no less than you do. The King too (James I.) believes Christ not only *really* present, but *truly adorable* in the Eucharist, and I myself do adore the very flesh of Christ in the mysteries.”⁽¹⁾

Dr. Lawrence thus expresses himself: “ As I like not those who say he is *bodily* there, so I like not those who say his body is *not there* ; because Christ says it is there ; St. Paul says it is there ; and our Church says it is there, really, truly, and essentially, and not only by way of representation or commemoration. For why would our Saviour bid us take what he would not have us receive? We must believe it is there. We must know what is there. Our faith may see it: our senses cannot.”⁽²⁾

Archbishop Laud says, “ The altar is the greatest place of God’s residence on earth : yea, greater than the pulpit ; for there it is, *Hoc est corpus meum* : in the pulpit it is, at most, *Hoc est verbum meum*. And a greater reverence is due to the *body* than to the word of the Lord ; and to the throne where he is usually present, than to the seat where his word is preached.”⁽³⁾

⁽¹⁾ *Answer to Card. Bellarmin’s Apology*, chap. 1, p. 11, and chap. 8, p. 194.

⁽²⁾ Lawrence’s *Sermon*, p. 17—18.

⁽³⁾ *Speech in the Star Chamber*, p. 47.

And yet the Bishop of Peterborough tells us, that at this very time [in the reign of Charles I.], the Church of England professed the SAME *true* religion which it professes at present."^(y)

"Concerning the point of the real presence," says Dr. Montague, "there need be no difference, if men were disposed as they ought to peace; for the disagreement is only *de modo Presentiæ*; the thing being yielded to on either side: viz. that there is in the Eucharist a real presence."^(z)

Bishop Bramhall writes thus: "No genuine son of the Church [of England] did ever deny a true, real presence. Christ said: *This is my body*, and what he said we steadfastly believe," &c.^(a)

Bishop Cosin is not less explicit in favour of the Catholic Doctrine. He says: "It is a monstrous error to deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist," &c.^(b)

Hooker thus expresses himself: "Sith we all agree that Christ, by the sacrament, doth really and truly perform in us his promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions, whether by consubstantiation or else by transubstantiation."^(c)

Will it be believed that these, and many others

^(y) *Charge*, p. 16.—1827. ^(z) *Appeal to Cæsar*, p. 289.

^(a) *Answer to M. de la Militère*, p. 74. ^(b) *Hist. of Transubstantiation*, p. 139. ^(c) *Eccles. Polity*, B. v. 67.

who held the same opinions, were all eminent divines, and members of the English Protestant Church, some of them posterior to the last revisal of the 39 Articles,^(d) and only a very few years prior to the time^(e) when members of Parliament were called upon to swear precisely to what they are at the present moment; namely, that they believed this doctrine in the sense in which it was *commonly* understood by English Protestants.

But while the oath remains the same, the doctrine appears to have differed; preserving only one characteristic of its former qualities—that of being as vague and indeterminate as ever. While the creed of the Established Church always appears, at first sight, to inculcate a true and real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, it invariably alters its course, either by admitting every possible variety of opinion, through the vagueness of its definitions; or, by Catechistical explanations, doing away with the reality of the

^(d) In 1634, the Convocation of the Irish Bishops denounced an excommunication against those who affirmed that any of the articles of the Church of England were *in any part superstitious or erroneous*. Twenty-eight years afterwards they were discovered to be both.

^(e) Dr. Andrews died 1626; Laud (executed) 1644; Montague, 1641; Archbishop Bramhall, 1663; Cosin, 1671; Hooker, 1660; Parker, 1575; Nowell, 1602; Taylor, 1667; Wake, 1736; Usher, 1656.

presence altogether; or by stating things in such contradictory terms, that it still contrives to leave the doctrine itself involved in mystery, doubt, and darkness. “ Its original framers knew that the Christian world was divided into two parties: the one consisting of the Catholics and the Lutherans, who contended for the real presence of Christ’s body, though they differed as to the manner of that presence; the other of the Zuinglians and Calvinists, who rejected the real presence and admitted nothing more than a bare figure and memorial of the death of Christ. By appearing to admit both opinions into different parts of the articles, catechism, and rubrics, they opened a door for proselytes from either party, who might thus become orthodox churchmen, and still retain their favourite opinions. Thus, the original articles published by the authority of Edward VI. contained a long paragraph against ‘ the real and bodily presence,’ as they term it ;^(f) which paragraph, though it was subscribed by both houses of Convocation, in the reign of Elizabeth, was omitted by the command of that female head of the Church.” “ The design

^(f) The first communion service, drawn up by Cranmer, Ridley, and other Protestant bishops and divines, and published in 1548, clearly expresses the real presence, declaring that “ the whole body of Christ is received under each particle of the Sacrament.” *Burnet, T. ii. p. 1.*

of government," says Burnet, "was at that time much turned to the drawing over the body of the nation to the Reformation, in whom the old leaven had gone deep; and no part of it deeper than the belief of the corporeal presence of Christ in the Sacrament; therefore it was thought not expedient to offend them by so particular a definition in this matter, in which the very word *real presence* was rejected."^(g) In like manner, in the second Book of Common Prayer, published by Edward VI., was inserted a long rubric, rejecting "*all adoration unto any real presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood.*" This also was laid aside by order of Elizabeth. "It being the Queen's design," says Wheatley, "to unite the nation as much as she could in one faith, it was therefore recommended to the divines, to see there should be no definition made against the aforesaid notion, but that it should remain as a speculative opinion not determined, but in which every one might be left to the freedom of his own mind."^(h) King James imitated the

^(g) "Burnet, *Exposition of the xxxix Articles*, p. 308. "This part of the Article was omitted, in 1562, probably with a view to give less offence to those who maintained the corporeal presence, and to comprehend as many as possible in the Established Church." Bishop of Lincoln's *Elements of Christian Theology*, vol. 2, p. 483.

^(h) Wheatley's *Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 334.

caution of his predecessor ; and in commissioning Bishop Overal, then Dean of St. Paul's, to add to the Catechism the explanation of the Sacraments, was careful that the real presence should be taught in such a manner as might satisfy the patrons of that doctrine.⁽ⁱ⁾

The 28th Article of the Church of England declares that “the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner.” Catholics say the same. “The Holy Synod openly and plainly professes that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially present under the appearances of those sensible objects. Nor in this is there any repugnance, that Christ, according to his natural manner of existence, should always remain in heaven at the right hand of his Father ; and that, at the same time he should be present with us, in many places, really, but sacramentally, in that way of existence which, though in words we can hardly express it, the mind, illuminated by faith, can conceive it to be possible to God, and which we are bound firmly to believe ; for so all our ancestors, as many as were members of the true Church of

⁽ⁱ⁾ See Dr. Lingard's *Tracts*, from which the above quotations are taken.

Christ, who wrote on the subject of this holy Sacrament, openly professed.”^(k)

Dean Nowell, in his *Catechism for Schools*, first published in 1570, says the same. “The body and blood of Christ are given to the faithful in the Lord’s Supper, are received, eat, and drank by them, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, *but truly and really* [*verè tamen atque reipsâ*]. So that, when it was asserted by a Catholic controvertist, that, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, the bread of the supper is but a figure of Christ, Bishop Montague had some reason to answer; “Is but a sign or figure, and no more! — Strange! — and yet our formal words are, *This is my body; this is my blood*. This *is*, is more than this *figureth*, or *designeth*; a bare figure is but a phantasm. He gave *substance*, and *really subsisting essence*, who said, “This is my body, this is my blood.”^(l)

“I know,” says the elegant and learned writer from whom this argument is taken, “that both this divine, and others who have held a similar language, have on other occasions taught the contrary doctrine; but this corroborates my assertion, since it shews that, in endeavouring to defend the tenets of the established creed, they were com-

^(k) *Council of Trent, Sess. xiii. c. 1. p. 86.*

^(l) *New Gag. p. 250. 1624.*

pelled, first, to acknowledge a real presence, and then to explain it away till it meant a real absence." The article says, "the body of Christ is *given*, &c.—Now, Archbishop Wake's catechism, entitled, *The Principles of the Christian Religion Explained*, asks this question; "Are the body and blood of Christ really distributed to every communicant in this Sacrament?" And the answer is, "*No, they are not.* For then, every communicant, whether prepared or not, would alike receive Christ's body and blood there." Is not this contradictory to the Article? The Article says, "the body of Christ is *given*;"—the Archbishop's catechism, that it is *not* given. "That which is *given*," says he, "by the priest to the communicant, is, as to its nature, the same after the consecration that it was before; viz. bread and wine, only altered as to its *use* and signification." He says again: "That which is given by the priest, is, as to its substance, bread and wine; as to its sacramental nature and signification, it is the figure or representation of Christ's body and blood, which was broken and shed for us. The very body and blood of Christ *as yet it is not.* But being with faith and piety received by the communicant, it becomes to him, by the blessing of God, and the grace of the Holy Spirit, *the very body and blood of Christ.*"—We have seen, that the Article at first says the body of Christ is *really* present, for

how can it be *given*, if it be not there? yet at last it asserts that it is *not* there; and that to bring it there, it must first be *received* by faith. In the Archbishop's definition a real and true presence is also expressed; and yet when the Bishop asks *how* the bread and wine become to the faithful and worthy communicant the very body and blood of Christ, he replies: "*As it entitles him to a part in the sacrifice of his death, and to the benefits thereby procured to all his faithful and obedient servants!*" If this has any meaning at all, it signifies that, instead of a real presence of the body and blood of Christ, there is in the Sacrament *a title to the inheritance of the merits of his death*; that is, some spiritual benefit, but by no means the *very body and blood of Christ*, as he had said before!

The late Bishop of Durham, in his celebrated *Explanation of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, thus expresses himself: "To eat Christ, is to incorporate with the mind the spiritual food of faith and righteousness. To eat Christ, is to imbibe his doctrines, to digest his precepts, and to live by his example. We eat Christ, by having him in our minds, and meditating on his life and sufferings. To eat Christ, is to believe in him; and to eat his flesh is to keep up the remembrance of him, especially of his death. To eat the body of Christ, therefore, and to drink his blood at the Sacrament, are *figurative* terms to denote an act

of faith, by which we profess our faith in Christ, and commemorate his death, by eating the *representative* and *vicarious elements of bread and wine.*"^(m) Hence, to eat the body and drink the

^(m) While the *Bishop* of Durham styles the consecrated bread and wine *representative* and *vicarious elements*, and "mere bodily elements of earthly manufacture," a *Prebendary* of the same Church says, "Who among us denies that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist? or the necessity of a supernatural or heavenly change? or that signs can become Sacraments only by the *infinite* power of God? What member of the Church of England would be acknowledged by his Church in making a bare figure of the Sacrament?" (*Letters to C. Butler, Esq.* by Dr. Phillpotts, p. 239.) Who shall decide between the Bishop and his Prebendary? Who is to unravel the mysterious secret of the doctrines and belief of Protestants on the Eucharist, out of such a complicated tissue of contradictions? or why is a Catholic to be stigmatized as an idolater for believing in Transubstantiation, and in offering the sacrifice of the Mass, when a Prebendary of Durham is allowed to *adore* Christ in the Eucharist without contumely or opprobrium? and by what mode of reasoning is it that this same Prebendary and those who think like him, if any such there be, can reconcile it to their consciences to *swear* that the worship of the Church of Rome is idolatrous, when they themselves are adorers of the same God, in the same Sacrament?!!! Will it suffice for them to say, that there is no absurdity which the licence of the reformed belief cannot shelter? that they, forsooth, have liberty to think, act, and believe as they list? That a Protestant, because he belongs to the

blood of Christ, is to eat, not his body, but bread, as a representation and substitute for his body ; and to drink, not his blood, but wine, as a representation and substitute for his blood. Yet, a few pages afterwards the bishop says : “ To think and believe, are as really acts of the mind, as to eat is an act of the body. What is done by the mind, is as truly done, as what is done by the body. The body of Christ is therefore *as truly, as verily, and indeed*, received by faith, as the bread is by the mouth.”—What are we to understand from all this? *What is the sense in which ENGLISH Protestants understand it?* I confess that to me it is wholly and entirely unintelligible and contradictory ; but not one tittle the more so than every other *explanation* of this doctrine to be found in Catechisms, Charges, Sermons, or even in the Articles of Faith of the Established Church.⁽ⁿ⁾

But it is useless to multiply proofs of the discordant opinions of prelates and members of the Establishment of the present day, and to shew that too many of them reject the real presence

religion established by law, may adore Christ in the Eucharist without being an idolater, while a Catholic, because he is an outcast, ~~and~~ member of a proscribed race, is unhesitatingly sworn to be guilty of the greatest of all crimes against his God, for doing the self-same thing?

⁽ⁿ⁾ See this argument pursued more at length in Dr. Lingard's *Tracts*.

altogether, and attempt to explain the whole by a *figurative* meaning. I will only notice another and a very remarkable instance of the contrariety of opinions between prelates of the Established Church, at the time when the oath was framed, and of the period in which we live. When the Duke of York asked Archbishop Sheldon, in the time of Charles II., if it were the doctrine of the Church of England, that Roman Catholics were idolators? he answered, “*that it was not; but that young men of parts would be popular, and such a charge was the way to it.*”^(o) While in the reign of George IV., Dr. Burgess, Bishop of St. David’s, tells us that “*they who do not hold the worship of the Church of Rome to be idolatrous, are not Protestants, whatever they may profess to be.*”^(p) I would ask, whether contradictions and absurdities like these were ever found in Catholicity?

Hence it appears clear, that the oath no longer bears the same signification now that it did when it was first established, and may at any time go round again to the sense in which English Protestants held it in former times; but not, perhaps, till, cameleon-like, it has caught a dozen different hues, from the colour of the politics or fancies of the day; for it seldom happens that the opinions of men pass from one position to its reverse, except

^(o) Burnet, *Hist. of his own Times.* 1673.

^(p) *Protestant’s Catechism*, p. 46.

through numerous gradations. Is it not, then, preposterous to call upon us to swear to so variable, contradictory, and incomprehensible a doctrine as this appears to be in the hands of English Protestants?⁽⁹⁾

⁽⁹⁾ See the Articles and Liturgy, as they stood in 1548, clearly expressing the real presence; in 1552, as clearly denying it; in 1562, leaving it doubtful; and, in 1662, apparently rejecting it altogether!!!

The contrariety of opinion that has ever been so remarkable amongst the prelates of the Establishment in England, appears likewise to have prevailed about this same period in the Irish branch of the Protestant Church. While many of the archbishops and bishops of Ireland, with Archbishop Usher at their head, declared that "the religion of the Papists was superstitious and idolatrous," &c.; and that to consent that they might freely exercise their religion was a grievous sin (see Plowden's *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i. c. 4.): Dr. Jeremy Taylor, bishop of Down, much to his credit for candour and discernment, says; "The object of their [the Catholics'] adoration in the Sacrament is the only true and eternal God, hypostatically united with his holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the veil of the sacrament; and if they thought him not present, they are so far from worshipping the bread, that they profess it idolatry to do so. This is demonstration that the soul has nothing in it that is idolatrical; the will has nothing in it but what is a great enemy to idolatry." (*Liberty of Prophesying*, sec. 20.) About the same time, in England, Thorndyke, prebendary of Westminster, argues thus: "Will any Papist acknow-

But even if I knew what I was called upon to believe, yet, under the view which I take of the

ledge that he honours the *elements* of the Eucharist for God? Will common sense charge him with honouring that in the sacrament, which he does not believe to be there?" (*Just Weights and Measures*, c. 19.) But Dr. Porteus, bishop of London, a few years ago, charged Catholics with "senseless idolatry," and with "worshipping the creature instead of the Creator." (*Confut.* p. ii. c. i.) It is really extraordinary, but not less true, that prelates and divines of the Church of England should, in this enlightened age, require to be sent back to periods of comparative barbarism (when there was at least as much inflammable matter in the polemical world, as there is at present,) to learn candour, fair dealing, liberality, charity, and common sense. Let them take a lesson from Dr. Parker; and, while they blush at the contrast, would to God they would apply his reasoning in the cause to which his candid mind directed it, namely, the abrogation of the Test. "So black a crime as idolatry," says he, "is not lightly to be charged upon any party of Christians, on account of the foulness of the calumny, and the barbarous consequences that may follow upon it. Before so bloody an indictment is preferred against the *greatest* part of the Christian world, the thing should be well understood. The charge is too big for a scolding word. It is a piece of inhumanity that outdoes the ferocity of the cannibal, and damns at once both soul and body; and yet after all, we have no other ground than the rash assertions of some popular divines, *who have no other measures of truth than hatred to Popery*, and therefore never spare

question, I could not possibly subscribe to any such misconstructions of the ancient doctrine of Christendom on the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist: For, in conformity with this doctrine, I most firmly and steadfastly believe, and am ready solemnly and sincerely to call God to witness my belief, that Transubstantiation does verily and truly take place in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and in the manner in which it is taught and explained in the Catholic Church.

In the first place, I believe it because the Catholic Church has always taught it; she has taught it,

hard words against that church; running up all objections against it into atheism and blasphemy, of which idolatry is the greatest instance. As to the use of images in the worship of God, I cannot but wonder at the confidence of these men to make so bold a charge against them in general, when the images of the cherubims were commanded by God himself (*Exod. xxv. 18.*); which instance is so plain and obvious to every reader, there being nothing more remarkable in all the Old Testament than the honour done to the cherubim, that 'tis a much greater wonder to me, that those men who advance the objection of idolatry so groundlessly, can so slightly rid themselves of so pregnant a proof against it; till, therefore, it can be proved that the papists worship the images of false gods as supreme deities, or the true God by corporal images and the representations of his divine nature, there can be no footing for idolatry in Christendom."—Parker's *Reasons for abrogating the Test.*

because it was revealed to her from heaven ; and of its revelation from heaven there is abundant and incontrovertible proof. Yes, if there be one tenet of Christianity more clearly defined, or more frequently illustrated in the sacred writings than another ; if there be one article of faith which it appeared to be the object of our Saviour to enforce more strongly upon our minds than usual ; if there be one mystery to which more importance is given, or to which more consequence is attached, it is the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It is a singular circumstance, that Transubstantiation should have been the characteristic both of the first and of the last miracle which our Saviour performed in the course of his sacred ministry,—the conversion of water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana, and the conversion of bread into his body, and of wine into his blood, at the last supper.

Like every other tenet of her creed, the Catholic Church can trace the belief in Transubstantiation up to the very æra of the Apostles, by an unbroken series of authentic history, by the luminous evidence of those unexceptionable attestators of truth, the Fathers of the Church.^(m)

^(m) See APPENDIX, No. XI. where these testimonies are adduced at considerable length.

“It is evident,” says Dr. Samuel Parker, “to all but ordinarily conversant in ecclesiastical history, that, the ancient fathers did, from age to age, assert the *true* and

But why should we have recourse to the testimony of history, and the opinion of the Fathers, while

real presence in very high and expressive terms. The Greeks called it *metaboli*, and the Latins, conversion, transmutation, transformation, transelementation, and at length transubstantiation! by which expressions they meant neither more nor less than the *real* presence of Christ in the Eucharist.”—Parker’s *Reasons*, p. 13. “I have often wondered,” says the learned Scaliger, “that all the ancient fathers should have considered the supper as a *real oblation*, and have believed, as they *unquestionably did*, the *change* of the bread into the body of Christ, for which reason, Protestants can *never prove* their doctrine from them.”—*Scaligerana*, p. 78.

But as other Protestant controvertists have endeavoured to turn aside the positive and overwhelming testimony of the Fathers of the Church, upon the doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist, and never more shamefully and falsely than in the present day, by pretending to produce doubtful, unsatisfactory, and even contradictory opinions amongst them on this point, and by endeavouring to stamp them with the same fickleness, uncertainty, and hesitation in their belief, as is found to prevail amongst Protestants themselves, I will introduce into the APPENDIX the admirable refutation of such notions in the bishop of Strasburg’s late triumphant answer to Faber’s *Difficulties of Romanism*. The reader will there see a notable proof of the truth and justice of the observations I have found it necessary to make upon the general character of works of the description of Mr. Faber’s, works which are a disgrace to the Church in whose defence they are undertaken—works in which forgery and falsehood are artfully but

we have the evidence of the Scripture, and the words of Christ himself to guide us? It is impossible for any one, with an unbiassed judgment, to read the 6th chapter of the Gospel of St. John, and disbelieve in the real and substantial presence of the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. We there see the express declaration of Christ: *I am the bread of life; the bread that I will give is my flesh:*⁽ⁿ⁾ and we see the sense in which

unblushingly advanced with a design to delude the ignorant and the credulous into a disbelief of the purest doctrines of Christianity, and for the purpose of upholding a system of imposture and deceit, by which thousands of talented and otherwise respectable individuals derive a luxurious subsistence for themselves and families. See APPENDIX, No. X.

⁽ⁿ⁾ It may be here observed, "that if Christ had wished to inculcate the Catholic doctrine, he could not have done it in terms better adapted to the purpose; and if he meant to inculcate the doctrine of the Church of England, he could have hardly selected words more likely to lead his disciples into error." (Lingard's *Tracts*, p. 215.)

During the period of our Saviour's sojournment upon earth, he was God under the *appearance* of man; and though he proved his divinity by miracles, yet those miracles were momentary and passing, and left mankind without any evidence, that was perceptible by the senses, of so incomprehensible a mystery as a God made man. And why should we require more in the sacrament of the Eucharist? Instead of the Son of God

his words were understood, and the manner in which they were received, by the unbelieving Jews,

under the appearance of man, we behold him under the semblance of bread and wine, and we have his own words in attestation of the fact.

If the second person of the blessed Trinity, united with the nature of man, but veiling his divinity under the form of an infant, had been presented in common with a hundred other infants before any indifferent person, would it have been possible to distinguish him from the rest? Why then should we look for any peculiar distinction in a consecrated host, over one that is not so? If the Son of God could appear amongst men as an infant child, preserving his divinity without altering the ordinary appearances of human nature, why can he not equally veil his divinity under the appearance of bread, without changing the appearance of that bread to the visual faculties of man? And why can He not also delegate the power to do so to his minister,—He who gave power to the rod of Aaron to convert the waters of the Nile into blood, and that blood into water again,—He who was able, by one single word, to call a whole world from nothingness?

The remark of Tertullian, that he believed in Transubstantiation because it was impossible to have been the offspring of the human mind, is worthy of observation. He did not disbelieve and reject it, because it appeared extraordinary and inexplicable! but feeling it impossible that it could have originated with man, he referred it entirely to God.

“What is there in the real presence,” says Mr. Corless, in his *Reply to Mr. Townsend*, “to which the mind of a

who incredulously asked ; *How can this man give us his flesh to eat ?* Instead of denying that this was his real and literal meaning, and undeceiving those who heard him ; instead of ceasing to tempt their faith by what he had no intention of forcing upon it ; he only confirms his own assertion, and

Christian can object?—Is it the impossibility? Then does the creature pretend to set limits to the power of his Creator? Cannot the Omnipotent, who called all things out of nothing, and whom all things obey, change one substance into another? Did he not change water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana? Does he not daily, by the common operations of nature, change the bread which we eat, into our body and blood?—Is it because to the senses it appears still to be bread?—Then cannot our Divine Saviour assume what appearance he pleases? Is it not as easy for the Son to assume the appearance of bread, as for the Holy Ghost to assume the appearance of a dove, as at the baptism of Christ, or of divided tongues, as on the day of Pentecost? Is it, because it is incomprehensible?—Then must we reject the Trinity, the divinity of our Redeemer, and every thing that a finite being cannot reduce to the standard of his reason. But, there must be mysteries, as long as there is man. As God requires a sacrifice of our will, so must he also require a sacrifice of our understanding. Could a *finite* being acquire all knowledge and fathom the secrets of omniscience, then would he become, in knowledge, *infinite*, and equal to his God. Then would the serpent's promise to our first parents be verified in their posterity : *Eritis sicut Dii.*"

their interpretation of it: *Except, he replied, you eat of the flesh of the son of man, and drink of his blood, you shall not have life in you.* His disciples, like the members of the Established Church, were still obdurate, and, like them, they exclaimed: *This saying is hard, and who can hear it?* But the doctrine of Jesus was fixed and immutable; and though *many went back and walked no more with him, because of this hard saying, that he would give them his flesh to eat,* yet his words were irrevocable; his decision was final. He never attempted to soften down his expressions, to adapt his meaning to the capacity of the senses, nor to measure his instructions by the understanding of man.^(o) At the same time that he conferred his

^(o) “The character of Christ was not more different from that of the philosophers, than his method of instruction, from that which they pursued. Those who gave no other proof of the truth of their speculations, than their conformity with reason, were necessarily obliged to the test of the most rigid examination.—But he, who wrought miracles in support of his doctrine, sufficiently impressed upon it the seal of a divine origin. Hence, in unfolding the most sublime and mysterious tenets of his religion, Christ was not in the habit of showing that they were susceptible of demonstration. Regardless of the difficulties which sometimes startled his disciples, he generally repeated the doctrine, without studying to make it easier of comprehension. Thus, when the Jews expressed their

favours, he wished to exercise our faith : he therefore left his doctrine as it was, and turning round to his

surprise at his intimation that he had seen Abraham, by asking him, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?' (*John* viii. 57.) He entered into no further explanation of the stupendous mystery, content with making this cool reply: 'Amen, amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I am.' (*Ibid.* 58.) That the Jews were not content with this brief answer, appears from the concluding verse of the chapter, in which it is stated, that they took up stones to cast at him, and that he went out of the temple to shelter himself from their fury.

"Again, when he announced the mysterious doctrine of regeneration to Nicodemus, who enquired of him, with the utmost impatience, 'How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb, and be born again?' Jesus answered, 'Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' (*John* iii. 4, 5.) To the mind of Nicodemus, the regeneration of the spirit was still more incomprehensible than the secret of the Redeemer's age. In the sequel of his discourse, Christ, far from wishing to accommodate this mystery to man's comprehension, labours rather to correct the perverse and unreasonable curiosity of the human mind. He tells him: 'We testify what we have seen;' (*Ibid.* 11.) which testimony, when confirmed by the wonders he had wrought, should have satisfied all of the truth of his doctrine. But, as if to arrest the presumption of those who should attempt to explore the mysteries of the Divinity, he adds: 'And no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended from heaven, the son of man, who is in heaven.' (*Ibid.* 13.)

Apostles, he asked; *If they also would leave him?* Was it possible to give a more striking proof that they had rightly understood him, and that his words were to be received in the plain and literal sense in which they had been taken by those who had left him disbelieving, and by those who, like Peter, remained *and believed?* If they had not rightly understood him, if they had left him with any material misconception of his meaning, would not he, who was the good shepherd, ready to lay down his life for his sheep, and whose sole desire was to gather all mankind into one fold, would not he have called them back, and, by a seasonable explanation, have relieved them from their errors? The only rational, the only possible method of explaining this conduct of our Saviour is, by *subjecting our understanding to the obedience of faith*, and exclaiming in the words of St. Peter: "Lord, thou

"When Jesus, after the departure of the wealthy young man, who came to consult him on the means of securing his salvation, said to his disciples: 'It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God,' they wondered very much, saying: 'Who then can be saved?' (*Matt.* xix. 24, 25.) Yet he gave them no other solution to a difficulty which seemed perplexing to their minds, than the simple language, 'With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible.' (*Ibid.* 26.)"—Dr. Machale's *Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church*, Vol. I. pp. 342—345.

hast the words of eternal life : we believe and have known that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." It is probable, however, that, at this time, neither party precisely understood the *manner* in which Christ was to give his body and blood for the spiritual food of mankind. But the conduct of our Saviour, and the declaration of St. Peter, both point out the implicit obedience which we owe to the words of Christ, whether we understand them or not. Had our Saviour been explaining the mystery of the Trinity, or any other of the mysterious doctrines of Christianity, which no human capacity can possibly fathom and comprehend, we may well imagine that the conduct of Christ, the exclamation of St. Peter, and perhaps the incredulity of the Jews, would have been precisely the same. ^(p)

(p) Then Jesus said to them ; Amen, amen, I say unto you : Except you eat of the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life : and I will raise him up in the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father : so he that eateth me, the same shall also live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread, shall live for ever. These things he said, teaching in

But to terminate the explanation of this wonderful mystery—to manifest the completion of this

the synagogue, in Capernaum. Many, therefore, of his disciples hearing it, said: This saying is hard, and who can hear it? But Jesus, knowing in himself that his disciples murmured at this, said to them: Doth this scandalize you? If, then, you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? (Jo. vi. 54-63.) Here again, our Saviour, so far from admitting that his disciples had misunderstood him, adduces his future miraculous ascension into heaven in testimony of the truth of his assertions. He asks if their incredulity will not fall before the stupendous miracle of his ascension? It would also appear that our Saviour intended to convey some idea of the *manner* in which his flesh was to be given for the spiritual food of mankind, since he adds, *It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life.* That is, my mere flesh, without my spirit and divinity, would be of no avail; or, without the spirit of God, the carnal man is incapable of comprehending or benefiting from the truths of Christianity. *No man can come to me, unless it be given him by my Father.* In judging of spiritual things, you must be governed by the spirit, not by the gross ideas of sensual man. It is not after the manner of common meat that you are to eat of the flesh of the Son of man, but though in a real and substantial, yet in a heavenly and spiritual form. *The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life:* they will animate you with the spirit of God, if you will but believe in them; they will conduct you to eternal life, if you will but follow them as your guide. Such appears to have been the meaning of a passage which is frequently brought forward

august sacrament—and to exhibit the fulfilment of the promise he had made of giving himself as *the bread of life*,—our Saviour, at his last supper, *took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to his disciples, and said: Take ye, and eat, THIS IS MY BODY;*^(q) *and taking the chalice also, he gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying; Drink ye all of this; FOR THIS IS MY BLOOD, &c.*^(r) Christ did not

by Protestants, in a vain endeavour to controvert the previous declaration of our Saviour. Nothing, however, can be more certain, from the whole context, that they nowise militate against the positive promise of Christ, to give his real and substantial, though spiritualized body, for the food of mankind. Had the Jews been less obdurate in their unbelief, they would in all probability have understood the precise meaning of our Saviour, who would then have condescended to enter into more explicit details. It is quite evident, however, that the passage will admit of these interpretations, and it would be blasphemy to assert that the God of Truth had contradicted, in the latter part of his discourse, what he had so positively and so strongly insisted upon in its commencement. Knowing that the eyes of his disciples were not yet opened to understand the Scriptures, and that it was not the intention of our Saviour to explain himself more fully upon this occasion, the whole difficulty is relieved.

^(q) An Almighty God has said it: and man, vain man, has presumed to question it.—*O man! who art thou that repliest against God?* Rom. ix. 20.

^(r) A flimsy quibble is frequently resorted to for the purpose of destroying the force of these expressions; namely,

say, *here* is my body, *here* is my blood! which might have appeared to countenance the doctrine of Consubstantiation; but he says, *this* is my body: this is no longer bread, but the body of him who addresses you; the life-giving flesh of the Son of God: this is no longer wine, but the sacred fountain of life, that blood which shall so soon be shed upon the cross for the remission of your sins.

If any other testimony were required, the manner in which St. Paul bears witness to this doctrine is a striking confirmation of it. *The chalice of benediction, which we bless, says he, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ; and the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body*

that all that was required of us by these injunctions of Christ, was a mere *commemoration* of the last supper—*Do this in commemoration of me.* But it is at once overturned by the simple question; What was the important *this* that was to be done? Were the disciples to do what our Saviour had just done, or something else that was left to their own fancy?—On one occasion Luther says: “The devil seems to have mocked mankind in proposing to them a heresy so ridiculous and contrary to Scripture as is that of the Zuinglians, namely, the denial of the real presence.” (*Op. Luth. Defens. Verb. Con.*) In another place he acknowledges that he had tried to persuade himself of there being no real presence of Christ in the Sacrament, on purpose to irritate and offend the Pope; but that the words of Scripture were too plainly in favour of it.—(See *Letters to a Preb. p. 154.*)

of the Lord?^(s) *And whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.*^(t)

In receiving the bread, how can we be *guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*, if his body and blood be not there? How can we *eat and drink judgment to ourselves, not discerning the body of the Lord*,^(u) if the body of the Lord be not there to be discerned?^(x)

^(s) 1 Cor. x. 16. ^(t) 1 Cor. xi. 27. ^(u) *Ibid.* 22.

^(x) While St. Paul says that the unworthy communicant *is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*, the doctrine of the Establishment renders the profanation of the Sacrament an impossibility. I presume—and after all it is only a presumption, though I doubt whether any Protestant will contradict me—that the Church of England denies the real presence *in toto*: and this being the case, what is there in the Sacrament for the unworthy communicant to profane? Where is the body and blood of the Lord, of which he is to be guilty? But supposing, according to the words of the 28th Article, an act of faith really gives the body and blood of Christ to the communicant, who but a madman will make that act of faith, when he receives the Sacrament unworthily and unprepared? How can he be guilty of *the body and blood of the Lord*, when, making no act of faith, he receives nothing but bread and wine? In one case, there is a certainty that the Sacrament cannot, in the other, there is a moral impossibility that it can, be profaned by an unworthy communicant who is a member of the Established Church. Hence the denunciation of St. Paul becomes void and unmeaning.

An omniscient God foresaw the incredulity of mankind, and in mercy to those who are willing to believe, afforded evidence without end to preserve them from error upon this most important point. All the Evangelists, all the inspired writers, all the Fathers of the Church, concur in opinion upon this doctrine. There is no tenet for which there are so many vouchers; there is no mystery so distinctly revealed, and so clearly defined.

If Transubstantiation were a modern doctrine, a doctrine of human invention, why cannot those who assert it to be so, prove both the manner and the period of so extraordinary an innovation in the faith of Christianity? If, in our own times, a minister of the Church of England were to ascend the pulpit, hold up to the people the consecrated elements, and exclaim, '*This is the body and blood of Christ;*' what astonishment would not fill the minds of his audience; what an outcry would there not be raised throughout the country! And is it to be believed, that, if a similar occurrence, under similar circumstances, had taken place during the first ages of the Church, the effect would not have been the same? Would it have been so completely overlooked both by history and tradition? That such an assertion, under such circumstances, should have met with success, is a monstrous supposition, because, independent of its

contradiction to our senses, it is a doctrine which has nothing but the authority of revelation to recommend it; for, unlike every false tenet, it neither flatters our passions nor our pride: that, under such circumstances, it should have been eagerly embraced, and universally adopted, would have required no less than the interposition of a miracle. But it did not originate in such circumstances; it rested not upon the authority of man; it was a doctrine not confined to a particular period, or a particular country: it was coeval and coextensive with Christianity itself.^(u) Of this, abundant evidence has descended to us, and whoever will

^(u) Transubstantiation is equally the doctrine of the Greek Church, and of all the Eastern Churches that have separated themselves from the communion of the see of Rome; and as this separation took place, in some instances, as early as the fifth century, even *they* can bear testimony to it for 1400 years. The Lutherans, also, believe in the real presence. "I clearly saw," says Luther, "how much I should thereby [by disproving the doctrine of the real presence] injure Popery; but I found myself caught without any way of escaping, for the text of the gospel was too plain for this purpose." (*Epist. ad Argenten.* tom. iv. fol. 502. Ed. Witten.) In another place he says, "That no one among the fathers, numerous as they are, should have spoken of the Eucharist as these men do [the opposers of the real presence], is truly astonishing. Not one of them speaks thus: *There is only bread and wine: or, the body and blood of Christ are not*

take the trouble of investigating the subject, will find no difficulty in the discovery.^(x)

present. And when we reflect how often the subject is treated by them, it ceases to be credible—it is not even possible—that not so much as once such words as these should not have dropped from some of them. Surely, it was of moment that men should not be drawn into error. Still, they all speak with a precision which evinces that they entertained no doubt of the presence of the body and blood. Had not this been their conviction, can it be imagined that, among so many, the negative opinion should not have been uttered on a single occasion? On other points this was not the case. But our Sacramentarians, on the other hand, can proclaim only the negative or contrary opinion. These men then, to say all in one word, have drawn their notions neither from the Scriptures nor the Fathers.” (*Defensio Verborum Cæneæ*, T. vii. p. 391. *Edit. Witt.* 1557.) Again he says: “This I cannot, nor am I willing, to deny, that had any one, five years ago, been able to persuade me that in the Sacrament were only bread and wine, he would have laid me under great obligations to him ;....for I was clearly sensible that nothing would give so much pain to the Roman Bishop.” *Ibid.* p. 502.

^(x) Let not the reader be deterred from this examination, under the idea that he has neither the capacity nor the leisure to explore the voluminous writings of the early Fathers of the Church. He will find every passage of moment which bears upon this, or any other Catholic tenet, selected, translated, and arranged to his hands, in an admirable and most useful compilation of scriptural and

We are well acquainted with the heresies of Montanus and Tatian in the 2nd, of Tertullian and Origen in the 3rd, and of Arius in the 4th century, and so on; and shall it be said that the tenets of Catholics alone are without evidence and proof; and while the errors of every petty sect, and even sometimes of individual writers, were carefully detailed in history and transmitted to posterity, that the faith and practice of the Universal Church alone were left unnoticed and unattested? Let any one peruse the passages in St. Ignatius, St. Justin, St. Irenæus, &c. &c. in proof of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, during the 1st, 2nd, and subsequent centuries of the Christian æra, and then determine whether it be the doctrine of primitive Christianity, or the comparatively modern innovation of the dark ages.

Under such a view of the subject, and with such evidence before us, is it possible we can swear that we believe the doctrine of the Eucharist in the sense in which it is commonly understood by English Protestants?

historical testimony, in a single volume, entitled: *The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the five first Centuries of the Church*; by the Rev. Jos. Berington and the Rev. J. Kirk. Should doubt arise as to the authenticity of any extract, or the fidelity of its translation, the reference at the end of every passage will afford a ready clue to the original.

III. In the third place, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because she calls upon me *solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, to profess, testify, and declare*—not simply that I disbelieve in the Invocation of Saints,—but that *I do believe that the Invocation of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, as now used in the Church of Rome, is superstitious and idolatrous.* Whereas, I do solemnly and sincerely declare, and am ready to call God to witness the same, that I believe, in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Trent, that the doctrine *received from the earliest ages of the Christian religion*, has been that *the Saints, reigning with Christ, offer up their prayers to God for men; that it is good and profitable suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their supplications and assistance, in order to obtain favours from God, through his Son Jesus Christ, our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour.*

The texts of Scripture which tend to prove this doctrine are as follow.^(y) The angel Raphael says to Tobias: *When thou didst pray, with tears, and didst bury the dead, I offered up thy prayer to*

^(y) “And that the people may know what benefits Christians receive by the ministry of angels, the feast of St. Michael and all angels is for that reason solemnly observed in the Church.”—Note to Mant’s *Book of Common Prayer*.

the Lord.^(z) Judas Machabeus relates a vision, in which he saw the late high-priest Oniah, whom he describes as he appeared to him—stretching out his arms, and praying for the Jewish people. He then mentions another personage whom he saw, of whom Oniah says: *This is the lover of the brethren and of the people of Israel. This is Jeremiah the prophet of God, who prays for the people, and for the holy city.*^(a)—*I say to you, that even so there shall be joy in Heaven upon one sinner that doth penance, more than upon ninety-nine just who need not penance.*—*So I say to you, there shall be joy before the angels of God upon one sinner doing penance.*^(b)—*And when he had opened the book, the four living creatures, and the four-and-twenty ancients fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials, full of odours, which are the prayers of Saints.*^(c) From all this we argue the intimate communication between the saints in Heaven, and mankind upon earth; the efficacy of their prayers; and the interest they take in our behalf. Since St. Paul besought the Romans, Corinthians, and Ephesians to pray for him, is it not clear that it is lawful for us to do the same? and may we not do so, without detracting from the only Me-

^(z) *Tobias*, xii. 12.

^(a) *Machab.* xv. 12. 13.

^(b) *St. Luke*, xv. 7. 10.

^(c) *Apocal.* v. 8.

diator between God and man? The practice of Protestants in praying for the king, &c. proves their assent to this position. And, if we may solicit the prayers of our fellow-men, who are mortals and sinners like ourselves, much more should we invoke those of the peculiar friends and companions of God, the adorers around the throne of grace and mercy, and whom, from the texts above quoted, we know to be informed of what is passing upon earth, to be eminently qualified for the task, and in the constant habit of performing it. All we beg of them is to intercede with the Mediator, through whom alone we hope for mercy, grace, and salvation, or for any favour that we may ask for at the hands of his saints.^(d)

Since there is not one single text of Scripture that can, in any way, be taken to contradict this doctrine, it is impossible it can be contrary to Scripture; and the convincing fact, that such has always been the view taken of it, and such the

^(d) The doctrine of the Invocation of Saints is so ancient and so universal, that the Greek Church, together with all the eastern Churches which separated themselves in the earlier periods of Christianity from the Church of Rome, still maintain it. Luther, so far from finding anything idolatrous or superstitious in the doctrine or practice of the Church on this point, exclaims: "Who can deny that God works great miracles at the tombs of the saints! I therefore, with the whole Catholic Church,

constant practice of the Catholic Church, is to be gathered from the works of the earliest ecclesiastical writers; copious extracts from which, relative to this point, are to be found in the valuable work already spoken of.^(e) To this the reader is referred, as these testimonies are far too numerous for insertion here.

The charge of idolatry brought against us for honouring those whom God has honoured, but especially for invoking the intercession of the Mother of God, the Queen of Angels, and the Saint of Saints, she who tells us, in an inspired

hold that the saints are to be honoured and invocated by us.”* Such also was the opinion of many of the prelates of the Church of England.† Bishop Montague, especially, says: “The blessed in heaven do recommend to God, in their prayers, their kindred, friends, and acquaintance on earth.”—(*Antidote*, p. 20.) “This is the common voice, with the general concurrence, without contradiction, of reverend and learned antiquity, for aught I ever could read or understand; and I see no cause or reason to dissent from them touching intercession in this kind.”—(*Ibid.* p. 23.) Is it then safe for Protestants to swear that Catholics are superstitious for holding such a doctrine?

^(e) “*The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the five first Centuries of the Church.*”—Booker, London, 1813.

* *In Purg. Quorund. Artic. Tom. i. Germet. Ep. ad Georg. Spalat.*

† See Duchess of York’s Testimony, in the Duke of Brunswick’s *Fifty Reasons*, Burnet’s *Hist.* &c.

Canticle, that *all generations shall call her Blessed,*^(f) and who was addressed by this appellation by the prophetic Elizabeth;^(g) who was hailed by the angel as *full of grace,*^(h) and to whom the Saviour and Maker of the world was obedient, as a child is obedient to its parent,—is too absurd to obtain a moment's credit with an unprejudiced mind. So far are we from the 'abomination of idolatry,' in the invocation of Saints, that the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, published in virtue of its decree, by order of Pius Vth, teaches that "God and the Saints are not to be prayed to in the same manner: for we pray to God that *he himself would give us good things, and deliver us from evil things*; but we beg of the Saints, because they are pleasing to God, that they *would be our advocates, and obtain from God what we stand in need of.*"⁽ⁱ⁾

(f) *St. Luke*, c. i. 48. (g) *Ibid.* v. 42. (h) *Ibid.* v. 28.

(i) If it should be observed, that prayers are *occasionally* addressed to the saints in a manner which *appears* at first sight to dispense with the mediatorship of Christ, or to ascribe a power to them which they do not possess, it must be remembered that "by a species of metonymy, we frequently employ the subordinate for the principal agent, and attribute to the intercessor what we know is the office of his superior. Let us suppose a criminal under sentence of death, who solicits the queen to obtain his pardon from the king. Were he in his petition to

Our elementary Catechism says: “ we are to honour Saints and Angels as God’s especial friends

beg of her majesty *to save his life*, would any one contend that he had ascribed to the queen the power which the constitution has entrusted to the sovereign alone; and on that account indict him for treason, or a contempt of the king’s prerogative?” (Dr. Lingard’s *Tracts*.)

“ If in our books of devotion, or any other treatise, he should happen to meet with expressions which his prejudice is inclined to misinterpret, or his piety to condemn, let his charity interpose, and see if it will not admit of a more favourable interpretation. Words, abstractedly, are but empty sounds: nor are they calculated to convey any impression, other than that which common practice annexes to them: nor will it be denied that all words are liable to different interpretations. Again, whoever is conversant with ancient phraseology will admit, that the sense which modern acceptance has attached to certain words, is not the sense in which they were formerly received. Thus, in the marriage service of the Church of England, the husband addresses his wife in the following words:—‘ With my body *I thee worship*.’ Now, what would be the indignation of Mr. Townsend, were I to tell him that, on such an occasion, he had been guilty of idolatry; that he had worshipped the creature instead of the Creator? If expressions of this description are to be found in a Church so modern as Protestantism, what wonder that they should be more frequently met with in a Church so ancient as Catholicity?—Let but the Protestant make the same allowances to the Catholic, as he requires for himself, and he solves his own objections. If

and servants, but not with the honour which belongs to God." And, when it is recollected that the reverence paid to the Saints is due to them only through the merits of our Saviour, surely it cannot be deemed any dishonour to the Creator to see his creatures honoured for the gifts he himself has bestowed upon them ; nor will it be considered unbecoming the weakness and the misery of man, to offer our petitions to the throne of mercy through less unworthy hands than our own ;—to make friends for ourselves amongst the friends of God ;—and to implore the intercession of those in our behalf, who had already succeeded so well for themselves.

As an additional proof of the efficacy of the merits and prayers of the Saints, suffice it, amongst

he will apply the above observation to the words *adore* and *worship*, in the instances adduced by Mr. Townsend, he will require no other reply.

“ Do not the Bishops remind us that, even in the translation of the Bible published at Oxford, to *worship* is used to signify inferior as well as superior worship? In the first book of Chronicles, we read in that edition, that the assembly ‘ *bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the King.*’ (1 Chron. xxix. 20.) Did they worship the King with the same supreme worship which they paid to God? Certainly not. It must therefore follow from the use of Scripture itself, that the word *worship* must be received in different acceptations, according to the person to whom it is addressed.”—(Corless’s *Reply*.)

others, to mention two recorded in Holy Writ :—*I will bless thee, and multiply thy seed for my servant Abraham's SAKE.*^(k)—*For thy servant David's SAKE, turn not away the face of thine anointed.*^(l) Do not these texts clearly show, that, in consideration of the zeal and fidelity of his departed servants, God may sometimes be induced to grant particular blessings and favours to the living? And this too without any derogation from the merits and mediatorship of Christ, because, whatever grace the Saints may possess in the eyes of God, it is wholly founded on the merits of our Saviour.

To understand the question rightly, and to explain that text of St. Paul, which says; *There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus,*^(m) it must be observed that Catholics acknowledge Christ to be the *only mediator of salvation*; but it cannot be argued from thence that there is no other *mediator of intercession*, without condemning the conduct of St. Paul, the commands of Almighty God himself, and the practice of the Established Church.⁽ⁿ⁾ If, therefore, it is not derogatory from the mediatorship of Christ to solicit the prayers of each other, while here on earth, how should it be so in any other state of existence? And if the efficacy of prayer be such in behalf of

^(k) *Gen.* xxvi. 24.

^(l) *Psl.* cxxxix. 10.

^(m) *1 Eph. Tim.* ii. 5.

⁽ⁿ⁾ See Dr. Lingard's *Tracts*.

each other, while in this mortal state, in which *no man living stands justified in the sight of his Creator*,^(o) how much more may not be expected from it, when the just man is not only removed from this imperfect state of existence, but has received *power over the nations* ;^(p) *is seated upon the same throne with the Almighty* ;^(q) and is become *a pillar in the temple of his God*,^(r) in that temple where *the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints ascends up before God*.^(s) Where, then, I would ask, is the superstition and idolatry in all this ?^(t)

^(o) *Psl. cxlii. 2.* ^(p) *Apoc. ii. 26.* ^(q) *Ibid. iii. 21.*

^(r) *Ibid. iii. 12.*

^(s) *Ibid. viii. 4.*

^(t) I will subjoin the opinion of Luther upon this point, though rather as an object of curiosity, than for the purpose of founding any argument upon it.

“Concerning the Invocation of Saints,” says he, “I agree with the whole Christian Church, and am of opinion that the saints in heaven are to be invocated ; for, who can contradict the wonders daily wrought at their tombs ?” (*In Purg. Quorund. Artic. Tom. i.*)—Again : “Some, however, may say ; Of what use can the saints be to us ? Thou art to use them as thou dost thy neighbour ; for as thou sayest to him ; Pray to God for me ; so mayest thou, St. Peter pray for me.” (*In Festo Sti. Johannis Baptistæ.*) And in another place : “Let no one omit to invoke the blessed Virgin, and the Angels and Saints, that they may intercede with God for them at that instant [the hour of death].” (*Luther’s Præp. ad Mort.*)

Though the honour paid to *relics and images* is not expressly mentioned in the oath, yet, as we are not sure that it may not by implication be comprised therein, and that the charge of superstition and idolatry may not, in the minds of those who take this test, be grounded upon the supposed doctrine and practice of Catholics upon this point, I deem it quite necessary for our justification to state our belief thereon. It may be found in the following propositions:—"God alone is the object of our *worship and adoration*; but Catholics shew *honour* to the relics of saints, and they place images and pictures in their churches, to reduce their wandering thoughts, and to enliven their memories towards heavenly things. They shew, besides, a *respect* to the representations of Christ, of the mysterious facts of their religion, and of the saints of God, beyond what is due to any profane figure; not that they believe any *virtue* to reside in them, for which they ought to be honoured, but because the honour given to pictures is referred to the *prototype*, or thing represented.

"They maintain also that honour and respect are due to the *bible*, to the *cross*, to the name of *Jesus*, to *churches*, &c. as things peculiarly appertaining to God; as well as to *kings*, *magistrates*, and *superiors*: for to whom honour is due, honour may be given, without any derogation from the majesty of God, or that divine worship which is appropriate to him."

To any one at all read in sacred history, it must be superfluous to produce texts of Scripture, to shew the wonderful miracles wrought by Almighty God by means of the relics of his saints:—When Eliseus smote the waters of Jordan with the mantle of Elias, they parted, and the prophet passed over;^(u)—When a dead man was let down into the sepulchre of Eliseus, no sooner did he touch the bones of the prophet, than he revived and stood upon his feet.^(x) Numbers were healed merely by the shadow of St. Peter passing over them;^(y) and others by handkerchiefs which had touched the body of St. Paul. In the primitive ages, the miracles wrought by the relics of the martyrs were frequent and notorious, never failing to produce their effect, confirming the faith of Christians, and commanding the belief of Pagans in the religion in favour of which they were performed. Surely, then, it is lawful to venerate these instruments which the Almighty has so often been pleased to employ in the performance of his wonders; and for this purpose, as well as to stamp a mark of sanctity on the spot, from time immemorial it has been the custom, when a Church was not actually built over the tombs of martyrs, to furnish it with the relics of saints, placing them immediately under

^(u) 4 *Kings*, ii. 14.

^(x) *Ibid.* xiii. 21.

^(y) *Acts*, v. 14, 15, 16.

^(z) *Ibid.* xix. 11, 12.

the altar, that their mortal remains might occupy a similar situation upon earth, in which their souls were seen by St. John in heaven: *I saw under the altar, says he, the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held.*^(a)

It is not that we believe any inherent power or supernatural efficacy to reside in these remains; the very bones and ashes themselves serve to admonish us that the individuals whom we honour were perishable mortals like the rest of the human race. But when we remember the extraordinary graces the Almighty has conferred upon his saints, the signal favours he has granted them, and the heroic and exemplary manner in which they have performed all the duties of a Christian, thus preserving their bodies, according to the instructions of the apostle, the unpolluted temples of the Holy Ghost, we conceive it to be in full accordance with the best feelings of humanity, that the heart should pray with greater fervency in the presence of the memorials of such men; which, while we yield them our honour, serve, by the recollections they inspire, to animate the soul, to cherish devotion, and to excite us to constancy and perseverance. The supplications which, under such circumstances, we offer to the saints, are in their end and object

^(a) *Rev.* vi. 9.

addressed to the Almighty himself; it is through him that we cherish a veneration for the remains of those whose lives have been passed in his service, and whose death has been precious in his sight: in *him* it originates,—to *him* it is referred;—and to his honour and glory it is ultimately, though not immediately, directed.

Having shewn that we are not superstitious in our veneration of relics, I trust also to prove that we are not idolaters in our respect for images, and in the manner in which we use them. The answer in our English Catechisms to the question, *Do Catholics pray to images?* is this; *No, by no means, for they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us.* A similar answer, together with the most pointed condemnation of every species of idolatry, is to be found, without one exception, in all the catechisms in use in Italy, France, Spain, Flanders, Germany; in a word, in every portion of the Catholic world, in every language in which Christianity is preached, and in every clime in which the name of Jesus is known. Now, if we consider the diligence with which the Catholic clergy inculcate the study of the catechism, the earnestness with which they impress it on the minds of children, the clear and familiar manner in which they explain it, and the assiduity and frequency of these explanations, we ought at least to hesitate before we pronounce that those who receive and

believe these doctrines, receive and believe them in one sense, and practise them in another. It should also be observed that the clergy are nowise interested in keeping up any delusion upon this point; while the common instinct of man, every principle both of natural and revealed religion, conspire to direct his adoration to the sole object worthy of it—to the great Creator and Disposer of all things. If, with all the checks and precautions employed, some abuse or extravagance should partially and occasionally exist, it must, in justice, be attributed rather to the perversity of human nature, than to any thing radically vicious in the system.

When the Almighty commanded cherubim,^(b) who are his creatures as much as man, to be made for the ornament of the ark of the covenant, he did so without fear that the Israelites, prone as they were to idolatry, would transfer those divine honours to them which they owed to himself alone.

^(b) Upon the Propitiatory stood two Cherubim, face to face, with their wings expanded and spread, so as to cover the Ark, forming, as it were, a throne for the God of all Sanctity and Majesty. Hence comes the expression often met with in the Sacred Writings, of God *sitting upon the Cherubim*. It is in imitation of this, that Cherubim are not unfrequently placed to ornament the altar of the blessed Sacrament, where the Almighty deigns to be visibly present.

Indeed, when the Jewish people fell into this most abominable of all crimes, the idolatry was generally meditated first, and the idol raised afterwards : so far were they from being led astray by the use of images in their worship ! Yet, be it remembered, that, though we are bound to pay a due respect to the images of Christ and of his saints, when used, we are not bound to use them. They are not necessary appendages to our service, and may be dispensed with, whenever it is judged proper. Except the Crucifix, an image is hardly ever seen in our Chapels in England, for fear of giving scandal to our Protestant brethren : in this we act in conformity to the advice of St. Paul, who recommends us to concede to the weaknesses of others, when concession is no sacrifice of our duty. The Clergy of Catholic countries are the best judges how far the use of images is liable to be abused, and whether any mischief arises from the toleration of them ; and, as they are not condemned, where there can be no sinister motive for continuing them, it is but charity to suppose, that they are not worthy of condemnation.^(c) In England we

^(c) That it is in itself no impiety to pay religious veneration to inanimate objects, is to be deduced from the commands of Almighty God himself, in the Old Testament. Moses was ordered to put off his shoes on Mount Horeb, and walk barefoot, because it was *holy ground*. The Israelites were, in several instances, commanded to

pray to saints, without their images before us, and we invoke the assistance of the Mother of God, without the aid of a picture to enliven our devotion. Protestants take off their hats out of respect before a sinful man ; they pay homage to the portrait of their sovereign, in the halls of his ambassadors, and to the empty throne in the house of peers ; they rise from their seats, and stand uncovered, during the performance of music in honour of the King ; they bow the head to the altar, and to the name of Jesus, when it is pronounced ; they kiss the Bible, when they have sworn by it ; they decorate their Churches with images painted upon glass ; they even kneel before their consecrated bread and wine, “ mere bodily elements, of earthly manufacture ;”^(d)—and all this without incurring the guilt of idolatry. But why similar marks of respect and veneration may not be shewn to the image of the Mother of God, or of the Prince of the Apostles, without subjecting

shew a high respect to the Ark of the Covenant, and severe punishments were inflicted upon those who either touched it, or looked upon it with irreverence or inattention. In the New Testament we are commanded to bend the knee at the name of Jesus ; and why may we not pay the same mark of respect to the representation of his sufferings, without the imputation of idolatry ? By both we only honour the Redeemer of Mankind.

^(d) Bishop of Durham's *Charge*.

those who shew them, to the odious imputation of superstition and idolatry, is only conceivable to the minds of men who come forward with so groundless and uncharitable a charge. It evinces a degree of ignorance and credulity, equalled only by the want of charity which it betrays. Those who see with a superficial eye, and without a due knowledge of the circumstances, may doubtless be scandalized: the Jews were even scandalized at our Saviour, whom, in the ignorance and the blindness of their hearts, they called a drinker of wine, and the companion of publicans. Idolatry is an act of the mind, and not of the body: and it is a crying injustice to presume that a Catholic is praying *to* an image, because he is praying *before* it.^(e)

(e) “Were the Israelites idolaters, when they turned their eyes devoutly towards the sanctuary in which were deposited the Ark and the Cherubim? or when, in the posture of suppliants, they cast an eye of confidence and hope upon the brazen serpent? Were Joshua and all the ancients of Israel idolaters, because they religiously fell prostrate on the ground before the Ark of the Testament? Was David an idolater, when he brought back the Ark of God with all the pomp and solemnity mentioned in the Scripture?”—(*Amicable Discussion, vol. ii. p. 291.*)

The second council of Nice, convoked by the Empress Irene and Pope Adrian, discussed the question most maturely, and defined: “That pictures and images are set up in Churches and other places, that, at the sight of them,

But such things are stumbling-blocks to those only whose minds are darkened: that darkness may

the faithful may remember what they represent: and that the honour paid to images passes to the archetypes or things represented, so that he who reveres the image, reveres the person it represents."—(*Act VI.*) It approves, consequently, of the expression of Leontius, Bishop of Napoli, in the island of Cyprus: "When you see Christians adore the cross, know that they pay their adoration to Jesus Christ crucified, and not to the wood." And as the word *adoration* is a general expression, applying to God, the angels, the person of the emperors, and their statues, to animate and even inanimate things, as well-informed persons of all parties admit, the council distinguishes the adoration due to God alone, from that which may be rendered to other objects: it calls the first, *adoration of latria*, and confines it to God alone: the latter, which is paid to images, it calls *salutation, and relative and inferior honour*, which passes to the original; but which is ever distinct from the worship of *latria*, which belongs exclusively to the divine nature."—(*Ibid.* p. 283.)

The term *adoration* is more freely used when speaking of the crucifix or the cross, because, in both cases, the reference to the Deity is immediate. The literal signification of the word is "to apply the hand to the mouth;" it is several times used in Scripture to express either the supreme worship given to the Deity alone, or an inferior honour given to man: because it is not the action which measures the degree of honour, but the intention with which it is performed. Examples in point may be seen in the article on Adoration in the Abbé Bergier's *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, an excellent work of reference in all difficult and

proceed only from ignorance ; that ignorance from prejudice ; and that prejudice from the erroneous impressions of our youth : and however pardonable it may be in some cases, yet it becomes our bounden duty to dispel it by the light of reason, and by the more invigorated powers of the understanding. But it is always most unjust and uncharitable for persons, with minds prepared for exaggerated impressions, to pass judgment upon questions on which they are quite incompetent to decide for want of information ; and still more so to publish those judgments to the world : thereby inflaming the passions of men, and giving weight to that mass of prejudice which already exists in so lamentable a degree in this country, against the most numerous, the most enlightened, but most calumniated body of Christians in the universe : and this too,

controverted questions. The term *worship* is used both by Protestants and by Catholics to express not only the supreme and sovereign homage due to God alone, but also the most inferior act of religious reverence, and even the most humble degree of civil dignity. In these two latter significations it is used in the marriage service, and as the title of honour for aldermen, mayors, and inferior public officers. Let not, then, offence be taken if the word *worship* be sometimes applied to the Virgin Mary and the saints ; for whenever it is thus employed, we may rest assured that it only means that degree of reverence which may be lawfully given to creatures, in accordance with the will of the Creator.

when a little research would have exhibited these matters in their true light, and would have shewn *that* to be a pious practice, agreeable both to reason and revelation, which is now first of all misrepresented, and then stigmatized as superstitious and idolatrous. It is surely beyond endurance that every thing should be calculated upon the impressions of prejudice ; and that, from the most liberal and most learned, as well as from the most bigoted and most ignorant, we should hear of nothing but the *absurdities* and *impositions* of the Catholic religion.^(f)

^(f) Speaking of the conduct of the people towards a supposed miraculous image in the Pantheon, in 1817, Mr. Hobhouse, in his learned researches into the Antiquities of Rome, observes :—

“ The veneration for a miraculous image which has lately crowded the Rotunda, has not bettered the condition of the pavement ; nor does it help the general effect of the interior prospect, to be aware that we see exactly the same *idolatry* which was practised in the same spot sixteen centuries ago. A philosopher may smile, but a less indifferent spectator is shocked at the inexplicable credulity which stares in the stedfast faces of a hundred worshippers, seated in chairs for hours before the image, in the wish—the hope—the certainty—of some indication of omnipotence from the dirty cobweb-covered block which has been *preferred into divinity*.”

Now, leaving the *credulity* to be dealt with as it may deserve, I certainly must exonerate these individuals from the heavy charge of *idolatry* here brought against them.

Every doctrine, practice, and ceremony of our Church is too often seen through the same distorted

Had Mr. Hobhouse, whom I most sincerely admire as the steady and uncompromising advocate of civil and religious liberty, employed the same spirit of research in respect to the grounds of the religious tenets of the Romans, as he has done in support of his reasons for and against the identity of the various and interesting antiquities of their capital, it is impossible that his acute and penetrating mind should not have discovered enough to have divested him of all predisposition to judge so hastily and so wrongfully of his neighbour, as he most assuredly has done in this instance: and had he, with this knowledge, applied himself to the particular case before him, I am quite satisfied, that he would have felt as convinced as I do, that no imputation of idolatry could be borne out. Whether any miracle was to be seen in the image is a different question, and depends solely upon the evidence of the senses; but supposing that there was, that miracle was not attributed to the statue, but to the omnipotent power of Him who gave efficacy to the brazen serpent in the wilderness—to the shadow of St. Peter—to the handkerchiefs which had touched the body of St. Paul—and to numerous animate and *inanimate* objects, in every period of sacred history. No divine attribute was imagined to exist in the statue—no worship was paid—no efficacy was attributed to it: it was supposed, and in all probability by over-heated imaginations, that the Almighty had made use of it to express in a supernatural manner, either his displeasure or his satisfaction upon some particular occasion, or to add one more to the many miraculous attesta-

medium; but, happily for the cause of Christianity, to the eyes of the sincere inquirer, the darkness by which she is enveloped, is as quickly and as completely dispelled by the light of truth, as are the shadows of night before the dawning of the day.

IV. From the idolatry of the Invocation of Saints, and the use of images, the oath now leads us to consider the grand accusation of idolatry against Catholics, as *the worshippers of bread and wine in the sacrifice of the Mass*. We are called upon “solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, to profess, testify, and declare, that we *do believe* that the sacrifice of the Mass, as now used

tions in favour of the religion of Rome. That Catholics are often predisposed to lend too easy a belief to miracles, is unquestionably the case: it arises from a firm, unhesitating faith in the truth of their religion. Under this impression, they are necessarily more inclined to look for supernatural testimonials in its favour, and to receive them with but little investigation. This, however, is not the case when they undergo the scrutinizing test recommended by the Council of Trent, and which is resorted to on all occasions before a miracle is officially announced to have taken place.

It is by such unfortunate misapprehensions as the one here noticed, that false impressions are produced upon the minds of the people of England respecting *the religion of Ireland*, and the cause of religious liberty is unintentionally impeded.

in the Church of Rome, is superstitious and idolatrous."—Whereas, I do solemnly and sincerely declare, and am ready to do so with God for my witness, that I most firmly and steadfastly *believe* that the sacrifice of the Mass, as now used in the Church of Rome, was instituted by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as a perpetual commemoration of his death and passion; and that, far from being either superstitious or idolatrous, it is a sacrifice of propitiation, most pleasing and acceptable to the Almighty, who absolutely requires it from the hands of his ministers. Independently of the authority of the Church, I believe it from the following view of the question, which I shall state in as cursory a manner as possible.

In almost the earliest periods of Sacred History, we read of the sacrifice of *bread and wine* offered by Melchisedec, the priest of the Most High; this, together with the feast of unleavened bread, was emblematical of the matter and form, while the chief sacrifice of the law of Moses, the Paschal Lamb, was a type of the essence and substance, of that great sacrifice which was once offered up upon the altar of the cross, and has been ever since perpetuated in the continual commemoration of that event, ordained by our Redeemer himself; a commemoration which so distinctly verifies the prophecy of Malachias, delivered so many years

before. *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts, [addressing himself to the stiff-necked and reprobate Jews,] neither will I accept an offering at your hands. For, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a clean offering.*^(f) We see how this sacrifice was offered, and in what manner its institution was understood, by the Apostles, immediately after the death and resurrection of our Saviour. *As they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, say the Acts of the Apostles, (xiii. 2.) the Holy Ghost said to them, &c.—Again, The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? and the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?*^(g) These, and many other texts of the inspired writings, point out the practice, and innumerable testimonials of the first ages of the Church mark the interpretation which it bore; and it has ever since continued, and ever will continue (for the word of God *shall not pass away*^(h)) a perpetual commemoration of that great peace-offering, in propitiation for the sins of mankind, the passion and death of our Saviour, and a striking and complete verification of the above pointed and remark-

^(f) *Malach. i. 10-11.*

^(g) *1 Cor. x. 16.*

^(h) *St. Luke, xxi. 33.*

able prophecy, and, without which, no accomplishment of it is to be found. Though Protestants have retained the symbols of bread and wine, and, in one sense, use them as a commemoration of the death of our Redeemer (though this but seldom), yet Catholics alone (the Greek and Eastern schismatics included, who believe in Transubstantiation as well as ourselves) continue to offer them in the way of sacrifice. As sacrifice is a homage which we never pay but to God alone, so also is it an essential mark of that supreme and sovereign duty which we owe to the Omnipotent Author of the creation; and from the very first existence of man upon earth, it has ever formed a principal part of the worship which heaven required at his hands: and yet protestantism has abolished it.⁽ⁱ⁾

⁽ⁱ⁾ Cain and Abel offered to God the fruits of the earth and animals. *Gen.* iv. 3, 4.

Noah, also, when he quitted the ark, immediately erected an altar, and offered thereon to the Lord of all things, a holocaust of clean animals. *Gen.* viii. 20.

Under the old law there were three distinct species of sacrifice: 1st. *The Holocaust*, which was entirely consumed by fire, to signify the complete and unreserved homage due to the Sovereignty of Heaven; 2nd. *The Victim for sin*, which was always united to the Holocaust, and was divided into three parts; one being consumed upon the altar, the second burnt beyond the precincts of the camp, and the third eaten by the priests; 3d. *The propitiatory sacrifices*, offered either in thanksgiving to

Under the Old law, 32,000 Levites were appointed to serve in the Temple of Jerusalem, and the sacrifices were offered with music. Four lambs were offered for a holocaust; two in the morning, and two in the evening; and this was called the *Perpetual sacrifice*. On sabbath days and festivals, the sacrifices were multiplied.

Under the Christian dispensation, the Sacrifice of the Mass has succeeded to the Sacrifices of the Temple of Jerusalem; indeed the latter were emblematical of the former, which now constitutes that universal and perpetual *Clean Offering*, foretold in those very times.

Notwithstanding the ample manner in which the subject has been already treated, of such high importance do I feel it to be to justify ourselves in the eyes of our fellow Christians from the very gross imputations heaped upon us, on account of our belief in Transubstantiation, and in the Sacri-

God for past favours, or to implore fresh blessings: of these not only the priests, but also the people, partook.

The sacrifice of the New law unites within itself all the three distinct sacrifices of the old: it is a Holocaust, a Victim for sin, and a Propitiatory sacrifice; fulfilling in reality, in the most sublime and perfect manner, all that was represented in figure before the coming of Christ and the consummation of the redemption of mankind, to which great event every particle of the ancient law was directed, and for which it was so obvious a preparation.

fice of the Mass—imputations which go to class us with the Idolaters of China and Hindostan—that I will insert an able and learned argument from the pen of a late venerable prelate of the Roman Catholic Church,^(k) which will, I trust, be found not only to elucidate the points at issue, but fully to establish the grounds of our belief in these mysterious doctrines.

“ But if,” says he, “ abstracting from the infallible authority of the Catholic Church, this question of fact, whether the Sacrifice of the Mass instituted by Christ as the sacrifice of his body and blood, really present under the appearances of bread and wine, be made a matter of historical inquiry, the truth of it may be easily ascertained by the evidence of historical testimony. The establishment of Christianity in all countries was a great public fact. The establishment of Christianity consisted in the establishment of the belief and profession of the doctrines, and of the reception and observance of the precepts and institutions of Christ. Every Christian will surely give credit to the Apostles for having introduced into all countries where they established Christianity, the very same doctrines, precepts, and institutions, that they had received from Christ himself. The Apostles could all say what St. Paul said of him-

(k) The Right Rev. Dr. Poynter.

self, when he shewed the Corinthians what authority he had for instructing them in the doctrine of the Eucharist: 'I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered to you.' (1 *Cor.* xi. 23.)

“ As there could be no contradiction or inconsistency in what they received from Christ, the Apostles must have uniformly delivered and established the *same* in all places. Hence, by ascertaining what religious doctrines and institutions were uniformly taught and established in all nations by the Apostles, or by Apostolic teachers instructed and sent by them, we come to the certain knowledge of the doctrines and institutions of Christ. What those were which were uniformly delivered and established by the Apostles in all nations where they established Christianity, may be shewn by historical evidences, attesting what religious doctrines and sacred rites have constantly and uniformly been professed and observed through all ages from the beginning, by all Christian Churches founded by the Apostles, or by men deriving their mission from the Apostolic authority. So that, if, on inquiry, it be found that the same religious doctrines and ordinances have been uniformly professed and observed in all Christian countries, for eighteen, or, at least, were for fifteen centuries, and that no later origin of the introduction of these doctrines and ordinances can be assigned, than the first establishment of Christianity

in those countries, in some of which it was established by the Apostles themselves, surely this must be admitted as a most convincing proof that these doctrines and ordinances are the same as the Apostles delivered, and as they had received from Christ himself.

“ If at any period of the Jewish state, proof had been called for to shew that the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb was instituted by the authority of God, on the eve of the passage of the Israelites out of Egypt, as a constant memorial of that miraculous event, and of the circumstances attending it, would not the historical evidence of the annual oblation of the Paschal sacrifice in the Jewish church, the uninterrupted observance of which rite might be traced back to the time of Moses, serve as an authentic and undeniable testimony of the origin and end of its institution? If it were required to shew that the sacrament of baptism was instituted by Christ for the remission of sin, and for the other spiritual effects which it is believed to produce; most undoubtedly the uniform and universal practice observed in all Christian churches, in all countries, and in all ages, from the first establishment of Christianity in those countries, of administering baptism as a sacred rite ordained by Christ for those spiritual effects, would be admitted as a strong and legitimate proof, that this sacrament originated in the institution and com-

mand of Christ himself. And this ancient and universal practice of all Christian churches, would have the force of an authentic decision of the true meaning of the words of Christ, related in scripture, concerning the necessity of baptism by water, for the remission of sin. Could the origin or meaning of any civil law be better shewn, than by the uniform practice of the judges and magistrates in enforcing the observance of it, from the period at which it is supposed to have been made?

“ If, therefore, it can be historically shewn, that the Sacrifice of the Mass, as the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, really present under the appearances of bread and wine, had been constantly and universally offered in all Christian churches, in all countries, and in all ages, from the first establishment of Christianity in those countries, to the time of Luther in the sixteenth century; it will be established as an historical fact, that the Sacrifice of the Mass was introduced by the apostles into all countries where they established Christianity, and consequently that it was received by them from Christ, no less than the Sacrament of Baptism, or any other doctrine or institution of the Christian religion. This can be shewn by the evidence of historical testimony.

“ It is an historical fact, that when Luther first began to abolish the practice of offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, in the year 1534, this sacrifice

was then universally offered as the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ really present under the appearances of bread and wine, by all Christian churches of every denomination in the world; not only by those which were in communion with the see of Rome, and which are spread more or less over all nations; but by those, which for many centuries had been separated from its communion; by the Greek schismatical church, and by all the various sects of the Nestorians, Eutychians, and other heretical churches spread over Asia and part of Africa. That the Sacrifice of the Mass was at that period offered in all churches throughout the world, which were in communion with the See of Rome, will not be denied. That it was offered at that time, by the schismatical and heretical churches alluded to, will be shewn by proper testimonies. It has, indeed, been acknowledged by Protestant writers of the first respectability.

“ It is also an historical fact, that the constant and universal practice of offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, as the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ really present under the appearances of bread and wine, may be so far traced back in all those Christian churches, in every country, from the sixteenth century to the earliest ages; that no later origin can be assigned of this religious practice, than the first establishment of Christianity in those countries.

“ It may be observed that none of those schismatical or heretical churches mentioned above, had derived any religious doctrine or rite from the Church of Rome, since the period of their separation from the faith and communion of the Apostolic See; and, consequently, that the Christian doctrines or rites which they held in the sixteenth century, in common with the Church of Rome, were held by both before the period of the separation. Hence the testimony of the Greek schismatical church, and of the other schismatical and heretical churches in Asia and Africa, concerning the antiquity and divine institution of the Sacrifice of the Mass, cannot be suspected as given in favour of the Church of Rome, but must be admitted as strong evidence of fact.

“ The attempts which were made by some Lutherans and Calvinists in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, to engage the Greek schismatics in the East to adopt the doctrines of the Reformation, and particularly to reject the Sacrifice of the Mass, drew from the Greek bishops the most solemn attestations of the practice of their churches, the most explicit professions of their ancient doctrines, and the most energetic condemnations of the innovations, both in doctrine and practice, introduced by the reformers of religion, in the sixteenth century. Relative to the Sacrifice of the Mass, the following declarations were made by

the first ecclesiastical authorities of the different schismatical churches in the East.

“The Eutychnian Patriarch of the Armenians published the doctrine and practice of the Eutychnian churches, in a solemn act, dated Aleppo, May 1, 1668 : ‘We adore,’ says he, ‘with supreme worship, Jesus Christ, who is hidden in the Holy Eucharist, and, *we offer*, in the *Holy Sacrifice*, for the remission of the sins of the living and the dead, the same body which was crucified, and the same blood which was shed for us on Mount Calvary.’

“The Nestorian patriarch, Joseph, and his clergy, in a public attestation, given at Diarbec, in the year 1669, thus express their condemnation of the doctrines falsely imputed to the Nestorian Churches by the Calvinists, and also their profession of the doctrine held by those churches concerning the Real Presence, Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Mass : ‘We have learnt with extreme astonishment that a certain son of Satan, of the French nation, (they speak of the minister Claude,) has dared to offer an atrocious injury to the Oriental Church, by falsely charging it with not believing, and not receiving, the great mystery of the sacred oblation. We firmly believe, that after the words of Jesus Christ, which the priest pronounces by the authority which he has received from heaven, the substance of bread is changed

into the substance of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the substance of wine is changed into the substance of his precious blood, so that nothing remains of the bread and wine, but their accidents. We *offer* this holy body, which was crucified for us, and this blood, which was shed for many and for us; *i. e.* for the living and the dead, for the remission of their sins.'

“Seven schismatical Greek archbishops, who were assembled at Constantinople, on the 18th July, 1671, attested the doctrine of their churches, by this solemn declaration: ‘That the Eucharist is a *sacrifice* for the living and the dead, instituted by Jesus Christ, and delivered to us by the Apostles.’

“It is therefore an historical fact, that at the time of the Protestant reformation, by Luther and Calvin, not only the Greek schismatical Church, but the heretical Churches in Asia and Africa, of which the Nestorians and Eutychians are the leading sects, admitted and offered the sacrifice of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, really present under the appearances of bread and wine. From whom did they receive this doctrine and this sacred rite? Not from the Church of Rome, from which they had received no rite of religion, no tradition, no doctrine, since the distant period of their separation from its communion. The Mass was, therefore, admitted as the common Christian sacrifice, by the

Greek schismatical Church before the year 890; by the Eutychians, before the year 451; and by the Nestorians before 431: the periods of their separation from the communion of the Church of Rome. Indeed, we see that the seven Greek Archbishops cited above, declared; ‘That the Eucharist is *a sacrifice* for the living and the dead, *instituted by Jesus Christ, and delivered to us by the Apostles.*’ The doctrine of the Nestorians and Eutychians concerning the sacrifice of the Mass, which is the same on this point as the doctrine of all other ancient Christian Churches, was not invented by Nestorius, nor by Eutyches, when they began to teach their heretical doctrines against other articles of the Christian creed; but this doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass was the ancient doctrine of the Churches in which Nestorius and Eutyches were originally instructed in the Christian Faith.

“The above testimonies, which shew what was the doctrine and practice in the sixteenth century of the Greek, and of all the Christian Churches of Asia and Africa, which are separated from the communion of the Apostolic see, and which shew the high antiquity, even the divine origin, of that universal doctrine and practice of offering the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, really present under the appearances of bread and wine, cannot be suspected of partiality to the Church of

Rome, but must be received as evidences of historical truth.

“ But when we consider the universality and primitive antiquity of the uniform doctrine and practice of all Christian Churches in communion with the See of Rome, concerning the sacrifice of the Mass, as the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, really present under the appearances of bread and wine, what a collection of historical evidence is presented to us, demonstrating that this doctrine and practice were established by the Apostles, as the doctrine and institution of Christ, in all nations where they established Christianity! The most incontestable and irresistible proofs of this universal and primitive doctrine and practice, are found in the ancient Liturgies, or Missals, or books containing the form and order of divine worship, used in all Christian Churches, from the beginning of Christianity.

“ The holy fathers of the Church agree that the substance of these Liturgies, which is the same in all, was derived from the Apostles, and communicated by them to the Churches where they preached and established the religion of Christ. The first Liturgy was that which was formed and used by the Apostles, in the Church of Jerusalem, and which is sometimes called the Liturgy of St. James, the first bishop of that see; then the Liturgies of the Patriarchate Churches of Alexandria, called that

of St. Mark, of Antioch, and of Constantinople. These Liturgies were communicated to the Churches under those Patriarchates. The most sacred part of these Liturgies, the Canon, was not originally written, but was carefully committed to memory by the bishops and priests, as the Apostles' Creed was by the faithful. The Canon was not committed to writing till the fifth age, when the danger of exposing all that was most sacred in the mysteries of religion to the derision and blasphemy of infidels, was not so great as in the first three or four centuries. But when the Canon was generally committed to writing, it was found to be the same in substance in all Christian countries, which shewed the unity of its origin, in the unity of that faith which was every where taught by the Apostles. In all these ancient and primitive Liturgies, we find the clearest expressions and professions, made by priests and people, that the same body and blood of Christ, which were immolated on the cross, are offered to God in the Christian sacrifice, under the appearances of bread and wine, for the living and the dead; and that this same body and blood are really received in the Communion. In all these Liturgies, we read the most sublime hymns of praise and thanksgiving to God and Christ really present; acts of spiritual communication between the faithful on earth and the Saints in heaven; and prayers offered for the repose of the souls of those

who have departed this life in the faith and communion of the Church. Some short citations, from a few of the principal Liturgies, will shew the spirit of them all. They all profess that the Mass is the *sacrifice* of the *body and blood of Christ, really present, under the appearances of bread and wine.*

“ In the Liturgy of Jerusalem, after the form of the consecration of the bread and wine, the priest says, ‘ We *offer* to thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody *sacrifice.*’ Before the Communion, the priest, addressing his prayers to Jesus Christ, on the altar, says, ‘ O Lord, my God, may thy grace render me worthy to receive *thy sacred body* and *thy precious blood,* for the remission of my sins, and for life everlasting.’ In the Liturgy of Alexandria, which has been in use among the Cophtes or Eutyrians for about 1300 years, the Mass is called the ‘ *sacrifice* of benediction.’ In the prayer of the oblation of the bread and wine, the priest thus prays to Jesus Christ : ‘ *Change* them, so that this bread may become *thy sacred body,* and what is contained in the chalice, *thy precious blood.*’

“ In the Liturgy of Constantinople, the Mass is called a ‘ rational and unbloody *sacrifice.*’ The priest offers this prayer to Christ : ‘ O Jesus Christ, —our God,—thou who dwellest in heaven with the Father, and who art here invisibly with us, make us worthy to partake of *thy most pure body,*

and of thy precious blood, and to distribute it to thy people.'

“ In the Liturgy of the Syrians, it is called a ‘ propitiatory *sacrifice.*’ In the Syriac Liturgy, called of St. Maruthas, the priest prays, ‘ that this, which is mere bread, may be changed, and may become *the same body* that was immolated on the cross, the same body that was raised in glory, and did not see corruption; the body of the Word of God, of our Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.’ The people say, ‘ Amen.’ And that ‘ the wine, which is in the chalice, may be changed, and may become *the same blood* that was poured forth on the summit of Golgotha; the same blood that flowed on the earth and purified it from sin; the blood of the Lord himself, of the Word of God, of the Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and for life everlasting, to those who receive it.’

“ In the Armenian Liturgy, the priest, praying for the dead, says: ‘ Be mindful, O Lord, and having pity, be propitious to the souls of those who have departed this life, and particularly to that soul for which we offer this holy *sacrifice.*’ During the communion this canticle is sung: ‘ This bread is *the body of Christ*; this cup is *the blood of the New Testament.* The hidden Sacrament is manifested to us, and by it God shews himself to us. Here is Jesus Christ, the Word of God, who is

seated at the right hand of the Father. He is *sacrificed* in the midst of us.'

“The Roman Liturgy was brought to England by St. Augustin in the year 595; and in substance has been the common Liturgy of all the Latin Churches, from the time of their conversion to Christianity. It agrees with our Catholic Liturgy now in use, except in some accidental additions that have been made. In the Roman Liturgy, according to the Sacramentary of Pope Gelasius, written about the year 490, we find these words before the consecration: ‘We beseech thee, O Lord, in all things to bless, approve, ratify, sanction, and accept this oblation, that it may become *the body and blood of thy most beloved Son*, our Lord Jesus Christ.’ And after the consecration the priest says: ‘We *offer* unto thy supreme Majesty, of thy gifts bestowed upon us, a pure *victim*, a holy *victim*, an unspotted *victim*, the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation.’

“By the evidence of the ancient Liturgies, used by all Christian Churches in the world, previous to the change of religion by Luther and Calvin, in the sixteenth century, the uniform and universal religious practice of offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, as the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, really present under the appearances of bread and wine, may be traced back to the earliest ages of Christianity. No later date can be as-

signed of the introduction of this sacred rite, than the period of the introduction of Christianity itself, into those countries in which the Sacrifice of the Mass was received. The primitive practice and the divine institution of Baptism by water, are not more strongly attested than the antiquity of the practice of offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the primitive belief that this holy sacrifice was instituted by Christ himself. The Sacrament of Baptism, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, are both proposed to our belief by the same authority, as institutions of Christ, and both equally attested by the universal practice of all ages of the Christian Church. Both, therefore, ought to be received with the same certainty of faith by every Christian."

At the end of this volume^(a) will be found some of the authorities by which we deduce our doctrine upon these points, from the age of the Apostles, through the first five centuries of the Church, taken from that learned compilation, *The Faith of Catholics, confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the first five Centuries of the Church;*" and which may be taken as a specimen of the testimony we can produce in favour of each individual article of our faith. The authorities from the fifth century to the present time, are so copious that it

^(a) See APPENDIX, No. XI.

would be only a redundancy of proof to cite any of them; indeed it must be considered perfectly unnecessary so to do, since all Protestant writers agree, that if the Catholic creed of the present day can be proved to be conformable to that of the first four ages of the Church, the question of its authenticity must be considered as settled.

I trust that sufficient proof has now been offered in favour of the doctrine of Transubstantiation—of the real, undivided, and substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and in the Sacrifice of the Mass; and if Catholics are still to be accused of idolatry and superstition for their belief on these points, the accusation must, in the first place, be preferred against the Apostles themselves, and then be repeated against their descendants in the ministry, through every succeeding age, implicating the great mass of the whole Christian world.

But, admitting for a moment, for the sake of argument, that the immense majority of Christians have, for upwards of 1,800 years, been labouring under an egregious mistake, to what does this charge of idolatry amount? That we believe Christ to be where, in the opinion of Protestants, he is not! ‘This is the head and front of our offending.’ Not that we adore any false or supposititious divinity, but that we worship the one only true and living God, the Creator of heaven, of earth, and of all things, truly and substan-

tially present on our altars, though concealed under the sacramental veils of bread and wine; for it cannot be that we adore the *elements* of bread and wine, since the faith of Catholics is, that the elements no longer exist, but that they are totally and entirely changed into the body and blood, united with the soul and the divinity, of Christ. It is, therefore, only the true God whom we adore; and if we are mistaken, the adoration is equally directed to Him. The greatest possible extent of our error, therefore, can be, in believing God to be visibly present where he is not so.^(b)

(b) That colossus of literature, Dr. Johnson, speaking of the supposed idolatry of the Mass, is reported to have said: "Sir, there is no idolatry in the Mass; they [Catholics] believe God to be there, and they worship Him."* But in thus enlisting Dr. Johnson amongst the Protestant authorities in favour of many of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, I am fully aware to how little weight his opinions are entitled upon such subjects. Like all those, who are not united in their creed by one common principle of obedience to revelation and authority, he was unsettled in his religious belief, and totally incompetent to pronounce upon such matters, from want of information, which, great as his acquirements were, in other respects, he had never taken the trouble to obtain in these. I chiefly cite him as an honourable example of liberality, and as above the vulgar short-sighted prejudices so com-

* See the whole Dialogue, which does great credit to Johnson's liberality.

With such principles of Christianity as we profess, and such a steadfast faith as we hold in the articles of our belief, it can no longer be a matter of astonishment that Catholics cannot conscientiously swear that these doctrines of their Church, which we have just discussed, are either superstitious or idolatrous : and, I trust that enough has been said to show, that it ought to be the earnest desire of Christians of every denomination, to see so false and so odious a test wholly and entirely abolished. What, in the name of Heaven, has the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, the Invocation of Saints, or the Sacrifice of the Mass, to do with the imposing or collecting of the public taxes (which, notwithstanding, Catholics pay the same as others), with the propriety of applying the sinking fund to the exigencies of the state—with the liberation of Greece—with the game

mon in the present day ; and that too amongst persons who have enjoyed much better opportunities of divesting themselves of the errors of education, than he ever had. The same observations may, more or less, apply to all the other Protestant authorities, which, while they exhibit the vacillating nature of Protestant belief, serve also to prove how much more substantial it was in the days of her earliest and most learned divines, than are the shallow and unmeaning doctrines to which it has been frittered and explained away, by subsequent teachers in their Church.

laws—or indeed with the regulation of any part of our economy, either foreign or domestic? Though no encomium was thought fitting in the speech from the throne, the nation has been loud in its just and heartfelt praises on the heroes of the glorious and brilliant victory of Navarin :—and I will challenge even a Peel to say, if it has ever once flashed upon his mind, that the laurels so nobly won by admiral de Rigny, were less bright because that gallant officer believes in Transubstantiation, and in the spiritual supremacy of the Pope? that admiral Heiden's were blighted by the Invocation of Saints? or that Sir Edward Codrington's were the more glorious, because, like a true Protestant, as we must suppose him to be, he looks upon these partners of his victory as idolaters? Away, then, with the folly and hypocrisy of those who would taint the merits of the valiant and the virtuous, because they believe in the purest and the oldest doctrines of Christianity; doctrines which we prove to have been revealed from heaven, but which a new and persecuting church has erroneously conceived it to be her policy to stigmatize as superstitious and idolatrous! If they *will* exclude Catholics from parliament, let them invent a Test for the purpose, which shall not be a libel on the memory of those ancestors, of whom Englishmen are so fond of boasting,—that shall not be a gross insult upon one hundred millions of the people of Europe, and

twenty millions of the people of America, all, and without exception, the allies of this country;— a Test which, while it ceases to defame those who refuse it, will not risk to wound the consciences of those who take it.^(c)

^(c) I trust I have given the true construction of that part of the oath which calls upon us to declare, that there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements, &c. *in the sense in which it is commonly understood by ENGLISH Protestants.* I have taken these words to refer to that tenet of Protestantism, be it what it may, which has been substituted for that doctrine of the Catholic Church, of which Transubstantiation forms a distinctive feature. If the oath were meant as a mere condemnation or rejection of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, why did it not say so in plain, simple, and unequivocal terms? Why add, “in the sense in which they [the words of the oath] are commonly understood by English Protestants,” unless it were meant to pledge us to the belief of that which English Protestants commonly hold as an article of their faith? If I have mistaken the meaning of the oath, I trust it is from the want of perspicuity and precision in the oath itself. But surely this very circumstance is but another objection against it. We allow that the terms of an oath are not always to be canvassed, and cavilled at too minutely; but the sense in which the oath is taken must be *clearly* understood, and *by no means be contradicted by the oath itself.* There must be a perfect understanding between the parties as to its *real* meaning. Now, if it be contended that the oath in question is so loose, vague, and indeterminate, that, its object being merely to exclude Catholics,

V. Let us now proceed to Other Reasons which must for ever prevent a Catholic from conscientiously conforming to the Established Church, or to any other system of Protestantism.

In the *First* place, then, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because, as the Scriptures do not contain *all* things whatsoever Christ commanded his Apostles to *teach*,^(d) Protestants are not authorized in holding them forth as our *only* rule of faith, our *only* teacher. We know that *there are also many other things which Jesus did* [and of course said]; *which if they were written every one, the world itself would not be able to contain the books that*

from parliament, it is not meant to bind the consciences of men, in any other respect; we meet with difficulties at every point. In almost every part of it, we find, not merely a negation of opinions, but an absolute and solemn asseveration of the truth of others, stated in plain and intelligible terms. Out of four distinct propositions of which the oath consists, there is but one that savours of any ambiguity; and this, I contend, does but make it the worse, unaccompanied, as it is, by any explanation. Such an evasion, as I have supposed, of the plain and positive terms in which it is couched, would only subject the individual who alleged it, to the guilt of a total disregard of the solemnity of an oath, and of calling the Almighty to bear witness to the truth of assertions, which, with the sacred volume in his hand, he was making with his lips, but from which his mind dissented.

(d) *St. Matt.* xxviii. 19, 20.

should be written.^(e) We know that St. Peter *testified with very many other words*^(f) than those which were committed to writing; and St. John also informs his disciples that, *having more things to write to them, he would not by paper and ink, for he hoped he should soon be with them, and speak face to face.*^(g)

Though numerous other instances of similar declarations^(h) are to be found in the sacred writings, yet with such a knowledge of the rich treasures which fell from the lips of our Saviour and his Apostles, Protestants argue as if they considered that nothing more was worthy of preservation but what was recorded, at a considerable distance of time, in the New Testament. What reason have we to suppose, that the doctrines which we hold by tradition, were not those which were preached by our Saviour, but omitted by the sacred penmen? Because the Scriptures are silent, are we to conclude that Christ was so too? It is nowhere said that those Scriptures were composed for the purpose of containing a regular code of faith: they were written to edify, instruct, and exhort—not to be a sole and independent guide in

^(e) *St. John* xxi. 25. ^(f) *Acts*, ii. 40. ^(g) *2 St. John*, 12.

^(h) Christ *shewed himself alive after his passion, by many proofs, for forty days appearing to them* [his apostles and disciples], *and SPEAKING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.*—*Acts*, i. 3.

matters of doctrine: to confirm, rather than to define, our faith. There are clearly other sources of historical evidence than written documents. If it pleased our Saviour to inspire the writers of the New Testament, (and which we do not know to have been the case from the Scriptures themselves, save in regard to the Apocalypse, though, indeed, many parts may be said to bear internal evidence of the hand of God,) so it has pleased him to guard uninjured and unbroken, by his particular providence, a chain of traditionary evidence. Is it not as easy for the Almighty, by a peculiar superintendance of his Providence, to preserve the purity of his doctrine inviolate through the lapse of ages, as it was to inspire illiterate fishermen to preach that doctrine in the first instance? If Christ could inspire men to write and to preach, can he not equally inspire them, when sitting in judgment, relative to the verdict ~~which~~ they are to pronounce? It is this superintendance of his Providence which has transmitted to us that part of his holy law which was not written, and which we reverence and obey equally with that which was, because both proceed from the same authority—the authority of God.

Though the Protestant Church rejects the doctrine of tradition, yet, amongst her numberless inconsistencies, she grounds a part of her creed upon it; namely, the sanctification of the Sunday,

the validity of infant baptism, and indeed, the ground-work of all her belief, the authenticity and inspiration of her sole, independent rule of faith, the canonical books of the New Testament.⁽ⁱ⁾ For it is traditionary evidence alone that can possibly prove, in most cases, the inspiration, and, in all, ~~parts~~ the authenticity and integrity of the Scriptures. At one period, the Gospels according to Peter, Thomas, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthias, the twelve Apostles, and a variety of other spurious works, were in circulation among Christians, and how, but by the authority of the Church, and the evidence of tradition, were they to be detected amongst the genuine productions of the inspired disciples of Christ? In her xxixth article, the Church of England quotes St. Augustine for his opinion, and yet she rejects his evidence on other

⁽ⁱ⁾ See *Strictures on Dr. Marsh's Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome*, by Dr. Lingard.—Booker, 1815. If you refer to the testimony of history for the inspiration of the New Testament, you must also refer to history for a proof of your independent rule of faith, for that certainly is not to be found in Scripture. Where are we to look for the evidence of the Fathers on this point, or to substantiate any other of the novelties of Protestantism? Have we ever seen a work entitled, “The Faith of Protestants proved by Scripture, and confirmed by the testimony of the Fathers, and the evidence of the first five centuries of the Church?”

points.^(k) If he be worthy of belief in one case, the circumstances being the same, equal credit is due to him in others. But this she refuses, and not only to him, but to all who, like him, are the most fit to guide us in such inquiries, and to make us most intimately acquainted with the belief and doctrines of the Catholic Church, during the first ages of Christianity. Yet do we find men who, in the nineteenth century, would know the feelings and opinions of the Apostles better than their

(k) In the Book of Homilies, St. Augustine is styled "*the best learned of all ancient doctors,*" and in the Book of Common Prayer, and in the sworn Articles of the Church of England, he is enrolled among the Saints! Yet this St. Augustine not only upheld the primacy of St. Peter, but declared schism to be the greatest of all crimes, as it was the greatest of all evils, and the most diametrically opposed to the great and essential attribute of God, *unity*: yet St. Augustine is the saint of schismatics, and is cited as the best learned of all ancient doctors, by a Church which calls heaven to witness that schism is no crime, and the primacy of St. Peter but a fable! St. Augustine was also a believer in Transubstantiation; he offered the sacrifice of the mass; he honoured and invoked the Virgin Mary and the Saints; he prayed for the souls of his departed brethren; he did all that the Head of the Church of England, together with her clergy and her people, now swear to be superstitious and idolatrous;—yet does he rank among them as a Saint, enjoying the honourable appellation of the "best learned of all ancient doctors!!" Was ever folly and imposture like this?

companions and contemporaries ; and who, at this remote period, would have us take *their* word in preference to those who were living witnesses of the faith and practice of primitive times. It is, indeed, not to be imagined with what reason, or justice, the evidence of such a constellation of the brightest luminaries of the Christian world, as the Fathers of the first ages of the Church is refused. How is it possible that any deception can be practised, when we rely on the testimony of men the most virtuous and the most learned, of every age, and of every country, not only divided by distance of space, but by distance of time, yet all concurring in the same opinions ; men who could have no object in deceiving, but whose only aim was the elucidation of truth, and the maintenance of the Christian religion in its native purity ? They could have no object in deceiving, for, unlike the Reformers of the sixteenth century, they inculcated a just obedience to authority, instead of an emancipation from it. They preached penance and mortification, instead of laxity of morals and criminal indulgence. Their very unanimity is a proof of the rule they followed, and of the protection of heaven in thereby exempting them from the errors and contradictions inseparable from the human mind, when endeavouring to judge for itself upon points above the ordinary capacity and comprehension of man. In rejecting tradition, a train of

evidence is denied, calculated most infallibly to establish any facts or any opinions to be drawn from the testimony of man; and such demonstrative proofs are refused, as we should be ashamed to disown for the establishment of a point of history, or a matter of inquiry in any other cause. We do not rely upon the Fathers as the infallible oracles of the word of God; we quote them only as proofs of the doctrines of the Church in their own times: in this light their evidence is most conclusive and unexceptionable, and, as such, they form a most invaluable traditional history.

We have, at the same time, Scripture evidence to prove, that it was ordained by Christ that much of his doctrine should be handed down to us by tradition. Tradition gives us the sense, at the same time that it proves the authenticity and inspiration, of the sacred writings; and as Catholics alone have existed in all ages, so Catholics alone have the tradition of all ages in their favour. St. Paul says to the Corinthians; *Keep my ordinances as I delivered them to you:*⁽¹⁾ to the Thessalonians; *Brethren, stand fast, and hold the Traditions, which you have learned by word, or by our Epistle:*^(m) to Timothy; *Hold the form of sound words which thou hast heard from me in faith, and in the love, which is in Christ Jesus:*⁽ⁿ⁾ and again;

(1) 1 Cor. xi. 2.

(m) 2 Thess. ii. 14.

(n) 2 Tim. i. 13.

And the things, which thou hast heard of me before many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also.^(o)

With such Scripture authority for tradition, surely we are justified in contending, that, if a doctrine ~~was~~^{were} known to have prevailed in a district which had been converted to Christianity by the preaching of the Apostles, and if the same doctrine ~~was~~^{were} prevalent in all other districts, under similar circumstances, that *that doctrine must have been derived from them, and is clearly an apostolical tradition.*^(p) Hence, it formed an article of Catholic

^(o) 2 Tim. ii. 2.

^(p) Besides many other Protestant authorities to this point, we have that of Dr. Waterland, which I quote from the Bishop of Strasbourg's learned *Answer to the Difficulties of Romanism*. "It was highly unreasonable to suppose," says Dr. Waterland, "that those several churches, very distant from each other in place, and of different languages, should all unite in the same errors, and deviate uniformly from their rule at once. But that they should all agree in the same common faith, might easily be accounted for, as arising from the same common cause, which could be no other than the common delivery of the same uniform faith and doctrine to all the churches by the apostles themselves. Such unanimity could never come by chance, but must be derived from one common source; and, therefore, the harmony of their doctrine was in itself a pregnant argument of the truth of it."

Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, p. 372.

faith, as much as if it had been detailed in the Sacred Writings. Throughout the Holy Scriptures there is constant mention of a command to *teach*, but never to write: preaching was the grand method of diffusing Christianity; writing was only an auxiliary and subordinate means. Christianity had been widely spread before any part of the New Testament was written, and, still more so, before it obtained any general circulation. Yet Protestants maintain, that what was written is *alone* to be attended to; that teaching and preaching are of no avail, unless that which was taught and preached was forthwith committed to writing: they argue as if St. Paul had said: "Hold fast the doctrine which you have learnt by our Epistle; but that which we have preached by word of mouth, heed it not."⁽⁹⁾

It is every day vauntingly and ostentatiously asserted that *the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the*

⁽⁹⁾ If we attend to the circumstances under which the New Testament was written, we shall immediately see that it never could have been intended as a regular and exclusive code of faith, a statute book, as it were, of the laws and ordinances of Christ, and, through him, of his apostles. In proof of this, see APPENDIX, No. XII. for a short historical analysis of the contents of the New Testament, with which I have been favoured by a learned and reverend friend.

rule of faith, and the religion of Protestants ;^(r) while the reflection of a moment will serve to dissipate this vain and idle illusion, by calling upon them to prove their right of possession, and the validity of this their great, eternal, and all-sufficient charter. Their right of possession is only the right of violence and conquest; for, till their great rebellion against the constitutions of God and the government of the Church, in the 16th century, when they forcibly wrested the sacred deposit from the hands to which it had been so long entrusted by its Divine Author, they possessed it not. But no sooner did they obtain it, than they sacrilegiously profaned it by mutilations, additions, and interpolations, so that the first fruit of their usurpation was an impious violation of that very law, to be ruled by which, as they asserted, they had incurred the guilt of apostacy and rebellion; a law, by which they have ever since sworn, in contradiction to its letter and its spirit, that it is good for every purpose but that for which it was evidently intended,—that it was pure and unadulterated, when they themselves had corrupted it,—that it was clear

(r) If the Bible alone, without note or comment, be the religion of Protestants, what need have they of Articles of Faith, of Catechisms, of Priests, of Bishops, or of any part of the complicated machinery of the Establishment? Surely not for the administration of two Sacraments!

and explicit, when they allow it still to tell us that it is *hard to be understood*, and easily *wrested to our own destruction*. They would have us to believe it to be equally the advocate of dissension, as of unity; because it was by the legions of dissension that they first invaded that stronghold of unity which, terrified at the consequences of their own presumption and violence, they have ever since vainly endeavoured to reconstruct upon new principles and insufficient foundations:—they would have us to acknowledge that this their law and charter was equally valid for belief and unbelief; because in obtaining it, they had poisoned that source from which alone a steadfast faith could be derived;—they would have us to violate every principle of reason and of revelation, by subjecting ourselves to a law which they proclaim to be immutable, eternal, and divine, the moment they have illegally obtained possession thereof; which, while it was in the keeping of its own promulgators and administrators, they despised, contemned, and rejected. The fundamental maxim of this great charter is obedience to the authority from which we have received it; while those who have now surreptitiously adopted it, not content with spurning the authority of their ancient legislators, demand us to transfer to innovators and usurpers that obedience, which a legitimate and established government can alone command.

Having, therefore, no right of possession but that of unlawful seizure, it is not surprising that doubts should have arisen among them upon the quality and value of their spoil. Ashamed to decide in a manner that would pass judgment upon themselves, by declaring that they found it in a sound and unadulterated state, they exercise their fancy, certainly not their judgment, in adopting one part and in rejecting another, without asserting any sufficient reason for so doing. While they pretend to receive only those portions “of the Old and New Testament of whose authority *there was never any doubt in the Church,*” it is notorious that they have received many the validity of which has frequently been questioned. They declare the law to have been enacted, so that it should interpret and decide for itself in all matters both moral and doctrinal, while it is manifest that much of this law has altogether disappeared. They say that the Scripture, and the Scripture alone, is their religion; while much of that Scripture has been lost, and consequently much of their religion with it. Upon *their* principles we have a right to presume this, and we defy them to disprove it, till they can recover those Sybil leaves, collect every fragment which has been scattered in the winds, and restore the phoenix from its ashes. Till they can accomplish this,—till they can work a greater miracle than

has ever yet been performed, they can never prove that the Scriptures are a great charter from heaven for the sole and independent guide and government of Christians in the important affair of the salvation of man. Much less, upon their principles, can they tell us what portion of these writings are genuine and authentic, and what are not. Surely, it must require more than the judgment of man to determine, especially after a controversy of 1,500 years, and when all traces of the *original* documents have been lost, what is, and what is not, the inspiration of heaven, and the true unadulterated version. Whatever the Almighty has inspired, must be received without doubt or hesitation as such; and which can never be the case as long as there is any insufficiency in the evidence; which insufficiency having so long and so notoriously existed, we must naturally look to some more decisive and unquestionable testimony. What Heaven has revealed, Heaven must own, sanction, and interpret. The very doubt of this inspiration is alone sufficient to disqualify the law itself for this purpose, and to contravene its authority. If the Scriptures alone were the law, that law never could have been questioned amongst those who were destined to obey its mandates, and whose submission it was to command. The first quality we should look for in a law which is to act and interpret for itself, is clearness, precision,

fullness, and authenticity ; but above all, a certain knowledge that we really possess the law which is to be our rule. Now, if it can be proved, and unquestionably it can, not only that a considerable portion of this law is obscure, difficult, and in appearance contradictory, but even that many portions of it have never descended to us, its insufficiency is manifestly established, and we must seek for some other medium of communication between God and man.^(s)

^(s) The 6th of the xxxix Articles, which declares that the “ Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation ” (but which is positively contradicted by the doctrine and the practice of the Church of England in making it an essential obligation of Christianity to keep holy the Sunday instead of the Sabbath—(an alteration which is nowhere even hinted at in the sacred writings), goes on to say, that “ in the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and of the New Testament, of whose authority there was never any doubt in the Church ; ” whereas, so far is this from being the case, that the Church of England has adopted much, the divine inspiration of which had been long and seriously doubted in the Church. But, more inconsistent than this, she has adopted, as an eternal and unerring rule of faith, writings which were lost long before Protestantism was heard of, and others which *may* be lost ere she disappears from the world. Knowing that some have been lost, why should we not put it as a *possible* case, that all that she now holds as her rule of faith may be lost also? In what

Happily, independent of all other testimony, this very law itself has disclosed it; and while we

a predicament would she then find herself? If her principles were true, annihilation would be the necessary consequence! Catholicity, however, is not exposed to such hazards. Suppose that, not only the Scriptures, but that every production of the human intellect which now gladdens and instructs the world, were suddenly to disappear from among mankind—suppose the art of printing to be lost—profane history to revert to mere fabulous traditions—and the reign of barbarism to be re-established,—Catholicity would still survive; because her principles, being immutable and eternal, are independent of all contingencies, are not subservient to adventitious and accidental circumstances, but are coeval with the duration of the world, and co-existent with the race of man upon the earth. There would still remain what we had in the first ages of the Church; a qualified succession of teachers and preachers, to promulgate and expound the revelations of heaven.

In proof of the uncertainty and fallacy of the Protestant rule of faith, which adopts the written word alone as the oracle of heaven, and the medium of communication between God and man, we have only to refer to the evidence of history, or to the Scriptures themselves, in attestation of the fact that much of those Scriptures has been lost. In Num. xxi. 14, we read, *It is said, in the Book of the wars of the Lord.*—Where is this Book?—In Joshua, x. 13, we find, *Is not this written in the Book of Jasher?* Where is the Book of Jasher? In 1 Samuel, x. 25, it is said, *Then Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord.* Yet

know from tradition that there is a law which was not written, as well as a speaking authority to

this book, though laid up before the Lord, is now nowhere to be found.

The 1st Chron. xxix. 29, tells us that *The acts of David, first and last, are written in the Book of Samuel the Seer, and the Book of Nathan the Prophet, and the Book of Gad the Seer.* But where are the books of these two Prophets? The same may be asked of "the Book of the Covenant," which, as we are informed in the 7th verse of the xxivth chapter of Exodus: "Moses taking, read in the hearing of the people: and they said: All the things that the Lord hath spoken, we will do: we will be obedient." Of the thousand and five poems, which (according to the 3rd Book of Kings, chap. iv. verse 32) were composed by Solomon, the "Canticle of Canticles" is the only one remaining: and of the three thousand parables, also spoken by him, but a very few have descended to us, scattered through the Book of Proverbs; whilst not a single vestige can be traced of the "History of Plants and Beasts" which he is recorded to have written. (*Ibid.* 33.) We may likewise search in vain amid the writings of the sacred volume for "the Book of the Words of the Days of Solomon," noticed in the 11th chap. and 41st verse of the 3d book of Kings; or for "the Book of the Words of the Days of the Kings of Juda," in which "the rest of the Acts of Joram" are said to be written; (chap. viii. verse 23 of the 4th Book of Kings:) or for "the Book of Ahias the Selonite," and the "Vision of Addo the Seer," spoken of in chap. ix. verse 29 of the 2d Paralipomenon: or for the Books of Semeias the Prophet, who diligently recorded the acts of Roboam, according to xiith

interpret that which was, and to stamp and distinguish the revelations of Heaven from the opi-

chap. 15th verse of the same Book :—or for “ the Words of Jehu, the Son of Hanani” (*Ibid.* chap. xx. verse 34) : or “ the Words of Hozai” (*Ibid.* chap. xxxiii. verse 19) : or for the whole of “ the Letter of the Prophet Elias to Joram the King” (*Ibid.* chap. xxi. verse 12) : or for “ the Description of Jeremias the Prophet,” mentioned in the 2nd Book of Maccabees, chap. ii. verse 1 : or for “ the Prophecy of Enoch,” of which a portion is recited by St. Jude, in his Epistle, verse 14. It is the opinion of many of the learned that St. Paul wrote three Epistles to the Corinthians, and that the first is lost. For, in that which we call the first, Cor. v. 9, St. Paul says, *I wrote to you in an Epistle!* Where then is this Epistle? Again, St. Paul commands the Epistle from Laodicea to be read in the Church, (Coloss. iv. 16,) *and that ye likewise read that which is of the Laodiceans.* Yet this also is lost. “ What,” exclaims Mr. Corless, to whose learning and diligence I am indebted for many of these illustrations, “ what is now become of the Protestants’ rule of faith?...How does the Protestant know but the doctrines which are handed down by tradition, were contained in the books that have perished? If they were—and he can have no evidence to the contrary—in rejecting tradition, he rejects the *once written* word of God. These are the appalling difficulties which, at every step, must obstruct the path of the man, who will admit of ‘ Scripture *alone* as his rule of faith.’ Either must he reject the sacred Scriptures, or admit tradition (since we know that much of sacred Scripture has been written which has never come down to us). These

nions of man, so do we plainly discover in that portion of the law which has received the universal sanction of Christianity, that maxim which is to supply all other deficiencies, which is to regulate our obedience, confirm and command our faith, and promulgate to mankind the will of the Almighty. *He that heareth you, heareth me; he that despiseth you, despiseth me... He that will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican... We are of God; he that knoweth God, heareth us: he that is not of God, heareth us not; by this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.*

When our Saviour gave his final instructions to the Apostles, he thus addressed them: *Go ye, therefore, and TEACH all nations, baptising, &c. 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.*⁽¹⁾

difficulties can be removed—these questions answered, only by the voice of Catholic tradition. Set aside tradition, and Christianity falls to ruin.”—*Reply to the Review of a Pamphlet, &c. &c.* by the Rev. G. Corless. London, 1827. See the same subject treated more at large in APPENDIX, No. XIII.

⁽¹⁾ *Matt.* xxviii. 19, 20.

“If we examine other parts of Scripture, in which these words, *I am with thee*, are used by the Almighty, we find them to have been infallible pledges of his pro-

Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is bap-

tection. When the Lord had said to Gedeon: 'Go in this thy strength, and thou shalt deliver Israel out of the hand of Madeon;' and Gedeon, distrustful of his own weakness, had replied: 'I beseech thee, my Lord, where-with shall I deliver Israel? Behold my family is the meanest in Manasses, and I am the least in my father's house;' the Lord added: '*I will be with thee*: and thou shalt cut off Madeon as one man.' (*Judg. vi. 14-16.*) Gedeon was accordingly strengthened by the words of the Almighty, and, under the shield of his promise, he achieved the deliverance of his country.

"'Though I should walk in the midst of the shadow of death,' says David, 'I will fear no evils, *for thou art with me.*' (*Psalms xxii. 4.*) Similar is the language by which Isaiah announces God's protection to his Church: 'Fear not, for I have redeemed thee, and called thee by thy name: thou art mine. When thou shalt pass through the waters, *I will be with thee*, and the rivers shall not cover thee: when thou shalt walk in the fire, thou shalt not be burned, and the flames shall not burn in thee.' (*Is. xliii. 1, 2.*) To show the might of the same protection, the prophet says in another place: 'Take counsel together, and it shall be defeated: speak a word, and it shall not be done: *because God is with us.*' (*Ib. viii. 10.*)

"It is not, then, by an arbitrary interpretation, that we infer from the words, '*Behold I am with you,*' that the apostles and their successors were to be guided by the spirit of wisdom and truth. We only attach to these important words their ordinary and natural meaning: and,

tized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.^(u) “ This is his promise (says

since Christ has added, ‘ all days even to the consummation of the world,’ we are free to conclude, unless we offer violence to the plain import of the language, that his divine protection was to be without limit or interruption. As the term of the lives of the apostles would be but short, far from confining his aid to that narrow period, he extends it to the heirs of their authority, unto ‘ the consummation of the world.’ From whence it clearly follows that they alone are the legitimate interpreters of Christ’s doctrine. If in teaching, and in administering the sacraments, Christ *is with* the pastors of his Church, it is plain that *they* cannot teach error, and that, in trusting our faith to their direction, *we* cannot go astray.

“ The apostles committed to writing, it is true, the principal actions of our Redeemer’s life. They also addressed several instructions to the Churches which they had planted. But as Christ himself, while on earth, could not yield the prerogative of being the expounder and the judge of his own doctrine, though he gave his apostles a commission to preach it; neither could they be supposed, by committing it to writing, to have resigned the solemn prerogative of interpretation, with which they were invested by Christ. While teaching and baptizing the nations, Christ promised *to be with them*; and whether they taught by word, or communicated their instructions by writing, they were equally assured of his unfailing protection. If they occasionally addressed letters to their infant congregation, surely they neither abandoned them

^(u) *Mark*, xvi. 15, 16.

St. Jerome); he will be with his disciples to the end of the world; thus shewing that they shall

to the licentious interpretation of every individual, nor suffered them to supersede their own authority. No, instead of permitting the divine legacy, which they bequeathed to the children whom they 'had begotten in Christ Jesus,' (1 *Cor.* iv. 15.) to be dissipated, they appointed vigilant guardians, to watch with care over its integrity. Thus, although St. Paul had preached the gospel at Ephesus, yet he appointed Timothy to remain there, that he 'might charge some not to teach otherwise, who, desiring to be teachers of the law, understood neither the things they said, nor whereof they affirmed.' (1 *Tim.* i. 3, 7.) With a similar view of guarding 'the word which was committed to him, according to the commandment of God, his Saviour,' the same apostle thus addresses 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.' (*Tit.* i. 3, 5.) Here we find Titus invested with a commission of perpetuating the priesthood, by virtue of the appointment which he received from St. Paul, who himself preached 'according to the commandment of God.'

"Lest, however, it should be imagined, that the authority which he placed in the hands of Timothy or Titus, was of a temporary nature, and to expire with their lives, St. Paul exhorts them to transmit to faithful and capable individuals, the sacred inheritance which was entrusted to them. 'Thou, therefore, my son,' he writes to Timothy, 'be strong in the grace which is in Christ Jesus; and the things which thou hast heard from me, through many

never die, and that he will never desert them that shall believe in him.”^(x) The Catholic rule of faith

witnesses, the same command to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also.’ (2 *Tim.* ii. 1, 2.) ‘Continue then in the things thou hast learned, and which have been committed to thee, knowing of whom thou hast learned.’ (*Ibid.* iii. 14.)

“Far, then, from being authorized to pervert, by any peculiar interpretations, the doctrine of Christ, Timothy was charged by the apostle, to *continue* in things which he had learned, and which had been confided to his care.

“In his instructions to Titus, after pointing out to him the several duties which it was incumbent on him to discharge, he concludes by reminding him of that authority which was transferred to him by virtue of his succession to the ministry. ‘These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke, with all authority.’ (*Tit.* ii. 15.) If then, he was authorized to speak and exhort with the fulness of the power which the apostle had conferred on him, it follows that the Christians of Crete were bound to receive his instructions, with a confidence fearless of being led astray. In short, we find the uniform exercise of this authority pervade the whole tenor of the lives of the apostles, accompanied by a correlative obedience, on the part of the faithful, to their instructions. In the communication of this power to others, to whom the last words of Christ were not addressed in person, it is clear that the apostles understood, that the virtue of his promises equally extended to their successors. It is, therefore, by the existence of the same power, residing to this day in their hereditary suc-

^(x) *Comment. in Matt. L. iv. T. iii. p. 734.*

therefore is, and always has been, that we are bound steadfastly to believe that which, the Almighty having revealed, the Church has proposed to our belief. We hold that the Church is the sole depository of the revelations of heaven, and that she alone has authority to promulgate them upon earth: and, consequently, that the same truths have been delivered down to us by the same channel, namely, by the *teaching* of the Apostles and their successors to the present time. We receive the doctrines of the successors of the Apostles, with the same credit as if we received them from the Apostles themselves. “The difference lies in this only;—that the interval between us and Jesus Christ, the fountain of every Christian truth, is measured by eighteen centuries; whereas, the communication between that fountain and the Apostles, and between these Apostles and the next to them in succession, was immediate. But truth is not lost, nor altered, nor weakened, by descent, when an unbroken chain

cessors, that the Catholic is guided; still as secure in his faith, as those who heard the apostles. For the past, he is secure, since the words ‘*all days*’ leave not a moment’s interval, during which Christ could be supposed to have deserted his Church; and, for the future, she feels no anxiety, since he is assured of the same divine aid ‘until the consummation of the world.’”—(Dr. Machale’s *Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church*. Vol. i. pp. 350-356.

of living witnesses, provided with all necessary documents, proclaims its identity; and the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit gives security to their words: *I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*"

I have preferred beginning with this point, rather than with the more systematical line of argument which follows, because it afforded me an opportunity of stating *the rule of faith* amongst Catholics, a rule which ought always to be borne in mind in every discussion, and to which every article of our belief is deducible.

In the *Second* place, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because no Protestant Church possesses any of those characteristic marks of the true Church, so clearly and incontrovertibly pointed out in the sacred writings, and attested as such by the universal consent of Christendom—Protestantism is neither ONE,^(y) HOLY,^(z) CATHOLIC,^(a) nor APOSTOLICAL.^(b)

First,—No Protestant Church is *one*, because none of them have ever succeeded in preserving, even for a single moment, any unity of faith.^(c) They began with variations, and have continued in a constant succession of variations ever since.

^(y) *St. John*, x. 16, and *Ephes.* iv. 3, 4, 5.

^(z) *Ephes.* v. 26, 27. ^(a) *Acts*, i. 8. *Romans*, x. 17, 18.

^(b) *St. Matt.* xxviii. 19, 20. *Ephes.* iv. 11, 12, &c.

^(c) *Ephes.* iv. 12.

All the Apostles of the Reformation differed in their creed and doctrines : the Church of England differs from them ; the divines of the Church of England differ among themselves, and hardly any two members of any Protestant Church agree in their belief ; they have not even, like the Greeks, the limited uniformity of a separate Church.^(d) If Protestantism were true, Protestantism would be one, because truth is essentially one. The common rules by which the reasoning faculty of man is usually regulated, appear to be strangers to Protestantism. It would appear to be forgotten, that opposite conclusions, drawn from the same authority, cannot both be true—that there cannot be many truths, all in contradiction to each other. Truth disdains to be made subservient to circumstances, and to the necessities of the times ;^(e) she scorns to be the sport of the passions, and of the pride of man ; she is always uniform and consistent—always open and undisguised—always sublime and unchangeable, like the Deity, from which she emanates.

No Protestant church *can be one*, because, though Protestants acknowledge an authority^{*} to decide upon matters of faith, yet they lay no pretensions

^(d) See Bossuet's *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*.

^(e) See the thirty-fifth of the Articles of Religion.

* See Lingard's *England* Page 153 Vol VI. 4to.

to infallibility;*^(f) they have no infallible tribunal to appeal to, for the interpretation of those parts

* See *Lingard's History of England*, p. 591, vol. VII. 4to.

^(f) Our definition of the Church is the same as yours (*See the 20th of the Thirty-nine Articles*), but with this difference between us, that you will not acknowledge it as a guide, whereas we do. You claim for your church the same powers that we do for ours, namely, *authority in controversies of faith*; but then you will not *submit* to that authority.

“For what cause, or by what authority, do you condemn the Arian, the Socinian, or the Unitarian, because he understands those texts, and such others as prove the eternity and divinity of the Son of God, in a sense different from what you assign to them? Are the Socinians not men of sound judgment? Have they not, according to your rule, a right; nay, are they not obliged to follow the dictate of that judgment, in preference to all authority on earth? and yet you exclude them from the kingdom of God, because, in the exercise of their judgment, or in what you consider the discharge of their duty, they differ in opinion from yourself. Your opinion of them, if judged of by your own principles, is unjust, uncharitable, unreasonable; you have divested yourself of all right to repute any man a heretic, to censure any man for being a schismatic; you have erased heresy and schism from the catalogue of vices, and said with the false prophet, *Peace, peace, when there was no peace.*”

You have established a system “which sanctions heresy and condemns it; which invites to schism and punishes it; which tells the believer to hear the church, and teaches him to prefer his own opinion, however monstrous

of scripture *which are hard to be understood, and which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction,*^(f) and, consequently, they have no right to establish a point of union, by which all Christians may become members of *one fold,*^(g) and believers in *one faith.*"^(h) The Protestant churches, therefore, instead of being collected into one fold, under the superintendance of *one shepherd,*⁽ⁱ⁾ are split and divided into an endless variety of heresies and *schisms.*^(k) No wonder, as has been well observed, that having fallen from the rock, they should have been shivered into fragments. They are not *one body and one spirit.*^(l) They are neither *perfect in the same mind nor in the same judgment,*^(m) nor *careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.*⁽ⁿ⁾ They are divided every where, and, as if a change of clime must naturally produce a change of doctrine, they vary wherever they are found. The religious opinions of the Protestant are like the political opinions of the Catholic—founded upon private judgment, and influenced by times and circum-

and absurd, to her most solemn judgments. Why, a church thus constituted is incoherent and inconsistent ; a hulk thrown upon the waters without helm or compass." —*Reply to Dr. Magee, by J. K. L.* pp. 18, 62.

^(f) 2 *St. Peter*, iii. 16. ^(g) *St. John*, x. 16. ^(h) *Ephes.* iv. 4.

⁽ⁱ⁾ *St. John*, x. 16. ^(k) 1 *Cor.* i. 10. ^(l) *Ephes.* iv. 4.

^(m) 1 *Cor.* i. 10.

⁽ⁿ⁾ *Ephes.* iv. 3.

stances, by prejudice and passion. No unity of sentiment pervades a system, established upon principles upon which every man must doubt and hesitate; a system which separates the people of England from every community of Christians in the world, and isolates her in religion, as she is isolated by her geographical position. Had Christ come upon earth to establish a plurality of religions, then, indeed, the principles of Protestantism would have been admirably suited to the purpose; but as we know it was directly the reverse, so are these principles diametrically opposed to the designs of God. For, having no true rule to direct him, and admitting his church to be liable to error, every Protestant becomes his own Apostle: each one follows the weak and fallible guidance of his own limited reason and capacity, which, creating an endless variety of opinions, and frequently of absurd contradictions, is not only wholly incapable of demonstrating the truth, but is eminently calculated to engender error, and to lead astray, instead of conducting to *a unity of faith*.^(o) The effects are true to their cause: religious dissension distracts the land; almost every family is at variance within itself; what God and Nature formed for harmony

^(o) *Ephes.* iv. 13. See this point admirably argued and illustrated in Dr. Machale's *Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church*, Vol. ii. p. 166, &c.

and concord, Religion, the lover of unity, and the promoter of peace, brings into strife and difference. Every year is ushered in with a new creed—every year, some new temple is erected to the God of Truth for another false worship. The wild reveries of a female impostor; the senseless ravings of an itinerant, self-inspired preacher; every crafty knave, or vain enthusiast, who throws the absurd and fantastic wanderings of his mind into the form of a religious belief, is sure to find votaries amongst Protestants: they contrive to divide what has already undergone a thousand subdivisions; and if Protestantism shall last another century, we may expect to see, in this bewildered country, almost as many creeds as there are Christians.—Is there, —can there be unity in Protestantism? but is not unity the proud and exclusive attribute of Catholicity? United within, by a perfect similitude of doctrine, and bound together without, by a uniformity of government—guided by the same pastors, partakers of the same sacraments, worshippers at the same altars, holding communion with their brethren in every portion of the world, knowing no difference of faith on account of a difference of language, of clime, of manners, of political institutions, or of geographical position—the Catholic Church constitutes that *house of peace* so prophetically announced by the Psalmist—that assemblage of true believers, for which the

Saviour of mankind declares that he came to sanctify himself, that they also might be sanctified in truth—that they all might be one, as his Father and he were one; and, that BEING ONE, THE WORLD MIGHT BELIEVE THAT HIS FATHER HAD SENT HIM. While the separation of Protestants from the common fold, and their disunion among themselves, not only excludes them from the house of peace, and the alliance with God, but absolutely contradicts and nullifies the mission of our Saviour, robbing Christianity of one of its most distinguishing characteristics, and belying it before the pagan and the infidel.^(p) For, if the divine mission of Christ is to be ascertained by the union which is to subsist amongst his followers, and by the agreement of Christians in his doctrines, it is manifest that the want of this necessary proof amongst those who pretend to be his disciples and apostles, must obstruct the progress of truth, and veil the revelations of Heaven from the eyes of the unbeliever. Even the most perverse and discordant sectaries (so universal is the recognition of this essential qualification of truth,) all insist upon unity as a necessary attribute of true religion; but, at the same time, they adopt a principle which banishes this attribute from amongst them.

^(p) See some excellent observations on this subject in the 2nd Letter of the *Amicable Discussion*.

They say, we must all believe alike, but we must all judge for ourselves :—we must all hold the same doctrine, but we must all follow our own fancies. The apostle pronounces an anathema even against an angel from Heaven, should he presume to preach another gospel; but *they* exalt themselves above the angels of Heaven, and claim the attribute of divinity itself. The Scripture says, *Be of one mind, have peace; and the God of peace and of love shall be with you.* (2 Cor. xiii. 2.) But *they* say, let us be of what mind we please; let dissensions reign amongst us; let us follow false prophets and lying teachers, and make ourselves the dupes of deceitful workmen :—no sect shall be a sect of perdition to us; we will transform every man whom we list into an apostle of Christ: the house of peace shall be rent with schism; the God of truth must be made insensible to falsehood, and the God of love shall cherish hatred and dissension, as well as charity and union.

Secondly, The Protestant churches are not *holy*, because Luther, Calvin, Beza, and other inventors and propagators of Protestantism, instead of being pure apostolic men, and models of meekness, piety, and mortification, such as the ministers of the religion of Christ ought undoubtedly to be, who himself fasted, prayed, and forebore, to teach us to do the same, were directly the reverse. Far from imitating the lives of the primitive saints and apostles, whose

doctrines they professed to preach, they every where established a greater laxity of morals, and, instead of reforming the wickedness of the times, only fostered and increased it; breaking down all the bulwarks against the tyranny of the passions, at the same time that they undermined the citadel of faith.^(q) Nay, even the principal champion of Protestantism does not hesitate to acknowledge in his own writings—as if to confound his followers, and open their eyes to his deceit—that he learned the principal tenet of his new creed, not from the spirit of light and the God of Truth, but from the spirit of darkness and the Father of Lies,^(r) giving

^(q) For an account of the increase of immorality, as a consequence of the Reformation in this country, see Dr. Milner's *Letters to a Prebendary*, Lett. 5th. And for the scandalous lives of the Reformers, see Appendix 2nd to *Lett. II. of the Amicable Discussion*.—"In a word," says the learned author of this admirable work, "the only point upon which they agree is to blacken and condemn one another, and it is but too certain, that this point, in which they were all agreed, is also the only one upon which they were all right."

^(r) *St. John*, viii. 44. See an Account of Luther's conversation with the devil, in *The Faith and Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, proved by the Testimony of the most learned Protestants, &c.* p. 54; by the Author of the *Protestant Apology for the Roman Catholic Church*. Dublin, 1813.

heed to spirits of error, and doctrines of Devils,^(s) and thus making himself a real object for the application of the words of St. Paul to Elymas; *O full of all guile and of all deceit, child of the Devil, enemy of all justice, thou ceasest not to pervert the right ways of the Lord.*^(t)

The Church of England is not *holy*, because it sprang from such unhallowed sources—because it originated in the lust of Henry VIII., was nurtured by the rapacity and profligacy of the ministers of Edward VI., and perfected by the ambition of Queen Elizabeth. Surely a religion with so impure an origin, which was fostered in vice, “and which neither improves the piety nor the morals of the people, cannot pass for the work of God:” ~~*by its fruits you shall know it*~~^(u) Such a Church

^(s) 1 Tim. iv. 1.

^(t) Acts xiii. 10.

^(u) St. Matt. vii. 16. “The very authors of the Reformation were themselves the first to mark its baneful effect upon the morals and piety of the people. ‘The world,’ says Luther, ‘grows every day worse and worse.—It is plain that men are much more covetous, malicious, and resentful; much more unruly, shameless, and full of vice, than they were in the time of Popery.’—‘The greater part of the people,’ says Martin Bucer, ‘seem only to have embraced the gospel in order to shake off the yoke of discipline, and the obligation of fasting, penance, &c. which lay upon them in Popery, and to live at their pleasure, enjoying their lawless appetites without control. Hence

must, at least, be liable to strong suspicion, and it is, therefore, the duty of men to examine it narrowly: *by its fruits you shall know it; the evil tree bringeth forth evil fruit:—do men gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles?*^(*)

Instead of endeavouring to bring our morality into a stricter conformity with the severer precepts of the gospel, and the maxims and the conduct of our Saviour, Protestantism has absolved its followers from many of those salutary restraints and mortifications, such as confession and fasting, which the religion of Christ had wisely imposed upon us for the subjugation of our passions, and as some slight atonement for our sins, through his infinite merits. She contradicts the Scriptures, by making the road to Heaven wide and smooth, while they declare it to be rough and narrow.—Instead of encouraging the people to pay a daily public homage to their God in the house of prayer, the doors are closed against

they lent a willing ear to the doctrine that we are saved by faith alone, and not by good works, having no relish for them.'

Frederick the Great has said, "If you reduce the causes of the Reformation to their simple principles, you will find, that, in Germany, it was the work of interest; in England, the fruit of lust; in France, the effect of novelty."

(*) *St. Matt.* vii. 16, 17.

them;^(y) and, except on the Sunday, when, indeed, no one who bears the name of Christian, would willingly absent himself from the service of his Creator, their altars are silent, and their Churches empty. With what feelings would our Catholic ancestors, whose piety was proverbial, and whose daily practice it was to assemble in public adoration of that God who was their daily benefactor and protector, have looked upon the degeneracy of these days, upon the melancholy fruits of Protestant Reformation!

Whatever, to a superficial, and, perhaps, a prejudiced observer, may be the general appearance of

(y) The Bishop of London, in his Charge for 1790, p. 11, observes: "Scarcely one symptom of religion ever appears amongst us, except on the Lord's day."—"It must be acknowledged," says he, in another publication, "that the present remarkable thinness of our churches on Sunday, at the east as well as the west end of the town, is a proof that the neglect of divine worship is not confined to the great, but has pervaded almost every class of people in this capital." *Sermons, Vol. I. p. 212.*—Will not the same observations equally apply at the present day?

"Liberal opinions, that is, no fixed principle whatsoever, are professed in every quarter: and, in spite of the apparent tranquillity which reigns around, the day cannot be distant, in which there will be as little belief among the gentlemen of England, as there now is among the philosophers in Germany—that is, *none at all.*" — *British Critic.*

immorality and irreligion in Catholic countries, in our own times; and whatever may be the real degree of vice among the wealthy and the great, whose virtue, as is usually the case, is too generally *choaked up with the cares, the riches, and the pleasures of this life*; there is, at any rate, to be found, even in demoralized France, a large portion of sincere and unaffected piety. One can never enter a Catholic Church, at any hour, even upon a week-day, without being edified by the devout comportment of at least a few, and at the hour of morning service, of a great number of pious Christians.^(z)

^(z) “ Even on week-days the Churches are not deserted; pious Christians may be seen on their knees at all hours; and the ancient and affecting custom of the Catholic Church, so much recommended by Erasmus, is not yet forgotten or neglected, even in this profane capital.” (*Eustace’s Letter to G. Petre, Esq.*)—It is to be remarked that, since this period, religion has made immense progress in France, especially in the provinces.

The Catholic Church is holy in her people, from the number of devout persons of both sexes, who, preferring the part of Mary to Martha, have retired from the bustle and temptation of the world, to adore their God in solitude and in silence :

“ Who quit a world where strong temptations try,
 “ And since ’tis hard to combat, learn to fly.”

Without taking into consideration the preference which the Almighty has generally been pleased to shew to a

The Protestant Churches are not *holy*, because, among the ministers of their religion, no one has ever yet appeared of such exalted piety, such mortified passions, such holy meekness, such unwearyed zeal, and such sublime devotion, as to render him worthy of being held up to the people as the pattern of a saint, or a model of the man of God. It is the prerogative of Catholicity alone to furnish such examples. She alone can shew forth her catalogue of Apostles, of martyrs, of confessors, of virgins, whom all Christendom have conspired to honour with the title of Saint : she alone can produce a lengthened succession of individuals, whose sanctity the whole world has admired and attested ; men who, having studied the science of the Saints at the foot of the cross, have there learnt those

secluded and ascetic life, no one has a right to complain of the pious refuge from temptation, and retreat from the attractive yet dissipating pleasures of the world, of so many devout persons, but those who are able to fulfil the duties and obligations of a Christian *amidst the cares, the riches, and the pleasures of this life*. These are the only persons who, with any justice, can complain of the seclusion of so much virtue, and the loss of so much good example to mankind : yet when they consider the difficulties they themselves have daily to contend with, they will not be so ready to condemn the more timorous, but, perhaps, safer and wiser resolution, of withdrawing from the troubles and temptations to which *they* remain so fearfully exposed.

sublime maxims of humility, of self-denial, of entire devotion to the love of God, which taught them how to apply themselves with such infinite advantage to the service of their fellow creatures ; men who, while they performed the work and accomplished the will of their Creator upon earth, though feeble mortals like ourselves, were all the while wrapped in the contemplation and in the enjoyments of heaven.

Feeling her lamentable deficiencies in this respect, and anxious to assimilate herself to the Church described by our Saviour through the sacred penmen, as a vine, repaying the labours of the husbandman by an abundant harvest of fruit, and as sending forth her Apostles to preach the Gospel, and to confirm their delegation from heaven by supernatural signs ; the Church of England has adopted the Saints of the Church of Rome, to supply those whom, had she been gifted with the Spirit of God, she ought to have produced herself. But, even here, she is involved in her endless inconsistency ; for while she reckons St. Augustine, St. Clement, St. Ambrose, St. Cyprian, St. Jerome, and St. Martin as her chosen few, she has discarded many of the doctrines which every one of these, her Saints, taught as essential to Christianity. They who maintained the doctrines of Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, of the Invocation of Saints, of prayers and oblations for the dead, and of the

supremacy of the See of St. Peter, have all been made the pillars of a Church, which has anathematized these doctrines as impious, heretical, and damnable! They who condemned heresy and schism as the greatest of all crimes, because, to use their own expression, “they burst the bonds of charity and unity;” they, forsooth, are made the sainted patrons of an heretical and schismatical Church: and for this plain reason—that having no Saints of her own to adorn her, none ^{who} ~~but such as~~ have obtained their titles as the advocates of separation and dissension, as the opposers of old, and as the abettors of new and unheard-of doctrines,—she has been compelled either to acknowledge her deficiency, or to adopt such as have ever been the most uncompromising enemies of the opinions of the men, who would fain account them as their guides. They have chosen to place themselves in an extraordinary dilemma: either to deny, reject, and contradict the faith and doctrines of their Saints, disregarding their principles and their testimony altogether; or, attentive to the records they have left us, to be compelled to read their own condemnation in every page of their writings. Till, therefore, holiness shall be shewn to consist in heresy and schism; in relaxing the morality of the Gospel; in renouncing the doctrines of the Saints, and the faith which the Apostles have sealed

with their blood, the Church of England has no claim to it.

The Protestant Churches are not *holy*, because they have never been sanctified by the manifestation of miracles. No Protestant teacher ever yet wrought a miracle in confirmation of his faith; whereas, there is no country in the world which has been converted to Christianity by Catholic missionaries — and few there are which have not been both edified by their virtues, and enlightened by their doctrine—without the miraculous interposition of Divine Providence having been exerted in their favour.^(a)

^(a) Catholics are often accused of lending too easy a belief to miracles, though generally without reason. It is surely natural that those who believe *firmly* in the truth of their religion, should be more disposed to expect supernatural proofs of its authenticity; and it is upon the firmness of their faith alone, that this predisposition is grounded, not upon any superstitious feelings, or excess of credulity. On the other hand, an obstinate disbelief of miracles, when clear to the evidence of the senses, would appear to be characteristic of an unsound religion, and of perversity of intention. The Scripture informs us, that the very day on which St. Peter had healed the sick, he was, for this crime of producing a miraculous evidence of Christianity, apprehended, and thrown into prison, from which he was delivered only by another miracle. When St. Stephen was brought before the council, *they*

No Protestant minister ever yet executed the following commission of our Saviour—a commis-

saw his face as if it had been the face of an angel, and yet they condemned him to death! When the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles, and imparted to them the gift of tongues, the people exclaimed: *These men are full of new wine!* Such was the obduracy and incredulity of the enemies of the doctrine of Christ! As it was with his Disciples, so it had been with Christ himself. When our Saviour, armed only with a scourge, but supported by the power of God, drove the multitude of profaners from the temple, the Jews said to him: *By what miracle dost thou prove to us thy right to do these things?* as if the very act they had just witnessed was not itself a miracle, and the evidence of a supernatural power. They ask for one miracle to prove another, like those sectarians and unbelievers, who ask for evidence upon evidence in favour of a truth which has already the mark of heaven upon it, and the Revelations of God to establish it. They act like the Pharisees and Sadducees of old, who, immediately after witnessing the most astonishing miracles, asked our Saviour for a sign; but, instead of granting their request, he only condemned their unbelieving curiosity, and censuring the voluntary blindness in which their pride and obstinacy had involved them, referred them to the signs that had just passed, and to another that was to come. That other sign arrived: it verified all those which had gone before; it was the sign which they had so eagerly and so importunately demanded;—but they remained perverse in their judgment, and obdurate in their infidelity.—How merited, then, was the reproof which Jesus so soon afterwards pronounced even on his own disciples: *Do you not yet know, nor under-*

sion which, to the honour and credit of the Catholic Church, has been so literally fulfilled in a thousand instances by *her* pastors, not only in primitive times, but in every age of Christianity; *And going...heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils.*^(b) No apostles of Protestantism ever *went forth and preached every where, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed.*^(c)

The Church of England is not *holy* in her Ministers, because she disallows the sacrament of Holy Orders; and without it, how can her pastors be qualified for the arduous duties of the shepherds of the flock of Christ? How are they to discharge the awful duty of *rendering an account of the souls* entrusted to their care?^(d) Without the peculiar graces of Almighty God, (and how are they to receive those graces but through the sacraments, the only means we have of applying the merits of our Redeemer to our soul,) how, it may be asked, are they to be holy and vigilant watchmen of the Lord? *Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen all the day,*

stand? Have you still your heart blinded? Having eyes, see you not? and having ears, hear you not? (St. Mark viii. 17, 18.)

^(b) *St. Matt. x. 7, 8.*

^(c) *St. Mark xvi. 20.*

^(d) *Heb. xiii. 17.*

and all the night: they shall never hold their peace.^(e) In fine, if they use not holy orders as a sacrament, how can her ministers possess the grace of God, which should be in them by the *imposition of the hands of the priesthood?*^(f) They who have extraordinary duties imposed upon them, must surely need extraordinary graces to be enabled worthily to fulfil them.

As the Church of England is not *holy* in her pastors, for the same reason she is not holy in her people.^(g) In acknowledging but two sacraments, she has narrowed the means destined to convey the graces of heaven to her followers; she has cut off so many sources for applying the merits of our Redeemer to the soul, and thereby abridged the sanctification and perfection of man.^(h)

Another proof of the want of holiness in the Protestant Church is, that those who leave the Catholic communion for the Establishment, invariably shew by their conduct, that they do so, solely in furtherance of their worldly interests, and

^(e) *Isai.* lxii. 16.

^(f) *1 Tim.* iv. 14.—*2. Tim.* i. 6.

^(g) Let any one read Dr. Clarke's account of the public and private morals in Sweden, Norway and Russia, and say whether he thinks holiness a characteristic mark of the Protestant Reformation in those countries.

^(h) See an excellent dissertation on the number of the Sacraments, in *The Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church*, Vol. ii. p. 210, &c.

to enjoy a greater latitude both of faith and practice. In deserting their religion, they almost always desert their morality with it: yet, even then, they generally flatter themselves with the hope of returning to die in the bosom of the ancient faith.⁽ⁱ⁾ But how seldom does the Almighty permit them thus to trifle with him! They say within themselves: Yours is the church in which we will live at our ease, but we will return to our own, to die in penitence and peace. But as they abandon God, he abandons them in their turn; he withdraws his grace, and consigns them to their folly. Far different is the conduct of converts to Catholicity; who evince the purity of their motives

(i) It has been no uncommon occurrence for Catholics, who, for temporal motives, have abjured their religion, to educate their children in the creed they had deserted, thus giving the strongest practical proof of the fallacy of their own conversion, and of the estimation in which they held the ancient faith. This was the case with the Earl of Arundel, the father of the unfortunate Lord Stafford, as well as with many others.—“Sir William Scott informs me, ^{say Boswell} that he heard Johnson say: ‘A man who is converted from Protestancy to Popery, *may* be sincere; he parts with nothing, he is only superadding to what he already had; but a convert from Popery to Protestancy, gives up so much of what he has held as sacred as any thing that he retains; there is so much *laceration of mind* in such a conversion, that it can hardly be sincere and lasting.’”—(Boswell’s *Life of Johnson*.)

by the severity of their religious observances, and by the example of disinterested piety which they exhibit to the world. No one scarcely has yet left us, who has lived well, or died happily : hardly any one has yet sought and found us, who has not been a pattern of virtue while living, and a saint in death.

The extraordinary circumstance of her followers choosing rather to remain without places of divine worship, than to make any sacrifices or exertions to erect them, might also be cited as another proof of the want of holiness, or at least of zeal, in the Protestant Church.^(k) It certainly is an anomaly in the history of Christianity, that the richest church in Europe—in the most opulent country in the world—should be compelled to call upon the whole nation, not one half of whom profess the religion of the State, to supply her with temples for the celebration of her religious rites. It was far different when the present possessions of the Church were in the hands of a Catholic Hierarchy. The most sumptuous buildings in the world, the wonders of each succeeding age, then every where arose in profusion, through the spon-

^(k) According to the Report of the Commissioners for building new Churches, there are very many places in which there is not church accommodation for more than one-eighth of the population !

taneous zeal and piety of the clergy and the people. —In poor, degraded, insulted, and impoverished Ireland, what exertions have not a Catholic starving peasantry, and an unbeneficed clergy, made for the erection of decent places of public worship!⁽¹⁾

Thirdly.—No Protestant Church possesses that other characteristic of revealed truth, *Catholicity*, that is, universality. The Protestant Churches are

⁽¹⁾ “ In the comparison of the relative sanctity of the different Churches, the Roman Catholic Church stands peculiarly distinguished. The sanctity of any church is a word of complex and extensive import, which may embrace as well the holiness of its members, as the purity of the doctrine which it professes. In either point of view, the Catholic Church is without a rival; since it teaches the necessity of mortifying the deeds of the flesh; and since it was in its bosom those eminent saints were formed, whom Protestants did not scruple to adopt into their calendar. But to form a fair and impartial judgment of this subject, we should chiefly turn our attention to the lives of their respective founders. God may permit the existence of immoral pastors in the Church, though he never chooses corrupt agents as its founders. As the one are the immediate heralds of the Almighty, they ought to be the living representatives of the high and holy commission which they bear. The others, too, are bound to sanctity; but, like the public functionaries of an established authority, the validity of their ministry is not affected by the profligacy of their lives.”—Dr. Mac-hale’s *Evidences of the Catholic Church*, Vol. ii. p. 172.

not universal in point of *time*, having had no existence for upwards of 1500 years after the coming of Christ; for no one can show that the doctrine and belief of Protestants was ever professed by any individual, much less by any Church or any congregation of Christians, previous to the days of Luther. Their very name is a novelty.^(m)

No Protestant Church is universal in point of *space*, because not one of them embraces more than comparatively a very small portion of the Christian world, no where comprehending any large numbers of the flock of Christ:—no where is Protestantism any thing but a sect. If the Church of England looks for universality, she finds herself checked upon every side; she is a mere insulated

^(m) “Does not the name *Protestant*,” says Mr. Corless in his very learned and excellent *Reply to Mr. Townsend*, “indelibly stamp upon the established religion the character of error? Does not novelty of name bespeak novelty of doctrine, and establish beyond the possibility of doubt, that she, like all other sectarians, has been cut off from the great body of Catholic Christians?”

Yes, their very name is their condemnation: they have adopted it not in a spirit of charity and union, but of hostility and separation; it is indefinite and vague, conveying no precise meaning but that of irreconcilable opposition to those against whom they protest: it implies no particular belief, being equally applicable to all sectarians and separatists from the primitive and universal church; from the first heresy down to the last.

province of Christendom. To be universal, she should be like the Roman Catholic,—*preached to every creature*; ⁽ⁿ⁾ *carried to the uttermost parts of the earth*; ^(o) *ruling from sea to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth*; ^(p) *offering a clean sacrifice in every place, from the rising to the setting of the sun*; ^(q) extending from the sands of Syria to the deserts of Paraguay; from schismatical Moscow to infidel Japan. To be universal,—she should, like the Roman Catholic, have preserved inviolate *the everlasting covenant*, ^(r) a covenant like that *of the day and the night*, ^(s) to stand for all generations, which the Almighty has made with her, and confirmed by a solemn oath. ^(t) By a perpetual, uninterrupted, and visible existence, she should have shewn herself the constant and steady *light of the world*, the standing and living ^{accomplishment} ~~memorandum~~ ~~and~~ of the promises of Christ; she should have been *the mountain of the House of our Lord* in these latter days, *prepared on the top of mountains, and exalted above the hills, with all nations flowing unto it*. ^(u)

There neither is, nor ever was, upon earth, any other Church to which these and numberless other

⁽ⁿ⁾ *St. Mark* xvi. 15. ^(o) *Acts* i. 8. ^(p) *Psal.* lxxi. 8.

^(q) *Malach.* ii. 11. ^(r) *Ezek.* xxxvii. 26.

^(s) *Jer.* xxxiii. 20, 21. ^(t) *Ps.* lxxxviii. 4, 36, & *Isaias* liv. 9.

^(u) *Isaias* ii. 2.

prophecies can possibly be applied, but the Roman Catholic:—she is universal in point of time; she is universal in point of space.—After an existence of more than 1800 years, we still find her every where.—We find her glorious and magnificent before the learned and the rich, under the golden dome of the Vatican, seated triumphant on the ruins of Paganism, and encompassed by the splendour of the Eternal City; ^(*) we find her preached

^(*) Amongst all the Revolutions recorded in history, the most remarkable, certainly, is the establishment of the temporal sovereignty of the Popes. That the successor of St. Peter, who was crucified by order of a Roman emperor, as a mean and contemptible impostor, should now possess the capital of that empire, for the seat of his dominion, and the temples of their gods, for the rites of his religion; and that the individual who now represents the proud senate of Rome, should hold his station at the will and appointment of that same successor of St. Peter, are circumstances which appear to point out a peculiar providence, and afford matter of contemplation to the Christian philosopher.

“ While thus perplexed between the opposite claims of conflicting sectaries, let him but take hold of the strong and palpable clue of the succession of the Roman Pontiff. Disengaged from his embarrassment, he walks back with straight and steady step, through the distance and darkness of time; directed all along by its strong and unerring guidance, until he finds himself seated in the sanctuary with Christ himself, and listening to the living oracle of

to the poor and the ignorant, under the canopy of heaven, in many a distant and unfrequented clime; we find her in the palaces of kings, and in the cities of the great; we find her among the idolaters of the Old, and the Savages of the New World;^(y) we find her in the east and in the west, in the

revelation. What a magnificent idea, or rather, what a vast assemblage of unspeakable ideas, does the word Catholic Church convey to the mind! How glorious the contemplation of a society, subsisting unchanged for the unexampled duration of eighteen centuries, spread over the fairest portion of the earth, and embracing almost all that is elevated or enlightened in its history; bequeathing to each succeeding generation the accumulated treasures of the wisdom of the past; moving on with the silent majesty of a being unconscious of decay, and secure of immortality; gathering from the lapse of time, which is wasting every other monument, fresh proofs of the infallibility of his promise, who has watched over her existence; conferring on her children, by the simple name of Catholic, the most envied and exalted title that kings ever yet bore; doomed occasionally to pass through the waters of tribulation, but rising buoyant over the waves, because the Spirit of God is with her; and again, because she is protected by the same spirit, walking through the ordeal of persecution, unhurt by its heat; nay, burnished by its activity."—*Evidences of the Catholic Church*, by the Right Rev. Dr. Machale, Vol. ii. p. 184.

^(y) On the missionary labours of the Catholic Church, see Milner's *End of Controversy*, Lett. xxx.

north and in the south; and we find her every where with the same image and likeness, always in possession of the same pure and holy doctrine. We find her to be *that great and various multitude ...like the stars of heaven or the sands of the sea,*^(z) *...which no man could number, of all nations, and tribes, and people, and tongues.*^(a) The very name of Catholic, which no other Church ever has assumed, or can assume, and which, by universal consent, is inseparably attached to her, is alone sufficient to prove her Catholicity.^(b)

^(z) *Gen. xxii. 17.*

^(a) *Apoc. vii. 9.*

^(b) Who can read the following passage from St. Augustine, without fancying it to have been written in our own days, so precisely does it apply, though at an interval of 1400 years:—"Among many considerations," says he, "that bind me to the Church, is the name of *Catholic*, which, not without a cause, in the midst of so many heresies, this Church alone has so retained, that although all heretics wish to acquire the name, should a stranger ask where the Catholics assemble, the heretics themselves will not dare to point out any of their own places of meeting."—(*Contra Ep. Fundam.* Tom. vi. p. 46.)

"The followers of Luther or Calvin are precisely the same, in his eyes, [the eyes of a Catholic] as those of Kant, or Knox, or Wesley, or any other of the numberless tribes who wander about the desert and attack the people of God, as they journey, under the divine protection, to the promised land. He may see some senate, or stadtholder, or prince, or potentate, associate himself with one

Fourthly,—No Protestant Church is *Apostolical*, because, instead of originating with the Apostles;

or other of those sects, and bestow upon it all the wealth and dignity, which law, or rapine, or conquest placed in his hands—he may see one of them preserve much of the form, order, dignity, rites, and liturgies of the church, whilst another strips its members in the market-place, and presents itself to the world as a sad image of human fatuity, or divine wrath; but as to the unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity of the church, all these sects, whether assembled in palaces, in the conventicle, on the moor, or on the mountain, are equally removed from them.”—*Reply to Dr. Magee*.

The following beautiful simile will be found illustrative of the subject: “Like the material world, the Church is continually vivified by a central and divine fire, enlightened by an eternal sun, watered by a miraculous dew, by which, like nature himself, she is at once embellished and refreshed, and endowed with a fertility which makes her bud, and bring forth fruit both for time and eternity.”—(*Ganganelli's Letters*.) In another place, speaking of the Church, both militant and triumphant, he says: “I figure her to myself as a tree, whose top reaches the summit of the heavens, whose roots pierce to the deepest abyss, and against which all the storms let loose their rage, without being able to wither or overthrow it.”—“If we consider the Church in her outward appearance, nothing can be more weak: her head and her members are men of flesh and blood, subject to all the passions; she has no other arms, no other strength than those words of Jesus Christ: *Go preach the Gospel to all nations—Lo! I am with you all*

instead of being founded by any teacher, deputed and commissioned by authority from the apostolic college; instead of being established by men who were sent, as the Father had sent the Saviour of mankind (*as my Father has sent me, I also send you*;^(c) and again, *how shall they preach unless they be sent*);^(d) they all grew out of the angry spirit, the pride, and the presumption of Luther, who, in the arrogance of his mind, set himself up in opposition to the received opinions of every nation, of every age, and of every Church; and who virtually confessed that it was impossible he himself should be right, and every body else wrong.^(e) They are not Apostolical, because instead of conducting us, as they professed to do, to the purer faith of the Apostles, by removing what they were pleased to term the additions and corruptions of the dark ages, they retrenched those very doctrines which were believed and practised,

days, even to the end of the world. But, take a view of her internally, and nothing is stronger; for being unceasingly guided and enlightened by the Holy Spirit, God himself is her impregnable rampart."

(c) *St. John* xx. 21.

(d) *Rom.* x. 15.

(e) "How often," says he, "did my trembling heart ask me; Art thou alone right? Is all the world, except thee, involved in error?" (*Præf. de Abrog. Miss. Priv.*) For the extravagances, contradictions, and turbulence of this Prince of Reformers, see *Letters to a Prebendary*, Lett. v.

and uprooted those very principles which were the ground-work of Christianity, in the apostolic and primitive times.

The Protestant Churches are not *Apostolical*, because they are all equally excluded from that lengthened and unbroken chain of apostolical succession, which identifies the last Pontiff with the first, and through him, with the source of all spiritual grace, power, and jurisdiction—Christ Jesus. The purity and nobility of their descent is intercepted by a bar across their escutcheon, the just inheritance of their treason; they are illegitimated as the rightful guardians of the faith of the Apostles; and as the lawful successors to the ministry of Christ. The Protestant Churches are not Apostolical, because, thus unconnected with the æra of the Apostles, they know not how *they have received the Holy Ghost*; ^(f) because some of

(f) *St. John* xx. 22. — “Protestants labour much to prove the perpetuity of their priesthood, and the validity of its orders.* A priesthood without a sacrifice is an anomaly

* “As the object of the present work (adds Dr. Machale, in a note to the above passage) is rather to exhibit a connected series of the evidences of the Catholic Church than minutely to canvass the claims of any other, the writer has purposely refrained from entering into the controversy regarding the validity of the ordinations of the Church of England. However, his opinion on that important subject is already on record. A profound knowledge of the controversy must ever prevent an impartial reader from coming to the conclusion, that the ordination of the ministers of the Church of England is valid.

“Little is now left to the defender of the English ordinations, but to repeat the arguments, if arguments they may be called, by

them cannot even demonstrate that their spiritual functions emanate from any other than a lay autho-

in language which cannot be explained. They are correlative words, which express correlative duties, and of

which Courayer, an Augustinian monk, ingeniously laboured to establish their validity. The reception he met in England, after abandoning his own country, and, I might add, his religion, shews how proud the English clergy were to receive aid on that delicate point, even from the darkness of a Catholic cloister. Yet neither Courayer, nor his copiers, have been able to efface the impression left upon the public by the writings of Harding, and Sanders, and Stapleton, which attest, that neither Parker, nor those he consecrated, or pretended to consecrate, were recognised by the Catholics, or the well-informed of that time, as invested with the character of valid ordination. This is a point which Harding, in his controversy with Jewell, the celebrated Bishop of Salisbury, pressed with repeated force, and to which the champion of the Protestant prelacy gave no satisfactory reply. Dr. Ebrington has expended much subtlety in giving a more plausible colour to arguments, which are justly deemed of little force. I will not say that his labours were utterly lost, since they probably earned for him the temporalities of a bishopric, which, in the estimation of many orthodox churchmen, is not less valuable than a valid ordination. But, after all that has been written, from Courayer to Ebrington, there still remains, in the mind of an impartial reader, some secret scepticism that cannot be entirely removed.

“The writer will not now dwell on the frequent challenge of the Catholic controvertists to their opponents, to produce the Lambeth Registry, on which Protestants rested the valid consecration of Matthew Parker; — a registry which, if seasonably produced, would have settled the question. He even dismisses the story of the Nag’s-head-inn consecration; nor will he dwell upon the more important circumstance of the want of evidence that Barlow, first a prior of one of the suppressed monasteries, and the consecrator of Parker, had ever received, not the appointment, but the character of episcopacy.

“These and other circumstances he leaves to that class of writers who rest their doubts upon dates, and upon circumstances of place, which it is difficult to clear up at this distance of time.

“But he cannot pass over the imperfect ritual adopted at that early stage of the pretended reformation, coupled with the theo-

riety. They are not Apostolical, because their founders bore none of the characteristics of Apos-

which the one can never be dissociated from the other. Such is the doctrine of St. Paul. Every high-priest, ac-
 logical opinions of those by whom it was composed. Those who have acquired a knowledge of the elements of theology must be aware, that the words or form by which a Sacrament is administered, must always be expressive of the virtue it imparts. Without such determinate words, the nature of a Sacrament would be an inert element, flexible to any, even a profane purpose; and hence, these words are, by scholastics, properly called the *form* which fits the matter to that end, for which it is destined. The words or form of the Eucharist are expressive of the real presence; and those of penance, of the remission of sin. Of orders, at least, of the priesthood, the peculiar and appropriate office, if we believe the Apostle, is to offer Sacrifice. The form, therefore, by which it is to be conferred, ought to be expressive of this peculiar duty. But the idea of a Sacrifice was banished from the English ritual: and, as to the form of episcopal consecration, it is confessed, almost on all hands, to have been imperfect and insufficient. The ceremony of anointing, too, used in the Catholic Church, was treated by the reformers with levity and derision. (*Ordinal of Edward VI. anno 1550.*) But why waste the reader's patience in shewing what little reverence the reformers attached to the episcopal character, when Cranmer, and his supposed consecrator, Barlow, acknowledged that bishops, like the chancellor, mayor, and sheriffs, depended on his Majesty; and that Cranmer did not mean in the exercise of their functions alone, but in every other particular, is evident from his saying that the usual ceremonies on such occasions (meaning those of consecration) are not necessary. (*Bossuet, Hist. des Variat. t. i. p. 345; Burnet, Heylin, &c.*) Persons who hold such opinions, must have been careless about the form of ordination: and so sensible did the Protestants become of its imperfections, that, in the reign of Charles II., it was improved to its present state, about 112 years after its introduction. But even supposing it was perfect, let not the ministers of the Church of England imagine, that it is the source from which their ordination flows. Parker and Barlow were more than fourscore years dead before this improvement, and must have, therefore, been deprived of all the virtue which that form could impart. If, therefore, the form of ordination were defective

tical men : for it is a notorious fact, that, instead of being eminent for their humility, their piety, and their morals, the first reformers, equally with their patrons, were renowned for their profaneness, their pride, and their public irregularity of life : instead of preaching by example, as well as by

ording to him, is appointed to *offer gifts and sacrifices*; where no sacrifice exists, a priesthood must be unnecessary. Such a priest would be as anomalous a character, as a king without any regal authority, or as a judge without any judicial functions. If, then, there be no sacrifice in the New Law, why insist on the validity of its priesthood? Or, if they must be so jealous of the priestly character, why labour to extinguish the office of offering sacrifice, which, according to the Apostle, gives the priesthood its distinction, character and name? There is a strange inconsistency in thus separating doctrines, which must be entirely received or entirely rejected. Eager for the honours of the Catholic Church, yet impatient of its control, Protestants would fain assume its priesthood, and reject the essential office with which that priesthood is intertwined. What they raise with one hand, they cast down with the other. But, to be consistent, it is necessary to believe in the Sacrifice of the Mass, or to annihilate altogether the existence of a Christian priesthood.”—(*Evidences of the Catholic Church, vol. ii. pp. 309—313.*)

in its beginning, it must have continued so in its descending series, unless we suppose some latent charm in the form adopted in the reign of Charles, which would reach back to the time of Elizabeth, to purify the source of the English episcopacy.”—(See also on this subject, Fletcher’s *Comparative View of the Grounds of the Catholic and Protestant Churches, chap. xii.*)

word, they bore testimony to the falsehood of their mission by the licentiousness of their manners.^(g)

No Protestant Church is *Apostolical*, because we know from history that, in the infancy of the Reformation, instead of following the Apostolical writings and Apostolical traditions, its abettors did not scruple to torture and pervert the Sacred Text to their own innovations, favouring their new creed by falsely pretending it to be conformable to the revealed will of the Almighty; propagating their religion by *adulterating the word of God*, and veiling the light of the Gospel, instead of exhibiting the *manifestation of the truth*.^(h) thus impugning the known faith by fiction and deceit, and fabricating ordinances for the God of truth and holiness, in the cause of falsehood and impiety.⁽ⁱ⁾ Well may we say, with St. Paul, to the deluded victims of such iniquity: *Who hath hindered you, that you should not obey the truth?*^(k) and well might they answer; *They who changed the word of God into*

^(g) See a spirited sketch of some of the first reformers, from Dr. Machale's *Evidences of the Catholic Church*, APPENDIX, No. XIV.

^(h) 2 Cor. iv. 2.

⁽ⁱ⁾ See Ward's *Errata of the Protestant Bible*, and Dr. Milner's *Inquiry into certain vulgar Opinions concerning the Catholic Inhabitants and Antiquities of Ireland*, pp. 271, &c.

^(k) Gal. v. 7.

a lie; ⁽¹⁾ the adulterators of the Sacred Text, the Protestant Reformers. ^(m)

⁽¹⁾ *Rom. i. 1. 25.*

^(m) “Henry VIII., in his first essay at reformation, allowed the free use of the Bible in an authorised version, not absolutely without comment, but, as his majesty afterwards discovered, disfigured by unfaithful renderings, and contaminated with notes calculated to mislead the ignorant and unwary.” — See Dr. Lingard’s *History of England*, vol. iv. p. 309.

Zuinglius, addressing Luther concerning his Scriptural works, uses the following energetical language: “Thou dost corrupt the word of God, Luther. Thou art seen to be a manifest and common perverter of the Scriptures.” (*Zuing. Lib. de Sacr. ad Luth.*, Op. tom. ii.)—See Milner’s *Letters to a Preb.* p. 185.

“The fact is notorious, the Bibles that were translated into English by Tindal, Coverdale, and Queen Elizabeth’s bishops were so corrupt, that a general outcry was raised against them, in which King James I. united.” — See *Bishop Watson’s Collect.* vol. iii. p. 98.

In Tindal’s Bible, Bishop Tunstal noted no less than two thousand corruptions in his translation of the New Testament.—(*Table of certain Places, Rhemish Test.*) Mr. Broughton, a learned Protestant, wrote to the Lords of the Council to request a new translation; for, he says, “that which is now in England is full of errors;” and he tells the Bishops, “that their public translation of the Scriptures into English is such that it perverts the text of the Old Testament in eight hundred and forty-eight places; and that it causes many to reject the New Testament, and

The Church of England, in particular, cannot be Apostolical, because there is no saying of the Apostles, nor any text of Scripture, nor any authority of Christ to support the monstrous notion, that a

to run [into eternal flames."—(*Triple Chord*, p. 14.) Staphylus found in Martin Luther's New Testament about one thousand corruptions: and in a petition to King James I. it is asserted, "that the translation of the Psalms comprised in the Book of Common Prayer, doth in *addition, subtraction, and alteration*, differ from the truth of the Hebrew, in, at least, two hundred places." (*Petr. p. 75, 79.*)—See Corless's *Reply to Townsend*.

The Protestant professor Zanchius, speaking of the writers of his own Religion, says, "We torture the Scriptures till they agree with our own fancies; and boast of being the disciples of the Fathers, while we refuse to follow their doctrines. To *deceive, to calumniate, to abuse*, is our familiar practice, nor do we care for any thing, provided we can defend our cause, good or bad, right or wrong. O tempora, O mores!" (*Zanchius ad Stormium*, Tom viii. Col. 828.)

Let us try this question by another test: let us examine what is the main object of the two religions. The Catholic has the truth and sincerity of religion in view, to make it neither more nor less severe than it really is; to represent it in its most winning and amiable light, and, at the same time, not to divest it of its terrors or restraints. But Protestantism, on the other hand, has ever evinced a marked and decided tendency to weaken all the obligations of the Gospel, to explain away all the injunctions which are most opposed to our inclinations, to smoothe the thorny path of our duties, and to admit as little as pos-

woman of the sixteenth century should be invested with the divine right of reforming the Church of God, of setting herself up as the arbiter of religious faith, and the infallible teacher of fallible doctrine.—Neither can a whole British Parliament substantiate a better claim to such an office.^(y)

Again, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because it possesses not two other characteristic

sible of what is irksome to our nature, or which necessitates the mastery of our passions. Which of the two is more likely to have corrupted the Sacred Text, to have distorted its meaning, and abridged its authority?

^(y) Speaking of the *divine commission*, Dr. Fletcher observes: “Since it was this alone, which made the apostles the pastors of the Christian Church,—so it is only the inheritance, or possession, of this same sacred diploma, which now, or at any time, invests any set of men with the same awful character:—and precisely as the apostles themselves would, without this sanction, have been the usurpers of holy things,—so, in like manner, now, whoever, not enjoying this same prerogative, pretends to perform the sacred functions, is a mere profaner in the eyes of religion. These conclusions are certain. Whence the learned Hooker remarks, that, in relation to the Church, the *commission* of its pastors is ‘the very chiefest thing.’ It is, in reality, *every thing*, insomuch that Archbishop Brett very justly says, ‘I have no occasion to examine men’s doctrines, but to inquire whether they have authority to act as the ministers of Christ, for, otherwise, they are no better than intruders and usurpers.’ Thus, is the whole business of ascertaining where the true Church subsists, reduced to the discussion of this one simple fact:—*Wheresoever the*

marks of the true Church, namely, constant *Visibility*, and *Indefectibility*.⁽²⁾

First,—No Protestant Church can claim any pretensions whatever to *Visibility*, because for upwards of ~~1600~~¹⁵⁰² years they were all perfectly invisible, having had no existence. To have been visible, she should always have been as the Catholic Church alone *has* been, and, as the true Church is described in Scripture, *the light of the world, like a city seated on a mountain, which cannot be hid*.^(a) No Protestant Church can be thus constantly

divine commission still subsists, which was once granted to the first apostles, there subsists the true Church of Jesus Christ. Wheresoever this is wanting, there is no Church at all, but a mere human conventicle."

See APPENDIX, No. XV. for some important extracts, farther illustrative of this subject, from Dr. Fletcher's *Comparative View*, pp. 36-43.

⁽²⁾ *Micheas* iv. 1. 2. *St. Matt.* v. 14. and xvi. 18. and xxviii. 18. 19. 20. *St. John* xvi. 16. 26. and xvi. 13. 1 *Tim.* iii. 15.

^(a) *St. Matt.* v. 14.—Evelyn, in his *Memoirs*, relates that “Sir R. Browne, Charles the Second’s minister in Paris, returned after a nineteen years’ exile, during all which time he had kept up in his chapel, the liturgy and offices of the Church of England, to his no small honour, and at a time when it was so low, and, as many thought, utterly lost, that in various controversies, both with papists and sectaries, our Divines used to argue for the *visibility* of the Church from *his chapel and congregation!*!” Where was its *universality*?

visible, because they all admit within themselves the principle of error: they admit that they may fall from their foundations and vanish.—For the moment a church has erred, all truth has vanished,—has departed from it; the moment it has fallen from the truth in which it was established by our Saviour, it has ceased to be the true visible Church. If she fail in one point, she fails in all: *He who offends in one point, is become guilty of all.*^(c) When a witness tenders his evidence, in part true and in part false, is he not immediately declared to be unworthy of credit *in toto*? He is not considered as a true and credible witness, because his testimony is in part true, but he is rejected altogether as a liar and a prevaricator, because it is in part false: we do not wait to sift the good from the bad, or try its merits in separate portions; but we at once expunge it entirely from our minds. So it is with the Church of Christ. She is the witness of the doctrines of the Gospel: if we find her bearing false testimony in one point, we should condemn her in all; we should declare her to be a false church, and unfaithful both to the promises and the commands of her Divine Founder. How, then, can a false Church be the visible Church of Christ, the God of Truth? How can she be the light of the world, when she is shrouded in the darkness of heresy? But, admitting any

(c) *St. James* ii. 10.

Protestant to be now visibly a true church, which is a monstrous proposition, and allowing the possibility, contrary even to their own expectations, of her remaining so, for ages to come, where was her visibility in ages past? To have been a visible Church, she should have been discoverable, as the Roman Catholic Church alone is, by one direct and luminous track, through every age which has succeeded the coming of her Divine Founder. She should have been *a holy and a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle;*^(c) pure and undefiled amidst the corruptions and the vices of the world; triumphant amidst the storms of persecution, and victorious over the assaults of heresy or schism.

Secondly,—No Protestant church has any title to *indefectibility*, because they are all founded upon the principle, that the Catholic church had erred. All who acknowledge themselves to be Christians, acknowledge the Catholic as the parent church; for the time was, when there was no other. They, therefore, who contend that the Catholic church had erred, necessarily admit a liability to error in the true church of Christ. For as the Catholic church was, for many ages, the only church in Christendom, she must then, at least, have been the true church, or no true church existed. Whichever be the case, there is a clear admission on the part of Protestants, of the fallibility of the church of Christ. It is then natural

^(c) *Ephes. v. 27.*

to inquire, how a fallible and erring Church—a Church which carries within herself the principle of dissolution—a Church which may preach falsehood as well as truth—which may be possessed with the spirit of darkness as well as the spirit of light, can be *the church of the living God, which is the pillar and ground of the truth?*^(d) Either the promises of Christ have failed, and the *Spirit of truth* has erred, or the church of God has preserved the purity of ~~the~~^{her} faith and doctrine. Our Saviour, the God of light and truth, has said; *I am the light of the world: he that followeth me, walketh not in darkness, but shall have the light of life;*^(e)—*I am with you always, even to the consummation of the world.*^(f) He has promised the Pastors of his Church *a comforter, the Spirit of truth to abide with them for ever,*^(g) *to teach them all things,*^(h) *and to teach them all truth.*⁽ⁱ⁾

(d) 1 Tim. iii. 15. (e) St. John viii. 12 (f) St. Matt. xviii. 20.

(g) St. John xvi. 16, 17.

(h) Ibid. 26.

(i) St. John xvi. 13.—These arguments are no novelties; they are at least as old as the second century of the Christian æra, when Tertullian thus addressed himself to the heretics of his day: “Well! then, for your satisfaction, we will suppose that all the churches have fallen into error!....not one of them has been looked upon by the Holy Spirit; not one directed in truth, by the Spirit which Christ had sent, and which he had asked of his Father, to be for his people the Teacher of Truth! This agent of God, this vicar of Christ, has then, we will suppose, neglected his ministry, by permitting the Churches

Yet, in opposition to these and many other express declarations and promises of Christ, Protestants presume to say, that our Saviour has left his Church without a guide to lead her through the mists of ignorance and the mazes of error, into the ways of truth and life. They argue as if they wished to persuade us, that the God of infinite goodness and infinite justice had commanded us to believe that which we have no means of ascertaining, and that he has given us only the faint glimmerings of human reason to interpret the sublime mysteries of Divine Revelation.—They tell us that he, whose decrees are fixed and immutable, (*if these ordinances fail before me, saith the Lord, then also the seed of Israel shall fail:*^(k) and again, *Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass,*^(l))—they tell us that he has condemned us to seek a steadfast faith in the wavering inconsistencies of our own minds;—that *Christ, who loved his Church, so as to deliver himself up for it, has now cruelly left it to be tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine:*^(m)—that the God of wisdom has abandoned his own work to *dishonesty and craftiness;*⁽ⁿ⁾ and that *the good shepherd, who laid down his life for his flock,*^(o) has now thrown it a prey to *false prophets, who come in sheep's*

to think and believe otherwise than he had himself announced to them by the mouth of his apostles.”

^(k) *Jeremiah xxxi. 36.* ^(l) *Ephes. v. 25.* ^(m) *Eph. iv. 14.*

⁽ⁿ⁾ *2 Cor. iv. 2.*

^(o) *St. John x. 15.*

clothing, but who inwardly are ravening wolves.^(p) Again; our Saviour declared to St. Peter, that he built his Church upon a rock, *and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it.*^(q) yet Protestants pretend that the words of God have been falsified; that the Church of Christ was built upon sand, and not upon a rock; that the powers of darkness have prevailed over the Spirit of light, and that *the pillar of truth* has been overthrown by the machinations of *the father of lies*. To shew the force of the declaration that the Church was built upon a rock, our Saviour elsewhere says: *Who-soever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon a rock, and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not; for it was founded upon a rock.*^(r) But Protestants, in maintaining that the Church of Christ had been torn from its foundations by the force of error, most pointedly falsify these words of the Son of God. They say that the Church was built upon sand; that the rain descended, the floods came, the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell: for it was founded upon sand. They say, that the Eternal Wisdom is not so wise as man, and that, instead of building secure from the storms of persecution, and the blasts of heresy, he lays his foundations upon a

^(p) *St. Matt.* vii. 15.

^(q) *St. Matt.* xvi. 18.

^(r) *St. Matt.* xxvii. 24, 25.

shallow and a tottering base. They say that the omnipotent arm of the Deity has refused to uphold his own work from destruction ; that he has promised what he would not perform ; that the right hand of God is shortened for the protection of *his chosen generation, his kingly Priesthood, his holy nation, his purchased people.*^(s) They would have us to suppose that the Almighty had selected means unequal to his design, and would constrain within narrow and insufficient limits, the powers of a Being confessedly infinite. They would have us to believe, that our faith reposes upon *the wisdom of men, and not upon the power of God.*^(t)

Innumerable are the texts of Scripture to prove that *indefectibility* is a necessary mark of the true Church, and innumerable and uninterrupted are the testimonies to shew, that the Roman Catholic Church alone possesses this characteristic. The Church of Christ is never alluded to in the ancient prophecies, nor mentioned in any part of the sacred writings, but as containing within herself the principle of perpetuity. *This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord : My Spirit that is in thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.*^(u)

^(s) St. Peter ii. 9. ^(t) 1 Cor. ii. 5. ^(u) Isai. lix. 21.

Such is the promise of the Almighty to his people; such is the declaration of his fidelity to his Church: and *the truth of the Lord remaineth for ever.*^(x) All the Fathers, all the expounders of the sacred text, concur in applying the prophecies regarding the law of Moses, and the promises made to the people of Israel, to the law of Christ, of which the Jewish dispensation was but a commencement and a type, and to the establishment of his religion upon earth. The circumstances are too parallel for the application not to be manifest at once. From the vocation of Abraham to the coming of our Redeemer, the seed of Israel never failed; they suffered a persecution of 400 years in the bondage of Egypt; numbers of them apostatized; they rebelled against their Maker, and they were led captive into Babylon: at one moment they triumphed in victory and prosperity—at another they mourned in defeat and disaster; at one period they were a free, a numerous, a powerful, and a wealthy people; at another, they were reduced to the extremity of slavery, poverty, and ruin;—they were encompassed by enemies on every side; they were desolated with the sword, with famine, and with pestilence, but their race was never extinguished,—the true religion was never lost: there always remained a chosen few, whose virtue was invincible, and whose faith withstood

^(x) *Psl.* cxvi. 2.

every temptation; *who never bowed the knee to Baal;*^(y) *but who walked in the name of the Lord their God.*^(z)

So has it been with the Catholic Church. She was persecuted, and she rose up stronger and more glorious from persecution; she was assailed by heresy and schism, and she acquired force and stability from the attacks of her enemies, from the perfidy of her false friends, and from the defection of her perverse and rebellious followers. The Lord has set his *sanctuary in the midst of her for evermore;*^(a) she has always *walked in his judgments, and observed his statutes;*^(b) she is always guided by *one shepherd,*^(c) and *illuminated by the everlasting light.*^(d) In fine, she alone is, she alone can be, infallible, because she alone has ever been true to herself. Setting all the prophecies and every text of Scripture aside, she alone can be infallible, because she alone has ever declared herself in possession of infallibility. No other Church has ever advanced any pretensions to it. All others are founded upon the fallibility and infirmity of man, without any regard to the promises and the power of God.

To pursue the same reasoning:—As the Almighty gave the Israelites a pillar of fire to guide them

(y) *Rom. xi. 4.* (z) *Micheas ii. 5.* (a) *Ezekiel xxxvii. 26.*

(b) *Lev. xviii. 5.* (c) *St. John x. 16.* (d) *Isaiah lx. 1.*

through the obscurity of the night, and a cloud to conduct them during the day, through a strange and hostile country ; so has the same beneficent Being given us, in consideration of the same necessity, a bright and safe conductor through the dangerous and toilsome pilgrimage of this world, a never-failing, a never-erring Church. And, as the Jewish people were ordered to *observe and do whatever was commanded them by the Scribes and Pharisees who sat in the chair of Moses,*^(e) so are we commanded to hear and obey those who sit in the chair of St. Peter, and fill the stations of the Apostles;^(f) they who are appointed by the same power and for the same purpose, namely, for the interpretation of the Law of God.

That the Law of God should be sometimes difficult of interpretation, and that the revelation of Heaven should have been so made to man, that each individual should not be capable of comprehending it, but that it should require an authorized tribunal to explain it, is only consistent with the usual situation of things in this imperfect state of existence. Neither is it any uncommon circumstance, that the lawgiver himself should not be the obvious and direct expounder of his law, but that he should choose to perform this office by delegation. In

(e) *St. Matt.* xxiii. 2, 3. (f) *St. Matt.* xviii. 17. — xxviii. 20. *St. Luke* x. 16. *Heb.* xiii. 7, 17. 1 *Ep. John* iv. 6.

mere human institutions this is invariably the case; parliament, for example, frames the law, the judges define it, and the jury pronounces upon its application. Were every one to interpret the law for himself, what confusion would it not create! How impossible would it not be to solve difficulties, to allay doubts and contentions, and to execute justice between man and man! As it is in the body politic, so it is, in a much stronger degree, amongst mankind, considered as a community of Christians, bound to believe the same faith, to obey the same pastors, to observe the same precepts, to be actuated by one soul and one spirit, and, in all things essential to salvation, to do and to think alike. The diversity of temperament, talent, and disposition, would create so great a variety of judgment and opinion,—and we have the lamentable proof of it daily before our eyes,—as to set all law and reason at defiance, had not the Almighty wisely instituted a decisive and infallible expounder of his law, at the same time that he revealed it, and imposed an obligation on us to believe and to obey it. Man having fallen from the original perfection of his creation, his omnipotent Maker, instead of restoring him to his former excellence, in which he might have been capable of judging of all things for himself, adapted his new order of things to the altered state of his existence, and supplied the weakness and imperfection of his na-

ture, by his own supernatural direction and assistance.

That this law has always received the same interpretation from this divinely appointed tribunal ; that the same articles of faith have always been proposed to our belief, and the same precepts held out for our observance—is a truth, to which there is the strongest and most perfect chain of evidence to conduct us ; a truth, which Protestants deny in vain ; a truth, which most incontestably establishes the triumph and the indefectibility of the Roman Catholic Church.

From all that has been advanced, it follows as a matter of course, that I cannot conform to Protestantism. I cannot, if it were only for this reason : that, when I read in Scripture, that *he that believeth not shall be condemned,*^(g) I cannot trust so important a concern as my religious belief to a Church which may deceive me. We know that *the ways of God are so straight, that even fools shall not err therein.*^(h) We also know, that, in Scripture, *there are things hard to be understood,*⁽ⁱ⁾ *which the unlearned and*

^(g) *St. Mark* xvi. 16.

^(h) *Isai.* xxxv. 8.

⁽ⁱ⁾ In Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, we find the following passage : "*Mrs. Knowles.*—She had the New Testament before her. *Johnson.*—Madam, she could not understand the New Testament, the most difficult book in the world ; for which the study of a life is required. *Mrs. Knowles.*—It is clear as to essentials. *Johnson.*—But not as to

the unstable wrest to their own destruction;^(k)

controversial points." (*Vol. iii. p. 324.*) Are not *all* points, even the most essential, controverted by the different denominations of Christians?

"St. Augustine observes, (*Lib. I. contra Cress. 33.*) that it is only by the Church we know what is the sense of Scripture, or what is not. His words are: 'The truth of the Scripture is held by us, or we possess the true meaning of them, when we do that which is approved of in the whole Church, which church the authority of the Scriptures themselves commends:'—so far removed was he from the opinion of those who would undertake to determine religious doubts, by the very book, from the misunderstanding of which they all arise. This the holy doctor, (*Tract. 18, in Johan. Cap. 5.*) expressly attests, in the following words: 'Heresies have arisen, and certain perverse doctrines, ensnaring souls, and precipitating them into the abyss, have been broached, only when the good Scriptures have been badly understood, and when that which was badly understood, was rashly and boldly attested.'"—*Reply to Dr. Magee*, p. 12.

^(k) 2 *Ep. St. Peter* iii. 10.—From infancy to age, amongst the poor and the rich, the learned and the ignorant, the savage and the civilized,—the bible is still administered to all as the sole and sovereign specific for the salvation of man; and while the bible is thrust into the hand, this motto is dinned into the head: "*The bible without note or comment, the bible ALONE, is the religion of Protestants.*" And so it is;—for there is not a truth which is not contradicted; an absurdity, which is not attested; an impiety, which is not grounded upon some

that *false prophets come in the clothing of sheep*

pretended interpretation of the sacred text. Yet, in spite of this, (and of which it would be needless to cite examples, so notorious is the fact,) each individual is invited to *search the Scriptures*, (and which, by the bye, was said of the Old, and not of the New Testament, and was applied to the discovery of the signs and prophecies relative to the coming of Christ,) and to select his religion therefrom. But then, (strange inconsistency! and so circumscribed in their operation are the principles of Protestantism!) if in *this kingdom* a man should read that declaration of Christ to his ministers; "*He that heareth you, heareth me: he that despiseth you, despiseth me....He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen or a publican....We are of God: he that knoweth God, heareth us...I am with you always, even to the consummation of the world....He that followeth me, walketh not in darkness, &c. &c.*—and should discover therein a divine command to obey the mandates of the Church, in all that concerns the object for which Christ came upon earth:—if in this kingdom of evangelical liberty and of religious slavery, a Christian in his researches in the sacred volume, should chance to perceive a promise from the God of Truth, to grant to feeble man a preservative from error, upon matters upon which he was to be judged by the justice of heaven; and if on beholding an injunction to *believe* upon pain of eternal condemnation, together with a divine assurance of the difficulties and dangers with which he was encompassed, he should convince himself that there was but one, true, holy, catholic, and apostolical Church, which had subsisted, and which would sub-

to ensnare us ;⁽¹⁾ that there are never wanting those who would *make dissensions and offences contrary*

sist, uninjured, and uncorrupted, as the guide and instructor of mankind ;—and seeing all this, should he be bold enough to fancy that this Church was any other than that established by the law of the land ; that, for example, these promises, this authority, these characteristics, belonged to that great assemblage of Christians who had ever formed one compact and united body, one fold under one shepherd, being, and professing to be, the depository of the law of God, and the promulgator of the revelations of heaven ; in fine, the ancient, Catholic, and universal Church, and not a modern, isolated society of separatists :—then is his bible become a traitor ; then does the whole wisdom of the legislature step in to interpret for him ; then are pains and penalties put in requisition to undeceive him of his errors, to quicken his understanding, and point to the full blaze and glory of *the Reformed Church of England*. Then is he taunted with obstinacy and stupidity if he cannot find reason enough to subscribe to the thirty-nine articles ; then it is said to him, “ Impious blockhead, does not thy bible show thee that the doctrine of transubstantiation is all a fable? Dost not thou see the idolatry of the Mass, and of the invocation of saints? Dost thou not perceive that no pre-eminence was given to Peter,—that though his succession has been perpetuated through persecution and revolution for 1800 years ; though those successors have ever been acknowledged to have inherited the divine commission of their predecessor, by the great majority of

⁽¹⁾ *St. Matt.* vii. 15.

to the doctrine ;^(m) and that there will always arise men speaking perverse things, to draw disciples

Christians throughout the universe, all conspiring to obey him as their head; though we see Christ investing him, and him only, with the keys, the emblems of authority, for the government of that Church of which he was declared to be the foundation upon earth, and over which he was appointed pastor, to feed both lambs and sheep, without limitation or restriction, in every portion of the wide world:—Seeing all this, dost thou not perceive it to be safe to swear that no successor of Peter hath, or ought to have any pre-eminence, jurisdiction, or authority over that part of the flock of Christ dwelling within these privileged realms? Does not thy bible tell thee that the king of England is the only lawful head of the Church, the only true protector and defender of the faith? that on him has at length devolved the office of Peter? that *he* is the inheritor of his credentials? that he and his Parliament are to regulate your faith, not, as heretofore, the bishops of the Christian world, whom the Holy Ghost had appointed to rule the Church of God? that their ministry is done, their authority annulled, their lineage extinct?” Such is the language of the church of England biblicals to those, who, like us, have fallen upon that interpretation of the sacred writings which makes us think as our ancestors thought before us, and as the great majority of Christians have always thought since those writings were first penned. If, on the other hand, as too frequently happens, the perverse searcher and knavish expounder should fancy that he discovers

^(m) *Rom. xvi. 17.*

away after them;⁽ⁿ⁾ *erring and driving into error.*^(o)

among the tropes and figures, and parables, and mystical expressions of the sacred volume, either the gross absurdities of the Ranters, the Jumpers, the Southcotians, or the more sober, but perhaps not less dangerous and erroneous tenets of the Quakers, the Wesleyans, the Anabaptists, or of any of those hundred sects, those protesters against Protestants, those dissenters from the dissenting church of England, which swarm around the parent-rebel of them all,—then again does she raise her voice, and exert her authority; then again, till lately, at least, did she call on the secular arm to protect her from such abominations, & to expel such foolish interpretations from the mind, by that luminous expounder, and acute reasoner, *civil disqualification*. Then does she exclaim, “Does not your bible tell you that schism is a crime of the blackest dye; but that seceding from the Church of Rome, the primitive, parent church, which had subsisted for 1500 years, and before our name and nation was heard of, and separating yourselves from the acknowledged centre of unity, that *that* is no schism? does it not explain, in the clearest terms, that the guilt of schism is alone incurred in separating from the mother of all Christian Churches, the Church of Henry VIII., of Edward VI., of Elizabeth, of the Parliament of England?—This is the schism of the Bible, this is rebellion against the word of Scripture, this is treason before God and man.” Such is the consistent reasoning of the bible distributors of the Church of England.

⁽ⁿ⁾ *Acts* xx. 30.

^(o) 2 *Tim.* iii. 13.—See Dr. Doyle’s *Defence*, &c. p. 88.

With such facilities on the one hand, and with such difficulties and dangers on the other, is it not folly, is it not madness, to trust a Church which bears the insignia of error upon her forehead, and owns herself incapable of protecting us? If we disown her authority, which her principles well warrant us to do, and have recourse to private interpretation, do we not immediately fall into presumption, by searching, in the infirmity and inconstancy of own minds, for the discovery of that firm and steadfast faith, without which we shall be condemned? Is it not incomparably safer to rely upon the united wisdom, talents, virtue, and experience of the good and great in every age; upon a representative assembly of the universal Church, under the sacred guidance of the Holy Spirit? *It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us,*^(p) are the remarkable and emphatic words used by the first council of the Church, in promulgating its decisions. Protestants, however, say that the Holy Ghost is no longer our guide; but, as if to silence their doubts, and compel their submission, our Saviour himself declares the contrary; he says, *his Paraclete shall abide with his Church for ever, and lead her into all truth;*^(q) and, in consequence, he declares us no better than *heathens or publicans,*^(r) if we refuse to hear her. Still, Pro-

^(p) Acts xv. 28. ^(q) St. John xiv. 16, 26. ^(r) St. Matt. xviii. 17.

testants say : We owe no obedience to the Church ; let us follow the guidance of our own fancy, for the Almighty will not require our allegiance, where he has given no power to rule. But, as if again to confound their presumption, and to give a clear confirmation of his doctrine, our Saviour inspires his apostles thus to admonish and instruct the faithful : *Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you Bishops, to rule the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.*^(s) Such are the words of Scripture, and yet Protestants maintain that the Church has no authority ; that the Hierarchy has no divine commission to rule the Church of Christ.

Again I repeat, that I cannot conform to Protestantism, because I cannot trust so important a concern as my religious creed, to a church which must necessarily be fickle and inconstant in her doctrine, and may, perhaps, altogether cease to exist. Because, as such, she can never lead me to any fixed and certain faith ; since, as she “ claims the twofold privilege of changing her tenets at will, and of being infallible at every change,”^(t)

^(s) *Acts* xx. 28.

^(t) “ The right of private judgment, as allowed by the Established Church, was a sort of an apology for her own revolt, and a sacrifice made to the Baal of puritanism ;

she can never answer the end proposed by the immutable God of Truth—that of pointing out his ways, and expounding his doctrine. During the period in which she is wedded to errors, she is evidently incapable of being the teacher of truth; and even in the season of her greatest purity, her liability to error must always disqualify her for that office: for though she may teach truth to-day, we have no assurance that she will continue to do so to-morrow; and, under such circumstances, who shall pretend to say when truth fails, and falsehood begins,—who shall tell us when she is possessed with *the spirit of error*, and when with *the spirit of Truth?*^(v)

but it is opposed to the letter and spirit of the church creed, as well as incompatible with the gospel, which foretels of heresies and schisms; for if the right of private judgment, in opposition to the declared decision of the Church, exist, it is utterly impossible that heresy should be damnable, or schism a crime. Every church, then, that excommunicates authors of heresy, that is, men who, exercising their right of private judgment, choose their own religion; or which casts out among the heathen the maintainers of conventicles, (all which the Established Church does,) is guilty, if guilt it be, of denying the right of private judgment, and of exercising, thereby, a dominion over conscience. Whether the church, doing so, claim infallibility or not, is nothing to the purpose; her judgment, and the effects of it to the excommunicated persons, are the same.”—*Reply to Dr. Magee.*

^(v) *St. John* iv. 6.

If I am unable to repose my confidence on such a church, and it is evident I cannot, only two alternatives remain:—I must either submit implicitly to some safe and certain guide, or, as I have said before, follow my own private interpretation ^{of the sacred writings.} And this latter course, though so repugnant to reason and common sense, is yet so generally prevalent among Protestants, that, in my mind, it forms another very powerful argument against conformity to their principles. Considering the fluctuations of opinion necessarily attending the person who frames his creed merely by the light of his own judgment in the interpretation of the Scriptures, it is utterly impossible he can ever attain to that firmness of belief on which a rational man would ground the security of his faith; or if, by such inadequate and disproportionate means, he should form to himself some consistency of mind upon the subject, he must, at least, be guilty of presumption, in venturing upon that which the wisest and best men in Christendom have always declared themselves incapable of accomplishing.

But there are not wanting those who, seeing the difficulties of their situation, boldly contend that a diversity of opinion in matters of faith destroys not the unity of religion. But this is a doctrine so monstrous, that it is impossible to read a chapter in the inspired writings, and not feel convinced of the falsity of such a position. It is at

variance with the very principles of the Reformation, because, if unity of faith were not necessary, why make a schism in the Church in favour of any particular code of tenets? It is at variance with reason, because it is unreasonable that we, who are the children of obedience, should be permitted to follow our own fancy in interpreting the immutable word of God; it is at variance with revelation, because it destroys charity, which is the essence of ^{revealed} religion,^(x) and because revelation says, *speak all the same thing, and let there be no schisms among you.*^(y)

^(x) 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2.

^(y) 1 Cor. i. 10.—Perhaps in these days of latitudinarianism, the Protestant will be induced to concede but little, even to the authority of his best and most learned divines. I will, however, invite him to the perusal of their opinions, but not without expressing my astonishment that men who could see so much, should not have been capable of seeing a little more;—that, where the discovery was so easy,—where history was so clear and so decisive,—they should have hesitated for a moment where to attach the guilt of schism, and to declare who were the separatists, and who the original and united body. But it is only another lamentable proof amongst the many which exist, that self-love and worldly interest are too often allowed to blind the understanding, to mar the best designs of the Deity, and to benumb the best faculties of the soul. “Touching the sin of dividing the Church,” says Dr. Goodman, “that it is of the deepest dye and greatest

If a diversity of religious opinions were permitted, whence all those denunciations against

guilt, I suppose we shall easily agree; for indeed, nobody can well doubt of that, who considers what care our Saviour took to prevent it; what pains he took with his Apostles that they might be thoroughly instructed and not differ in the delivery of his mind to the world; with what extraordinary ardour he prayed for them upon this very account—(*John xvii. 10.*): and the Apostles themselves answered their Master's care with their own diligence and circumspection. He that observes how industrious they were to resist all beginnings of schism in every Church, to heal all breaches, and to take away all occasions of division; to unite all hearts, and reconcile all minds; how they taught people to detest this distemper, as the bane of Christianity; charging them to use the greatest caution against it; to mark and avoid all those men that inclined that way, as persons of a contagious breath, and infectious to society; what odious names they give it, as *carnality, the work of the flesh and of the devil*: he, I say, that observes all this, cannot but be apprehensive of the greatness of this sin. But he that shall trace the sense of the Church a little further, will find the primitive Christians having it in such detestation, that they thought it equal to the most notorious idolatry, murder, and sacrilege."

"I will challenge," says S. Parker, Bishop of Oxford, "all the world to show me any one thing more earnestly enjoined and frequently recommended, than the preservation of unity among Christians; and thence, if without an unity of government, no other could be possibly preserved; as our author (Thorndyke) has proved, from common sense

innovators and false teachers? Why does the Apostle so often and so strenuously insist upon unity? Why does he exclaim, *Is Christ divided?*^(*) *God is not the God of dissension, but of*

and common experience, that must be the thing principally commanded by all these injunctions. And thus, our Saviour, having instituted the society of his Church, and established governors in it, when he enjoins them to be careful to preserve unity, no man can be so dull as not to understand, that he thereby requires them to make use of all means of obtaining it, but especially such as are necessary to its preservation in all societies. And therefore, whether this unity of government be enjoined in express words of Scripture, I will not concern myself to inquire, because it is as clear there to all men of common sense, as if it were so enjoined, and that is enough."

(*) 1 Cor. i 13.—Jesus Christ, praying to his Father for his Apostles and Disciples says: *As thou hast sent me into this world, I also have sent them into the world. And for them do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth....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 me, I have given to them; that they may be one, as we also are one.*—(St. John xvii.) How could truth and unity be more clearly and more energetically inculcated?

The following passages are to the same effect. St. Paul, writing to the first Christians, says: *For first of all, I hear that when you come together in the church, there are schisms amongst you; and in part I believe it. For there*

peace.^(a) Many also hush the voice of conscience, and, while they strive to vindicate their conduct to themselves, plead for their apology, that their faith is complete if they believe, in what they call, the grand leading tenets of Christianity;^(b) and in

must be heresies, that they also who are approved, may be made manifest among you. (1 Cor. xi. 18, 19.) Again; Be of one mind, have peace; and the God of peace and of love shall be with you. (2 Cor. xiii. 11.) But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there shall be among you lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction. (2 St. Peter ii. 1.) My brethren, if any of you err from the truth, and one convert him, he must know that he who causeth a sinner to be converted from the error of his way, shall save his soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins.” (St. James v. 20.) For such false Apostles are deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ. (2 Cor. xi. 13.) The word of the Lord endureth for ever, and this is the word which has been preached unto you. (1 St. Peter i. 25.) We are of God: he that knoweth God, heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth us not: by this we know the spirit of Truth, and the spirit of error. (1 St. John iv. 6.) How true it is that error does, will, and must exist: and that truth is immutable and enduring, and always discoverable, if we will but apply the proper means, and have recourse to the proper sources.

^(a) 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

^(b) “To extenuate the number and guilt of the ancient heresies, it has been often insinuated that they were but

consequence they profess to consider doctrinal points as matters of minor importance. But so

so many shades, which gave a pleasing variety to the face of Christianity,* without preventing a substantial agreement. This is an idea which has been propagated with great zeal, though plainly opposed to the very nature of Christianity. If there are doctrines which can be denied, without forfeiting the birth-right of Christians, it would be desirable to know the limits which it would be death to transgress; for *he that believeth not shall be condemned*. — (*Mark xvi. 16.*) Notwithstanding the frequency of its repetition, the distinction of fundamental and non-fundamental articles is as yet vague and undefined: nor has any method been ever assigned, by which the doubtful distinction can be ascertained. The Scripture does not fix the limits. Obedience to the authority of the Church is the fundamental article, which it most clearly defines. If its authority be once discarded, every other criterion must be arbitrary and capricious. No individual will deliberately rank his own errors among those by which the foundations of Christianity are upturned. He may be shocked at the impiety which characterizes the doctrines of others, yet is insensible to that which is conspicuous in his own. He may be told that his errors are fundamental, but can he not rebuke the officious insinuation, by an indignant appeal to the sovereign and uncontrollable tribunal of his own private authority?" — (Dr. Machale's *Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church*, vol. i. p. 322.)

* Dr. Middleton says, that *diversity of opinions, in religious matters, is as natural as diversity of tastes*. It was a favourite idea with some of the Reformers, who wished for peace on any terms; and it is still proclaimed aloud by many a ranter of the conventicle.

far from this being the reality, there is not the slightest doubt but that we shall stand or fall, we shall live or die, by our faith in doctrinal points.

We may find a striking illustration of this in the doctrine of the real presence. The Israelites in Egypt were informed that, unless they were sprinkled with the blood of the paschal lamb, the angel of death should destroy them. Our Saviour informs *us*, that *except we eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, we shall not have life in us.*^(c) Is it, then, a matter of minor importance whether we are to live or die, and that eternally too? and yet the words of Christ declare that this depends upon our eating his flesh and drinking his blood. But do Protestants do this? They frequent the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper—but do they there eat of his flesh and drink of his blood? They say they do not. We say we do, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.—Is it, then, a matter of minor importance to have this point decided, on which depends everlasting life? Is it a case of little moment, whether we have a false or a true faith, upon a doctrine involving such stupendous consequences? *As, without faith, it is impossible to please God,*^(d) so, without faith, even though we should be the partakers of it, it is impossible to live by this bread of life.

^(c) *St. John vi. 53.*

^(d) *Hebrews xi. 5.*

Many also hold the preposterous idea of an amalgamation of truth and falsehood in the true Church of Christ, and are satisfied with it in this state ; but surely, if the religion of the God of truth once becomes contaminated with error, it ceases to be his. By superadding new and unwarranted doctrines, or by denying the smallest article of the Christian faith, she errs as much as if she rejected the greatest mystery of our belief, because the smallest rests upon the same authority as the greatest, *not upon the wisdom of men, but upon the power of God.*^(e) If she has failed in one point, she has failed in all : *He that offends in one point, is guilty of all.*^(f) Truth is essentially one—she associates not with error, without the loss of her reputation. *What fellowship hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial?*^(g) If there be a true Church, and undoubtedly there is, that Church is true, in every sense of the word. She is not an unnatural combination of truth and falsehood, a chaos-mixture of light and darkness, which neither the ingenuity nor the capacity of man can separate or distinguish. She is the truth, and *only* the truth ; not true in some doctrines, and false in others ; but, like the God by whom she was established, and by whom she is still protected and directed, she is TRUTH ITSELF.

(e) 1 Cor. ii. 5. (f) St. James ii. 10. (g) 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15.

But to return to our argument :—Let us take, for instance, this same doctrine of the real presence, and see whether reason, which is as various and uncertain as the dispositions of men, can guide us into any settled faith concerning it. Catholics and Greeks believe in Transubstantiation, and Lutherans in Consubstantiation, while the Church of England, perhaps, rejects the real presence altogether. Yet, this contrariety of belief is all grounded upon the self-same texts of Scripture. The light of reason directs us all, and yet we all arrive at opposite conclusions : and how can it be otherwise? How is it possible, amidst such a variety of opinions, to *reason* ourselves into any decided judgment?^(h)

^(h) Dr. Doyle, writing upon this subject, observes :—
 “The numerous and discordant sects which, since the 16th century, have sprung up in the midst of the Slavonic nations, which, as Leibnitz observes, then separated themselves from the Latin Church and name, afford ample evidence of the insufficiency of human reason, or of the scriptures, interpreted by private judgment, to preserve unity in the body of Christ ; as also, of the absolute necessity of a controlling and supreme church authority to preserve such unity, and check the spirit of religious innovation.

“These sectaries, like a discomfited army, having been driven from one position to another—from reason to the Scriptures—from the Scriptures, to the Scriptures interpreted by the judgment of each individual—from the

Let us take another illustration :—After instituting the Sacrament of the Eucharist, our Saviour

Scriptures so interpreted, to the same interpreted by the interior unction or taste of the Spirit ; driven, in fact, from absurdity to absurdity, with the mark of schism, like that of Cain, imprinted on their forehead, without possessing one Church or one altar, throughout the kingdom, connected in any way with those which were Catholic, and Apostolic ; they, in the delirium of their revolt, sought to break down the Church herself into an immense mass of confused and jarring elements, preferring a place in this chaos to a recognition of their errors, and to the obtaining, by a dutiful submission, a place in that house of peace and unity, from which, in a moment of passion, they had departed. They said that the Church of God, the kingdom of the Redeemer, the body of Christ, consisted of every sect and every heresy which invoked the name of the Lord. When they first broached this monstrous opinion, it was said to them, (*Psal. lxxiii.*) *and his house is in peace.* Are those contending sectaries the *men of good will* to whom the angels announced at Bethlehem, (*Luke ii. 14,*) that Christ came to bring peace upon earth ?

“ Are they, who contend one with another, even to excommunication, that strong body, which, drawing its strength from its union, is called by Christ himself *a rock* ? Are these sectaries that one fold, under one pastor, spoken of by our Lord, (*John x. 16,*) where all hear the same voice, where all feed on the same pasture, where altar is not erected against altar, but where all are one body, who partake of the same bread ? Is it possible that he, who came to gather together in one, the children of God who

said : DO THIS IN COMMEMORATION OF ME ; and he imposed a positive command thereby. Our Saviour also said, and that upon the same occasion. *You ought to wash one another's feet, for I have given you an example, that as I have done to you, so do you also.*^(d) Yet nothing is more certain than that no positive command is conveyed by these words. But how do we know it?—By reason? No. Reason would say that one command is equal to another ; if both proceed from the same authority, both are equally binding. But reason, singly, has no sway over such questions. No : it is not within the province of the weak and fallible guidance of our own limited capacity alone, to conduct us through the maze of religious controversy. We must have recourse to some superior power, to the divine Spirit of truth, to those whom the Holy

were dispersed, (*John xvii. 11.*) should assemble them only to contend with one another? Is it for an assemblage of discordant sects, that Christ prayed, saying : “ Holy Father, keep them in thy name, whom thou hast given to me, that they may be one as thou and I are one ? ” (*John, xvii. 11.*) Was it for such an assemblage he invoked the Spirit of peace, saying to his Apostles : “ Peace be to you : as my father sent me, so I send you : and having said this, he breathed on them, saying : “ Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” (*John 20, 21, 22.*)—*Reply to Dr. Magee.*

^(d) *St. John xiii. 14, 15.*

Ghost has appointed to *rule the Church of God.*^(e) Talent, genius, ignorance, and simplicity, must alike bow to this tribunal. We must no longer give a pretended superiority to human reason over Divine Revelation. This is ‘the head and front of our offending;’ this is the spring and essence of heresy; and till this spirit of pride, disobedience, and presumption shall yield to a meekness and docility, *bringing into captivity all understanding unto the obedience of Christ;*^(f) till we consider the ‘sun of Revelation as better than the twilight of our reason,’ the same miserable effects, dissension and division, doubt and error, will continue to flow from the same corrupted sources. Without a centre of unity, to attract us by one common principle; without *those ancient bounds which our fathers have set,*^(g) to guard us within a safe inclosure; without a rallying point, to which all may fly for protection in their trouble and distress; without a

^(e) *Acts*, xx. 28, &c. “Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock wherein the Holy Ghost that placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God, which he had purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departure, ravening wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock: and of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.”

^(f) *2 Cor.* x. 5.

^(g) *Prov.* xxii. 28.

tribunal of final decision, from which no appeal can be made, we shall never rest satisfied or secure.

This tribunal can be no other than that which the Eternal Wisdom has appointed, to preserve with jealous care the sacred deposit of his law, a representative assembly of the universal Church, the concurring opinion of those whom the Holy Ghost has placed to rule it. Here all doubts are quieted, and all dissensions allayed;—here the weak are strengthened, and the strong are confirmed, in their faith;—here we tread with a firm step; and while others are tossed to and fro by every wind and wave, we remain secure upon the steadfast rock. It is by this we preserve the *unity of the spirit in the bond of peace*; ^(h) through this *we believe and are saved*; ⁽ⁱ⁾ by this *with one mind and with one mouth we glorify God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. ^(k)

Independently of all this, which to my mind brings full and entire conviction, and assures me in the clearest terms which of the two is the safer and the better Church; many other reasons may be urged, and many other arguments may be drawn, against conformity to Protestantism.

In the *Third* place, therefore, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because, instead of being go-

^(h) *Ephes.* iv. 3. ⁽ⁱ⁾ *St. Mark*, xvi. 16. ^(k) *Rom.* xv. 6.

verned by any fixed principles, it is full of contradictions and inconsistencies.

It is inconsistent,—because, in rejecting the spiritual supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, Protestants have established a much more arbitrary spiritual jurisdiction and supremacy in the person of a layman, a woman, or even of a child, by ascribing to Henry VIII. and his successors the power of deciding on heresies, schisms, and all doctrinal points; a power never entrusted by the Catholic Church to any Pope whatever.⁽¹⁾ It is inconsistent, because, in the 20th article of her formulary, the Church of England declares that the Church hath authority in controversies of faith. If so, why does a modern, isolated Church, that has separated herself from the great family of Christendom—that was founded by a haughty and voluptuous prince, not by a meek and mortified Apostle—that has never produced one single individual super-eminent for sanctity and wisdom, nor ever stamped the seal of heaven upon her faith by supernatural attestations—that has modelled her doctrines and her discipline, not by the canons of any general council, but by the acts of a national parliament;^(m)—why does *such* a one deny the same

⁽¹⁾ See Dr. Milner's *History of Winchester*, vol. 1, p. 364.

^(m) I know it is said that the parliament does not define doctrines, but only proposes them: but, it is equally true

power to a Church who traces through eighteen centuries an uninterrupted descent from the Apostles—who stands illustrious by the piety and learning of a thousand Saints and scholars—who has beheld her pastors assembled from every region of the Christian world, in eighteen general councils, to bear witness to her faith,—and who looks forth upon a hundred nations dwelling within her fold, and constituting the true kingdom of God upon earth?⁽ⁿ⁾

that no tenet can be a doctrine of the Church of England, which is not first sanctioned and promulgated by an act of parliament. The authority of the Church, in matters of faith, is subservient to the parliament, not having the right to frame a single article, without her sanction. Such has been, almost always, her undeviating practice.

⁽ⁿ⁾ The Established Church of England, but especially that of Ireland, is a stupendous structure of worldly pomp and interested traffic, in which the episcopal dignity, enriched with privileges and revenues, is bartered against political influence, and the cure of souls is put up to public sale. She possesses an hierarchy without spiritual authority—an altar and a priesthood without a sacrifice—pastors without a flock—a head without unity—a creed without believers. She has the semblance of all that of which a Church ought to consist, but by that principle of self-destruction with which she identified herself at her birth, she is become an empty tenement, or rather a white-washed sepulchre. She is a body without a soul—a gorgeous shrine without a relic—a taber-

Again,—the Protestant Church is inconsistent in holding the impossibility of performing a work of supererogation ;^(o) for, at the same time that she acknowledges the efficacy of fasting, confession, and other acts of humility and mortification, she seldom recommends, and never enforces, their observance.

nacle without a God—a Propitiatory without a Deity to proclaim his oracles to mankind. As a religious institution, she has not one redeeming virtue, save a Catholic code of morality, often contradicted by those who are appointed to be its guardians, and always feebly, *very* feebly enforced. As a political engine she is still worse : she is a garden of delights portioned out among the great families of the realm, by the ruling minister of the day, the occupiers of which are retained in their state of subserviency through every successive change, if not for the sake of consistency in their original submission, by the more attractive lure of an almost never-failing hope of advancement. Is it wise in such a Church to court the enmity of a whole people ? She herself needs reform much more than she is fitted to reform others : but she might be amended without being destroyed.

^(o) “ Voluntary works, besides, over and above God’s commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety : for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more, for his sake, than of bounden duty is required : whereas, Christ saith plainly : ‘ When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.’ ”—(*Fourteenth of the Thirty-nine Articles.*)

If she considered them necessary, she would enforce them; but as she is content only to recommend them, she must of necessity account them as works of supererogation. Of those who deny the power of performing a work of supererogation, let us ask an explanation of the following words of Scripture: *And some fell upon good ground, and brought forth fruit that grew up, and increased and yielded, one thirty, another sixty, and another a hundred.*^(p) Hence, is it not clear that a produce of *thirty* fold will make us acceptable in the sight of God? And is it not equally clear that by a life of greater perfection, by a stricter compliance with the severer precepts of the Gospel, by following the counsels as well as the commands of Christ, we may attain to a much fuller measure of the riches of his bounty—to *sixty* or a *hundred* fold? The parable of the pounds is equally in point: he who had gained but five pounds, was rewarded as a good and faithful servant, while he who had gained ten, he who had done more than was exacted of him, was still more liberally rewarded.

Elsewhere our Saviour has also said: *If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me.*^(r) This surely is not a command, but a counsel; not a work of necessity,

^(p) *St. Mark*, iv. 8.

^(q) *St. Luke*, xix. 24.

^(r) *St. Matt.* xix. 21.

but one of absolute perfection. No one can say that the observance of this precept is necessary for salvation, yet none can deny its superior efficacy and virtue, without falsifying the words of Christ. What, then, is it but a work of supererogation? a conduct which will render us more perfect followers of our Saviour, and more deserving in the sight of God; more worthy to receive a *hundred fold*, and to possess life everlasting?^(s) Yet, when we have done all this, we are still, and most truly, *unprofitable servants*;^(t) because it is not in the power of man to do any thing profitable to his Creator. We are only profitable to ourselves, in serving that Creator well. Neither can we perform him any service which we do not owe him a thousand and a thousand times. We are unprofitable servants, because we have nothing good in ourselves, but receive all through the merits of our Redeemer, and the efficacy of his sacred passion and sufferings: “God,” as St. Augustine says, “crowning his own gifts, when he crowns the good works of his servants.”

In the *Fourth* place,—I cannot conform to Protestantism, because I have no means of discovering its tenets; because I can find no one to instruct me in its doctrine.^(u) As to the Thirty-nine Articles,

^(s) *St. Matt.* xix. 29.

^(t) *St. Luke*, xvii. 10.

^(u) Should it so happen that a member of the Established Church in his researches into ancient ecclesias-

they are every where openly impugned, or totally disregarded.^(x) If we apply to her pastors, we find

tical records, should discover that the sacrament of baptism was formerly administered by immersion, whereas it is now given by infusion; nay, should he travel into the controversy on the validity of this sacrament as conferred upon infants, and should the result of his temerity prove as unfortunate to him, as it has to many others, by filling his mind with doubts as to the efficacy of the manner, and the propriety of the time, in which his own baptism had been performed; and should he, with the docility of a Christian, but with his mind thus troubled and perplexed, repair to his pastor for a solution of the problem, what answer does he receive? Why, that it has been the constant doctrine and practice of the Church, and can be proved from unquestionable historical evidence, that baptism administered to infants was equally valid with that conferred upon adults; and as to the change in the method of performing the rite, *that* we know also from the same source to be immaterial in its effects upon the sacrament. But, replies the sincere inquirer, “ You have taught me in my catechism, you have preached to me from the pulpit, and you are said to have sworn to your own belief in the doctrine, that only that which is read in Scripture, and can be proved thereby, is to be admitted in evidence of our faith: now, I have for several years past diligently searched the Scriptures, for it is my daily occupation, but till this moment I have

^(x) See the disputes about the meaning of the Thirty-nine Articles, and the *quo animo* with which they are to be subscribed.

them all in doubts and difficulties. Bishop Watson, in a Charge to his Clergy, in 1795, says; “ I think

never been able to discover one syllable upon the subject: all ^{that} I can find is, that baptism by water and the Holy Ghost is necessary to purify us from the stain of original sin, and to enrol us among the inheritors of Christ. I see that the other sacraments require a corresponding action on the part of the receiver, and a peculiar disposition of mind to render them efficacious, but of which an infant is wholly incapable: I see likewise that many of my neighbours, who are as competent judges of these things as myself, have carried their opinions so far as to refuse baptism to their children till they are of an age to answer for themselves; and even when they consider them qualified to receive it, they are careful to administer it by the ancient method of immersion, and not by sprinkling or infusion, as is now practised amongst us. Though unable to fathom the mystery, I am a firm believer in the doctrine, because Christ has revealed it to mankind. Hence, I consider it of the very first importance, and hence arises the anxiety of my mind: but instead of allaying my doubts you have only increased my perplexity; you have given me good reason to mistrust your sincerity by the contradiction of your principles; you have proved to me either the complete hollowness of your faith, or that you rest it upon very different foundations than those upon which you have ever taught me to rely; instead of referring me to Scripture, you now speak to me of tradition: hitherto you have ever warned me of the danger of trusting to such a teacher, but now you enlist her in your cause, you bring her forward as the living interpreter of the law, and put testimony in

it safer to tell you *where they* [the Christian doctrines] *are contained*, than *what they are*. They are contained in the Bible, and if, in reading that book, your sentiments concerning the doctrines of Christianity should be different from those of your neighbour, or from *those of the Church*, be persuaded on your part, that infallibility belongs as little to you as it does to the Church!" In another place, he informs them, that Protestantism consists in believing what each one pleases, and in professing what he believes!! This, indeed, I have always thought to be the truest definition of Protestantism, which is no where agreed, but in one single point—that of *protesting against Catholicity*. She is, in fact, little more than a negative religion, a mere renunciation of *Romanism*. Her articles of faith have always been received more as civil edicts, emanating from a lay authority, and

her mouth where the word of God is mute. In so doing you have only excited my suspicions, instead of allaying my apprehensions; for if there be truth in what you have told me now, there is certainly none in what you have taught me heretofore. I must, therefore, seek for some other and more certain method of arriving at that steadfast faith without which I know I shall be condemned, and which it is impossible I could ever acquire amidst such palpable contradictions." Such are the means possessed by the Ministers of the Establishment for quieting the scruples of their people!!

as safeguards to scare away that phantom-monster, Popery, than as definitions of the true religion of God. Many even profess their adherence to the Established Church to arise more from a feeling of loyalty and attachment to existing institutions, than from any assurance that she holds a better or a purer creed than any other of the various sects of Protestantism.^(y) Catholicism, on the

^(y) “It is the humour of some men,” says the Protestant Dr. Heylin, “to call any separation from the Church of Rome, the Gospel; and the greater the separation, the more pure the Gospel.”—Of Dr. Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury in the time of James I., Lord Clarendon observes, that he considered “the Christian religion no otherwise than as it abhorred and reviled popery, *valuing those men most who did it most furiously.*” How many have been weighed in the same scales, in times much nearer to our own!

I am sorry to be obliged, in our own defence, to exhibit such a picture of Protestantism; though I am not aware that I have, in any way, exaggerated the deformity of the portrait. But when we see ourselves condemned in the futile nonsense, regularly doled out by ministers of the Church of England and others, to a devouring multitude, in the shape of sermons and lectures; when we are assaulted by hosts of impious, but anonymous, pamphlets, issuing also from “ministers of the Church of England,” who, by fighting with their visors down, prove both their cowardice and their shame;—when we are reviled in more courteous and measured language in *Charges*,

contrary, is not a *system of opinions*, it is a *collection of facts*. It is a series of historical

from the dignitaries of the Establishment, printed “at the request of the clergy” to whom they are delivered;—when the presumed errors of Popery are made the point of many a text, and the burden of many a spiritual philippic, in almost every pulpit throughout the kingdom;—when there are many who do, and few who are not willing to swear, that they believe us to be idolaters:—when, to crown the whole, we are punished with pains and penalties for crimes expressly invented for us, are we to be denied even the weapons of Truth in our defence? When we are daily called upon, both by the legislature and the clergy, to desert the *mystery of iniquity*, to come out of Babylon, that ‘prodigious structure of imposture and wickedness,’ and to take refuge under the tents of the establishment; and then are taunted and scoffed at for our rejection of their offers:—are we to be denied the privilege of declaring *why* we prefer the security of the fold of the shepherd in which we now repose, to the dangers of the trackless wilderness to which we are so importunately invited?

The almost total absence of religious instruction, especially on doctrinal points, observable in the charges, and other publications of the prelates and ministers of the Establishment, just alluded to, goes far to prove what I have stated above, that, in practice, Protestantism is now become little more than a negative religion. It consists only of two propositions: That *it is just and lawful to defend the temporalities of the Establishment, by calumniating Catholics, and marking them as a caste among the peo-*

documents, supported on indubitable and incontrovertible evidence; evidence which has been carried

ple, and, That *the bible, and the bible alone, is the religion of Protestants*. We are even told that this last proposition has passed into a familiar maxim. But, when we ask to know what the bible contains, we plunge at once into a fathomless ocean,—we arrive at nothing fixed or sure,—we fight as with men beating the air: they wander to and fro—they repeat negative propositions, but as to any thing positive and certain, we may as well look for substance in a shadow. The Church of England has so often exchanged her doctrine, for the preservation of *unity* in the kingdom, pretending, at each exchange, to have been directed by the Holy Spirit, that, as if ashamed of her versatility of character, she is become more circumspect in her public professions of faith. She has allowed upwards of a hundred and fifty years to pass over without announcing any new method of *preventing a diversity of judgment* amongst her followers. She has chosen the wiser course, to retain the same ostensible articles, but, adopting the whole Bible as her creed, to remain silent and slumbering at her post, and to permit her children to range at large among the mazes of speculative belief, as long as they disturb her not by open revolt, nor break their license by venturing within the precincts of *Popery*, which is the only forbidden fruit in that spiritual garden of Eden, “the liberty of believing what each one pleases.” But, while they are allowed to gather from every other tree, the moment they presume to eat of *that*, not only does their spiritual death ensue, but they are banished from ^{the} paradise, the earth is cursed in their regard, and they are, for ever after, condemned to la-

down upon the stream of time, from generation to generation, during a course of eighteen hundred years.

bour and to toil, in a land fertile only in thorns and thistles.

I am sure there is no exaggeration in all this: and if it be offensive to hear these truths, it is much more so to be obliged to write them; since we are not only the objects, but the *victims*, of that system, against which we are endeavouring to defend ourselves. In a case like the present, charity rather compels us to speak the whole truth, than to conceal any portion of it. For the greater the evil, the more ought it to arrest attention, and the more loudly should it demand a remedy. If the spirit of discord which is abroad, be not considered an evil to the country, the minds of our rulers must be modelled on principles far removed from reason; and if it be considered such, the remedy is in their own hands. The wand of Circe never wrought a more complete and sudden transformation than would be effected by the magic of just and equitable laws. Were it no longer the supposed interest of one party to maintain an ascendancy over the other, by any means but those of virtue and of truth, England would rid herself of sectarian ~~discussion~~^{discussion}, that plague which now preys upon her very vitals, and religious harmony and tranquillity would be restored throughout the empire. If it should prove otherwise, we must then indeed acknowledge, that some heavy and peculiar curse has fallen upon the country. When we are no longer vilified as idolaters, and condemned to the alternative of either conforming to the establishment, or of being incapacitated for the exercise of civil rights, we may defend our own religion, without

In the *Fifth* place, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because it rejects the doctrine of Purgatory.—We know that *nothing defiled can enter heaven*; ^(u) we know also that, *in the sight of God, no man living shall be justified*; ^(x) and our Saviour himself has declared, that, *every idle word that men shall speak, they shall render an account of, in the day of judgment*; ^(y) how then, with the dangers and distractions of the world around us, with the

exposing that of others. Its truth, happily, does not depend upon the falsehood or impiety of other societies of Christians; it rests upon its own transcendant merits; and upon these, alone, we are ready to rely for its vindication. We now adhere to it, for its own purity and perfection, through evil report and good report—in peace or in persecution—in its glory, or its abjection. As our fathers revered it in its prosperity, so do we cling to it in its adversity: we know that our religion was reared in trouble, and will live on in trouble; we know that she will survive both us and our oppressors; and that whether we remain faithful to her or not, she will still continue from one generation to another, the great parent of Christianity, the great city and empire of God. Should we have the baseness to desert her, we should only brand our race with apostacy; we should be lopped off as a withered and lifeless branch; while that gigantic tree, whose roots overspread the earth, and whose summits ascend into the very heavens, would equally continue to flourish and to fructify to the end of time.

^(u) *Rev.* xxii. 27. ^(x) *Psal.* cxlii. 2. ^(y) *St. Matt.* xii. 36.

weaknesses of human nature upon us, and with our natural proneness to sin, can we expect to die in a state of heavenly purity? It would be presumption to think of so doing. Sin, and the consequences of it, are not so easily cleansed from our souls.— There must be a middle state, a state of purgation from those lesser offences and imperfections, which have passed unheeded and unrepented of; a state of satisfaction, but always through the merits of our Saviour, for the debt of temporal punishment due to our more grievous offences, after their guilt has been remitted by the Sacrament of Penance. For who shall say that his repentance is so perfect as not only to cancel the guilt of sin, but even to make atonement for all the penalties due to his transgressions?

Who will not tremble for the future atonement to be required of him, when he remembers that Moses himself, the chosen servant of God, was prohibited from conducting the people of Israel into the land of promise, in punishment of his disbelief at the rock of Cades, though he still retained the favour of the Almighty? Who shall say, that having sinned like David, and repented like David, he shall be more deserving than that great monarch, and exempt from the punishment which the royal penitent nevertheless received? Though this punishment may befall us in this life, it must of necessity be more generally inflicted on us in the

next. For it is but too obvious, that our failings and imperfections, generally at least, continue with us to the end; and if we fail and are imperfect to the last, how much less can we expect that the penal atonement for our former and more grievous offences, was ever completed in us! The belief of Purgatory is a doctrine the most congenial to the human heart. As the Communion of Saints binds us together by a common sympathy in each other's fate, and explores all the regions of heaven in our behalf, so the doctrine of Purgatory not only excites a lively interest in each other's destiny, but enlarges the sphere of our charity by carrying it into another world. If it be one of the highest gratifications of the soul, to be linked by ties of mutual charity while with our fellow-creatures upon earth, the extension of this power of giving and receiving the benefits of an affectionate attachment, beyond the fleeting and uncertain existence of this life, must be no ordinary acquisition to the feeling heart of conjugal or parental love. If holy friendship be an emanation from Heaven, that doctrine, surely, is worthy of the same origin, which "enables a man to stretch his arm beyond the grave, and embrace his friend, in his progress through eternity."

Instead of leading to despondency, or producing more than a salutary dread, it is a doctrine the most consoling. Is it not consoling to reflect, that,

though we pass imperfect through the trials and tribulations of the world, the divine mercy and goodness will still permit us to satisfy in another life, for our deficiencies in this? At the same time it tempts us not to presume, for in no way do we hold the pains of purgatory to be a substitute for the torments of hell. They are of quite an opposite nature: the pains of Purgatory cleanse us from our smaller offences; the flames of hell feed for ever upon our greater and more heinous sins. We all offend in many things, and *if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.*^(z) Hence the necessity of a purgatory, for *nothing defiled can enter heaven;*^(a) and hence also, an end of that presumption, which would teach us to believe that we stand like angels pure in the sight of God, holy, without spot or blemish. We must hope that we do not deserve *to be cut down and cast into the fire;*^(b) but may we, therefore, deem ourselves worthy to enter immediately *upon our eternal weight of glory?*^(c) We must hope, that we are not *to suffer eternal punishment in destruction;*^(d) but, without further purgation, do we merit *to see the face of the Lord, and partake of the glory of his power?*^(e) If he is not to be condemned by the wrath of God to *that*

^(z) *St. John*, i. 8. ^(a) *Rev.* xxi. 4, 6, 8. ^(b) *St. Matt.* iii. 10.

^(c) *2 Cor.* xiv. 17. ^(d) *2 Thess.* i. 9. ^(e) *Ibid.* i. 9.

place of fire and brimstone, where the smoke of his torments shall ascend for ever and ever ;^(f) yet who shall be warranted in saying, he is *that wise and faithful servant, whom the Lord shall forthwith appoint over all his goods?*^(g) Should reasoning by analogy, and the authority and evidence of tradition, not prove sufficient to convince us of the existence of a middle state of suffering, the words of the Old Testament are decisive on the point, where it is related, that *Judas the valiant commander, sent twelve thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem, for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead ; for that it was a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they might be loosed from their sins.*^(h) and in the New Testament, this purgation from our lesser offences after death is clearly described, where it is said ; *If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss ; but he himself shall be saved ; yet so as by fire.*⁽ⁱ⁾ (1 Cor. iii. 15.)

^(f) Apoc. xiv. 10. 11.

^(g) St. Matt. xxiv. 45, 47. ^(h) 2 Machab. xii. 43, 44, 45, 46.

⁽ⁱ⁾ " For Christ, who had once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, (that he might bring us to God) being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit, also went and preached unto the spirits in prison : which, sometime, were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing." (1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20.)

In the *Sixth* place,—I cannot conform to Protestantism, because it is a religion only for the

“From this text, it appears, that at the time of our Saviour’s death, there were some souls in a state of suffering [*in prison*] in the other world, on account of lesser sins, not deserving of damnation; for, certainly, our Saviour would not have gone and *preached to them*, had they not been capable of salvation. These souls, therefore, were not in heaven, where all preaching is needless, nor in hell, where all preaching is unprofitable; but *in the middle state of suffering souls*, which is the *purgatory* maintained by Roman Catholics.”—See *The Protestant’s Trial by the written Word*, p. 76.

Many Protestant divines have believed and advocated the Catholic doctrines on these points; amongst others, Dr. Forbes and Dr. Taylor, from whom I cite the two following passages: “Let not the old practice of praying and making oblations for the dead, received throughout the whole Christian world, and the whole Church, almost from the time of the Apostles, be any longer rejected by Protestants, as unlawful, or vain. Let us respect the judgment of the primitive Church, observing in public this rite as lawful, profitable, and approved by the Church universal, which has ever believed this practice not only lawful, but profitable to the faithful departed.”—(Bishop Forbes’s *Discourse on Purgatory*.) “Nay,” says Dr. Taylor, “we find by the history of the Maccabees, the Jews did pray, and make offerings for the dead. Now, it is very considerable, that, since our Saviour did reprove all their evil doctrines, practices and traditions, and did argue concerning the dead, and the resurrection, yet he spoke no

learned and the rich, and to which the lowly and the illiterate cannot in reason belong. No one, who cannot read, can deduce his creed from the only Protestant rule of faith, the Sacred Writings, and thus take advantage of the licence of his Protestant principles, the licence of private interpretation. As a Protestant, he must either have no religious tenets at all, or he must take them second-hand from the lips of his pastor. Now, can any one be so far removed from the dictates of common prudence or common sense, as to adopt implicitly without hesitation or doubt, and as the faith on which he is to rest his hopes of salvation,

word against this practice, but left it as he found it, which he, who came to declare to us the will of his Father, would not have done, had it not been innocent, pious, and full of charity. The practice of it was at first and universal, it being plain in Tertullian, Cyprian, and others, and is still the doctrine and practice of the Jews.”—Taylor’s *Liberty of Prophesying*, No. II. p. 345.

Dr. Montague, bishop of Norwich, also held similar opinions: “Though there be no third place,” says he, “mentioned in the scriptures, yet it would not follow that there is no such place; because, *there are many things which are not expressed in scripture*: as to those texts which seem to restrain the state of souls departed to heaven, or hell, such are to be understood of the *final* state, after the day of general judgment; when there will, according to all sides, remain but two everlasting states, *viz.* heaven and hell.—(*Appar.* p. 135.)

the opinions of a man, who acknowledges no authority to guide him but his own judgment; whose creed is neither watched nor regulated by any superior power;^(k) and who has no more than a common right with himself to interpret the doctrines of Scripture? If he is not satisfied with his own pastor, he goes to another, and is puzzled with the difference of his doctrine: he sees a champion for methodism in one pulpit, and an orthodox member of the church of England in another; he becomes perplexed; he has no means of extricating himself from his difficulties;—he goes to the meeting-house, where he finds either an enthusiast, or a knave, crafty enough to *make merchandise of him*,^(l) by the apparent vehemence of his zeal; or,

^(k) “ In the body of our clergy, we have Arminian, Calvinian, Unitarian, Arian, Socinian, Sabellian, Trinitarian, and I do not know how many other sorts of clergymen; some starving, in a curacy; and others fattening, in a bishopric. We have methodistical clergymen; and clergymen with no method at all. All these classes of clergymen are retained in the Church, live upon her revenues, and are protected by her laws.”—(*Nightingale.*)

^(l) 2 St. Peter, ii. 1-3. *But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there shall be among you, lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction.—And through covetousness shall they, with feigned words, make merchandise of you; whose judg-*

confounded by the absurdity and folly of the doctrines which he hears, he becomes an unbeliever; and, probably, in the end, degenerates into a pest to society. And how can it be otherwise? He sees nothing to command his confidence, and without confidence he can have no fixed and steadfast faith, and must needs *walk in darkness, and know not whither he goeth.*^(m)

ment now of a long time lingereth not, and there perdition slumbereth not.

^(m) *St. John, xii. 35.*

The members of the Established Church are loud in their invectives against the sectarians: they picture them as “a set of low, ignorant, self-sufficient enthusiasts, industriously pushing themselves into every parish; creeping into houses, and leading captive those silly persons, who are weak enough to be led by them;” they paint the guilt and consequences of schism in all their horrors; they ask these men from whence they come; they call upon them to show by what authority they have intruded themselves amongst the pastors of Christ; from what power they have received their commission to preach, and *who has sent them* upon their ministry. While the sectarian, smarting under these taunts, very justly turns upon the member of the Established Church, and puts the very same questions to *him*. He says, “If *we* are schismatics, you are the same, for you were the first to set us the example of separation. If *we* err in preaching the liberty of the children of God, and the right of choosing for ourselves, it was from you that we learnt that

It is far different with the Catholic: to him indeed *the ways of God are so straight that even*

principle. If you have any right to ask us from whence we come, we have a right to try you by the same rule; we perceive a long interruption in the chain which you would fain represent as connecting you with the parent Church; we know that having withdrawn from her obedience, that Church has long since disowned you as her children; we know that she is continually putting the same questions to you, which you, in imitation of her, are now putting to us; she has all along defied and provoked you to produce your credentials, to prove your mission, and to satisfy the world that while you are separatists, you are not schismatics—that while you are rebels against the authority of others, you have a right to re-establish that authority in your own persons, and to shew cause why no law, no argument, no reason should have power over *you*, at the same time that you upbraid others for claiming the same licence with yourselves.” No, all are schismatics who are separatists; all are guilty of the crime of schism, who have made a division in the church, who have withdrawn from her communion, and have established another government for themselves: they only differ in the degree of guilt, according to the greater folly and impiety of the doctrines in whose favour they make the separation. Till a withered and lopt-off branch be one with the parent-tree, till separation be tantamount to union, and discord be the name for harmony—the Church of England has no more claim to be acquitted of the guilt of schism, than have any of the immense diversity of sects which have separated from *her*, and which *she* condemns for such separation.

fools shall not err therein ;^(m) the most lowly, the most illiterate, and the most busily employed, may be as firm and sincere in their faith as those who have both ability to read, leisure to discuss, and capacity to understand. They willingly take the preacher's word for the doctrine which he inculcates, because they have confidence in its orthodoxy. They know that if it were unsound, he would be immediately displaced ; he is the authorized organ of the Catholic church, and as such they bow submission to him. They know him to be a pastor who has " entered in at the door of the sheepfold ;" and they follow him because " they know his voice."⁽ⁿ⁾ Were they addressed by St. Peter himself, they would not believe him with a firmer faith.^(o) A man must be a controvertist to be a Protestant ; he has only to be a humble dis-

^(m) *Isai.* xxxv. 8.

⁽ⁿ⁾ *St. John*, x. 1, 4.

^(o) St. Paul says, " Faith comes by *hearing* ;" and it was the custom during the earliest ages of the Church, to convey all religious instruction *vivâ voce*. It was many centuries before any written catechism was adopted ; and generally speaking, the scriptures were read and explained publicly, and not privately. The people knew *from whom they learnt their doctrines*, and who had *sent* them their pastors : and so far were they from adopting the licence of private interpretation, or listening to unauthorized teachers, that if any did so, they were immediately rejected from the society of the true followers of the gospel.

iple of Christ to be a Catholic : and when once a Catholic, he is fixed in unfailing security ; “ The true religion is built upon a rock ; the rest are tossed upon the waves of time.”^(p)

Lastly :—I cannot conform to Protestantism, because, when I reflect how necessary, even in health and prosperity, are the consolations of religion, of the religion of *the God of all comfort* ;^(q) I cannot but experience a melancholy dread of being bereft of its cheering influence when oppressed by trouble, or languishing on the bed of sickness, or of death. *Come to me all you that labour and are burthened, and I will refresh you,*^(r) is an invitation of the kind and benevolent Jesus, the most applicable to the professors of that religion which abounds most in consolation ; which affords us a more intimate intercourse with our spiritual pastors, and more copious means of applying the merits of our Redeemer to our souls. If our conscience be loaded with the guilt of sin, in the sorrow of our hearts we apply to our pastors, and find a remedy for our troubles in sacramental confession.^(s) There the fever of the soul is as-

^(p) *Lord Bacon.*

^(q) *2 Cor. i. 3.*

^(r) *St. Matt. xi. 28.*

^(s) For a very full and able Dissertation on Confession, in which its divine origin is clearly and indisputably de-

suaged, the pangs of remorse are quieted, and iniquity is washed away; because by an act of obedience—of humiliation—of true repentance for her transgressions—joined with a sincere purpose of amendment for the future, she is reconciled with her Creator. The confession of our sins may be repulsive in theory, but it is most consoling in practice. It is also a strong argument in favour of this doctrine of the Catholic Church, that, however benign its influence and soothing its effects, it is yet so contrary to the inclinations of man, and so opposite to our nature, that it is impossible to have been of human institution. If, again, our troubles arise, not from the pressure of any particular criminality on the conscience, but from some of the melancholy list of misfortunes incidental to mankind, we still have recourse to our pastors. We are healed of our lesser offences and imperfections, by the sacrament of penance; we receive comfort from the advice of our spiritual

duced from Scripture, and where it is shewn to have been universally practised amongst Christians in the earliest ages of the Church, and to have been continued uninterruptedly ever since; see that incomparable work, *An Amicable Discussion*, in which the reader will also find the most ample and satisfactory information upon every point controverted between the Church of England and the Church of Rome.

director, and having thus PROVED *ourselves*,^(t) we venture to the great sacrament of grace, *the communion of the body and the blood of Christ*.^(u) Does Protestantism provide us with such a refuge in our necessities, such manifold sources of consolation in our troubles?

But it is upon the bed of sickness, and of death, that the superior comforts of our religion are the most striking. It is a lamentable truth, that the Protestant clergyman is but seldom found by the couch of the dying Christian: he is but rarely sent for, and seldom comes; and if he does make his appearance, it is only to hurry over a few prayers, and escape from the distressing scene. In cases of fever and contagion, the clergy will not attend, perhaps, in consideration of their families, they cannot.^(r) But where is the Catholic, however poor and forlorn, dying within reach of a clergyman of his own communion, who does not receive both the benefits and the consolations of his religion? Where is the pastor who shrinks from the functions of his ministry, from fear of taking the disease with which his penitent is afflicted, and of paying the forfeit of his life in the cause of cha-

^(t) 1 Cor. xi. 2.

^(u) 1 Cor. x. 16.

^(r) This single circumstance pleads more eloquently for the celibacy of the clergy, than a whole volume upon the subject could possibly do.

rity? Where is the cabin so wretched that does not find him a ready inmate—the being so destitute, to whom he is not a willing and a faithful friend—the malady so loathsome or infectious, as to drive the messenger of *the God of all comfort* from the performance of his duty? It is not from one solitary visit that the penitent sinner, or the just man, derives his consolation, (for even the just man requires consolation when the terrors of death are upon him,) but from a series of unremitting attentions during the whole course of his disorder.

Nor is it by mere exhortation and prayer that the contrition of the dying man is excited, his conscience calmed, and his hopes elated; but by the seasonable administration of the Sacraments of Penance, the Eucharist, and Extreme Unction. *Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him. Confess therefore your sins one to another.*^(y) The Protestant Liturgy formerly contained these injunctions equally with the Catholic:^(z) but they have

^(y) *St. James*, v. 15, 16.

^(z) If in this discussion I have asserted any thing concerning the Establishment, which is not founded in fact,

long since expunged this doctrine, or at least suspended the practice of it, and have ^{thereby} defrauded their people of that spiritual assistance which the soul of a Christian, upon the verge of judgment and eternity, so strongly and so feelingly demands from the ministers of religion.

HERE ended the *Reasons*, in the first edition. But finding ^{that} the most extraordinary prejudices exist in the minds of Protestants against the doctrine of Catholics, on account of the use of a dead language in parts of the Church service, and from confining the sacramental cup to the priesthood only; — prejudices which are to be attributed, I suppose, to the Articles of the Church of England, which condemn these practices as *repugnant to the word of God*; — I wish to offer a few remarks explanatory of these points.

“That the Apostles,” says Mr. Berington, “and the first founders of the Christian faith preached the Gospel, and celebrated the holy mysteries, in the language of the several people whom they converted, seems to be a point generally admitted.

I am willing to stand corrected: I have relied upon the best information that came within my reach, and any misapprehension into which I may have fallen, will, I hope, be admitted as an unintentional error.

The languages at that time most predominant, were the Greek, Latin, and Syriac, in which, consequently, the Liturgies, or the forms of public prayer, would be principally compiled; while the Armenians, Copts or Egyptians, Ethiopians, and other less distinguished people, enjoyed also their particular Liturgies. But when, in process of time, from various causes, changes took place, and new tongues were spoken, the old still retained the place of honour, and the Church, ever tenacious of antiquity, judged it proper not to depart from the forms which she had received. The *deposite* of her faith was intimately interwoven with the primitive expressions of her Liturgies. Thus, when Greek ceased to be spoken in the many nations that formerly constituted, what was called, the Greek Church, and even, as now, was not understood, the language of the Liturgy remained: as was, and is the case, among the Syrians, Copts, Armenians, and Ethiopians. The service is every where celebrated in a tongue no longer intelligible to the people. On what grounds then is it required that the Western Church, of which we are a part, should have followed another rule: particularly as in this Church, in all the countries within its pale, the Latin language, in early ages, was every where sufficiently understood, if not spoken? And when the northern nations were reclaimed to the Christian faith, the established rule was not altered for

this additional reason, that the use of the same tongue in the service might help to unite them more closely to the Old Church, and tend, in some degree, by this approximation, to soften and civilise their manners.

“ The general accord, among all nations professing the Catholic faith, not to admit any change in the language of their Liturgies,—though, in many other respects, they were much divided,—is a curious and important fact. And it must have rested on some general motives, equally obvious to all. They saw — what the experience of the day confirmed — that modern languages were liable to change ; while those that had ceased to be spoken — from this very circumstance, and because, from the valuable works written in them, they were cultivated by the learned — were become permanently stable. They saw, that the majesty and decorum of religious worship would be best maintained, when no vulgar phraseology debased its expression ; that the use of the same language which a Chrysostom spoke at Constantinople, and a Jerome at Rome, would unite, in a suitable recollection, modern with ancient times ; and that the mere fact of the identity of language would be a convincing proof of the antiquity of the Catholic faith. They saw, that as this faith was every where one, so should there be, as far as possible,

one common language, whereby the members professing it might communicate with one another, and with their ecclesiastical superiors, whether in council, or in any other form of intercourse. And they saw, that though some inconvenience would arise to the people, from their inability to comprehend the words of the Liturgy, this inconvenience would be greatly alleviated, if not almost entirely removed, should all instruction, in sermons and catechism, be delivered to them in their own tongue; all parts of the service be constantly expounded; and not a shade of darkness be permitted to remain. If, with all this caution, ignorance should still be found—as it will be found in many—every ingenuous mind would ascribe it to the usual causes of ignorance, and not to any want of knowledge in the Greek or Latin tongues.

“It is certainly gratifying, and highly profitable, from this uniformity of language, when a Catholic travels into distant countries, that he should every where find a service celebrated, to the language and ceremonies of which his ears and eyes had always been habituated. He can join in it; and though removed, perhaps a thousand miles, from home, the moment he enters a Church, in the principal offices of religion he ceases to be a stranger. The Western Church has been particularly attentive that her people might not suffer

from this concealment of her mysteries; and the Council of Trent thus ordains: ‘ Though the Sacrifice of the Mass contains great instruction for the faithful, the Fathers ^{not expedient that it} judged it should be every where celebrated in the vulgar tongue. Each Church, therefore, will retain its ancient and approved rites. But that the sheep of Christ may not hunger for want of food, and that little ones may not ask for bread, and there be no one to break it to them, the holy synod orders all pastors and them that have the cure of souls, frequently, and especially on Sundays and feasts, to expound some portion of what is read, and some mystery of the holy Sacrifice.’—(*Sess. xxii. c. viii. p. 194.*) Beside this, and the other instructions which have been mentioned, the whole of the Church service is translated into the language of each country, and, together with a variety of prayers for all occasions and all states of life, placed in the hands of the people.

“ Thus is our Western Church one in faith and one in language, united in the same bond of communion, with all the faithful of modern and of ancient times.”^(a)—(*Faith of Catholics, pp. 404-406.*)

^(a) It is remarkable that, under the Old law, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, the service of the Temple was continued in Hebrew, which was then become almost a dead language, the people generally only speaking

On Communion under one kind, I shall also extract the evidence and observations of the same learned writer. “ The above doctrine [that Christ is whole under each species] having at all times been professed in the Catholic Church, the introduction of lay-communion in one kind is easily accounted for, and seems not liable to any serious objection. It is admitted that, from the earliest time, down to the twelfth century, the faithful of both sexes, laity as well as clergy, when they assisted at the public and solemn celebration of the Christian service, and were admitted to Communion, generally received under both kinds. But, during the same period, there seems never to have been any positive ecclesiastical precept so to do : for we often read that the Communion was given to infants sometimes under one kind, sometimes under another:—in times of persecution, or under difficulties, or when long journeys were undertaken, the consecrated bread was permitted to be carried away ; the same was taken to the sick, and where there was a repugnance to the taste of wine, the bread also was alone given. It may then, it seems, be said, that, unless on public and solemn occasions, the faithful, in the times of which we are

and understanding Chaldaic: and so it was, in a still more decided manner, during the mission of Christ, who, though he frequently assisted in the Temple, was never known, in any way, to have condemned the practice.

speaking, communicated under one kind alone ; while the priesthood, to whom the command of Christ—*Do this in remembrance of me*, (*Luke*, xxii.)—we believe, solely applies, and when employed in the duty of their sacred function, received under both. The completion of the mysterious institution demanded this.

“ But many abuses and accidents, through carelessness and incaution, happening in the distribution of the consecrated wine ; and the use of bread alone, on so many occasions, being permitted ; and the belief that Christ was wholly present under each species, authorising the practice ; the primitive rite gradually subsided, and Communion in one kind very generally prevailed. The rulers of the Church, meanwhile, promoted rather than obstructed the change. And so things continued ;—no ecclesiastical law intervening, till the followers of John Huss, in Bohemia, tumultuously contending that the use of the cup was absolutely necessary, the Council of Constance, which opened in 1414, finally decreed that, ‘ As the body and blood of Christ were wholly contained under each species, the custom, introduced on rational grounds, and long observed in the Church, of communicating in one kind, should be received as a law, which no one without the authority of the Church, might reject or alter.’ — (*Sess. xiii. Conc. Gen. T. xii. p. 100.*)—So just is the observation that, as circum-

stances and the manners of men change—where change, under due authority, as in discipline, may be permitted—practices, once good and laudable, should change with them.

“ In the Greek Church, the ancient practice of receiving in both kinds has been retained, unless in such circumstances, or under such impediments as I have mentioned; which, among the Latins, allowed a departure from the established rite. But what is peculiar among the modern Greeks is, that they distribute the sacred bread, not separately, but dipped in the wine, and placed in a spoon. From its being allowed by them, that the bread, unless at the times principally of solemn Communion, may be given separately, it is plain, if any proof were wanted, that their belief of the real presence of the whole Christ under each species, is the same as that of the Western Church. And another proof of the same is, that neither at the time of the schism in the ninth century, when minds were most exasperated, nor since, has it been made a subject of complaint against the Latins, that, in the administration of the Eucharist, they had departed from the precept of Christ, or violated any established rule of general discipline. Some of their charges against us were sufficiently frivolous; and as, among these, one was that we celebrated the Eucharist in unleavened bread, contrary to the practice of their Church; they, certainly, could

not have overlooked the more important point of Communion in one kind, had they judged it reprehensible: or, in other words, had not their own practice, on certain occasions, been the same, and their general faith the same.

“ The Council of Trent, following the judgment of the Church (as pronounced at Constance) and its usage, declares and teaches, ‘ That neither laity nor unofficiating clergy are bound, by any divine command, to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both species; and that it cannot be doubted, without a breach of faith, that Communion in either kind suffices for them. For though Christ, at his last supper, instituted this venerable Sacrament under the forms of bread and wine, and thus delivered it to his Apostles, yet that institution and that delivering do not show that all the faithful, by the command of Christ, are bound to receive both kinds. Nor can it be fairly collected, from the discourse of our Saviour (*John*, vi.) that Communion in both kinds was commanded by him; however, according to the various interpretations of the holy Fathers and other learned men, that discourse be understood. For He who there said: *Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you* (54); —also said: *If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever* (52). And He who said: *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath ever-*

lasting life (55); likewise said: *The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world* (52). He, in fine, who said: *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him* (57); said, notwithstanding: *He that eateth this bread, shall live for ever* (59).—(Sess. xxi. c. 1, p. 174.)—‘Therefore though, in the early ages, the use of both kinds was not unfrequent, yet the practice, in process of time, being widely changed, the Church, for weighty and just reasons, approved the change, and pronounced it to be a law, which no one, without the authority of the Church, is allowed to reject or to alter.’—(*Ibid.* c. ii. p. 175.)—‘It must be acknowledged, that the whole and entire Christ, and the true Sacrament, are taken under either kind; and therefore, that as to the fruit, they who thus receive are deprived of no necessary grace.’^(b)—(*Ibid.* c. iii. p. 176.)—(*Faith of Catholics*, pp. 246-249.)

^(b) The proofs that communion under one kind was always partially admitted, are to be seen in Pope Leo, *Serm. iv. de Quad.* tom. i. p. 217; Eusebius, *Hist.* lvi. c. 44. p. 200; the eleventh Council of Toledo, *Concil.* tom. vi. Can. 11; St. Cyprian *de Lapsis*, p. 133; St. Augustine, *Epist.* 98, *olim* 23; Paulinus, *Vit. Sti. Ambrosii*, No. 47; Tertullian *ad Uxor.* lib. xi. c. 5. p. 169.

In the time of Edward VI. the Church of England also held that the sacrament might be fully and lawfully administered under one kind only. It was then enacted, “That the most blessed sacrament be hereafter *commonly*

Though the doctrine of Indulgences ~~is~~^{be} not touched upon in *the Articles of Religion* of the Church

delivered, and ministered unto the people under both kinds, that is to say, of bread and wine, *except necessity otherwise require.*” And this statute was re-enacted by Elizabeth.

Luther, though at different times he took each side of the question, on one occasion says : “ They sin not against Christ who use one kind only, seeing Christ has not commanded us to use both. Though it were an excellent thing to use both kinds in the sacrament, and Christ has commanded nothing in this as necessary; yet it were better to follow peace and unity, than to contest about kinds.” (*Lib. de Capt. Babyl. c. de Euch. Epist. ad Bohemos,*) &c.—See Dr. Lingard’s *Tracts*.

A similar decision was delivered in 1707, by the Faculty of Divinity in the famous Lutheran University of Helmstadt, in the duchy of Brunswick, in answer to questions propounded on occasion of the marriage of the Princess of Wolfenbuttle with Charles III. of Spain.—(See the Duke of Brunswick’s *Fifty Reasons*, p. 79.)

I will avail myself of the present opportunity to notice the barefaced and abominable falsehoods contained in almost every paragraph of Bishop Mant’s Notes to the Book of Common Prayer. I beg the reader to compare what has gone before with that Prelate’s observations upon the 30th Article, and then to examine into the real evidence upon the question, and I am satisfied he will be convinced that a more gross imposition was never attempted to be practised by the most interested polemic of the Established Church. The same may be said of almost every argument and pretended quotation of this false and calumnious

of England, yet as so much misapprehension prevails in their regard, I am sure no apology can be

commentator; who has proved himself a true disciple of those who have gone before him in the same race, as will be seen by comparing his character and conduct with that of his predecessors, so faithfully and candidly depicted by one of their own party, the celebrated Protestant Professor Zanchius. "I am indignant," says he, "when I consider the manner in which most of us defend our cause. The true state of the question we often, on set purpose, involve in darkness, that it may not be understood; we have the impudence to deny things the most evident: we assert what is visibly false; the most impious doctrines we force on the people as the first principles of faith; and orthodox opinions we condemn as heretical; we torture the Scriptures till they agree with our own fancies; and boast of being the disciples of the Fathers, while we refuse to follow their doctrine: to deceive, to calumniate, to abuse, is our familiar practice; nor do we care for any thing, provided we can defend our cause, good or bad, right or wrong."—(*Zanchius ad Stormium, tom. viii. col. 828.*)

It is really lamentable to think that such are the writers to whom the people of this country are, generally speaking, indebted for their knowledge of the Catholic and Protestant faith. Both are painted in the most false colouring; the one is attempted to be made agreeable to Scripture by the most gross perversions of the Sacred Text, and conformable to the doctrines of the Fathers, of those very men who are notoriously known to hold the very opposite opinions, by strained, garbled, and mutilated quotations—and is then held up to the people as the pure faith of the

necessary for offering some explanation of them. Nor can this be more satisfactorily done than by cit-

primitive Church; a Church which condemned these doctrines in the moment of their birth, and has never ceased to condemn them ever since. On the other hand, the belief of Catholics is misrepresented, misconstrued, tortured into every absurdity and impiety, and most pertinaciously declared to be any thing but what is taught or acknowledged by those, who alone are gifted with authority in matters of faith amongst them.

There is one quotation from Scripture given in a note on *the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for salvation*, by Bishop Mant, which is so glaringly falsified, and in that state brought forward to substantiate so important a point, that it deserves to be selected for particular notice. The passage is to be found in the 3d chapter of the 2nd Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, verse 16. In the Greek it is, Πᾶσα Γραφή θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἔλεγχον, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. The Latin Vulgate, which is equally held in estimation for its accuracy by Protestants as by Catholics, gives it thus:— ‘ Omnis Scriptura divinitus inspirata, utilis est,’ &c. The Syriac is also to the same effect, as may be seen by referring to the word Θεόπνευστος in Schleusner’s Lexicon, as well as in Walton’s Polyglot. The Douay version is, *All Scripture inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, &c.*; while Bishop Mant has it, *All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, AND is profitable for doctrine, &c.* The Church of England Bible gives the same translation, but saves itself in some trifling measure, by inserting the word *is* in Italics, to show that it is an addition to

ing the following passage from that admirable work of Dr. Milner, *the End of Religious Controversy*.

the sacred text. But the guilt of grossly perverting the sense of Scripture remains precisely the same, since the object evidently is to deceive and to mislead. With this intention, this text has frequently been quoted by Protestant controvertists, not only to prove the inspiration of the Scriptures from the Scriptures themselves, but also to prove their sufficiency as an independent rule of faith. Now, in the first place, it is evident from the context, that the Scriptures here alluded to, and which Timothy is said to have known from his childhood, are the books of the Old Testament, and not of the New, which were not then written. In respect to a rule of faith, it therefore proves nothing; and as an evidence of the divine inspiration of Scripture, it only establishes the fallacy of the principle they have adopted (that of proving every thing from Scripture), seeing that they are driven to incur even the guilt of prevarication, in a vain and delusive attempt to maintain their pretensions.

The work which has given rise to these observations, extraordinary to relate, is considered as a standard of orthodoxy in the Church, as the ruling guide on controverted points, and the most successful effort against the errors of Popery. Serving, as it does, as a perfect encyclopedia of the Christian religion, amongst the great majority of the people of this country, it is really frightful to think with what falsehood and impiety it is fraught, obscuring the very light which it pretends to irradiate, and charging the purest doctrines and the most immaculate reputation, with the foulest calumny, and the grossest

“ To explain, now, in a clear and regular manner, what an indulgence is ; I suppose, first, that no

errors. But such has always been the character of the writers in defence of the Reformation, a character too well supported in our own days by a Phillpotts, a Faber, a Townsend, and a hundred others, all convicted delinquents upon every charge brought against their predecessors in the cause of Protestantism, by one who knew them so well as their own far-famed professor Zanchius.

I have already referred to the APPENDIX for the trial and conviction of Mr. Faber ; I will now cite Mr. Townsend and Dr. Phillpotts before the public, in a charge, which I take at hazard, as brought against them by an able divine. “ Not content,” says Mr. Corless, “ with insulting the living, the vicar of Northallerton seeks to disturb the ashes of the dead. ‘ Thomas Aquinas,’ says Mr. Townsend, ‘ a man who has been canonized, and who is now invoked as a saint, has decided that the image of Christ is to be worshipped with the Latria.’ (*Review*, p. 59.)

“ When Mr. Townsend thinks proper to give us St. Thomas’s words, or to tell us where to find them, we shall be better able to judge of his expressions. In the meantime, I take the liberty of observing that I think I am as well acquainted with the writings of St. Thomas, as the Northallerton vicar, and I never yet met with this *decision*. I will tell Mr. Townsend, what St. Thomas does say on that subject, and where he will find my quotations. ‘ Idolatry,’ says St. Thomas, ‘ is the greatest of all crimes.’ (*Summa 2a. Quest. xciv. art. 3.*) Again, he observes, ‘ No worship or respect is due to the material

one will deny, that a sovereign prince, in showing mercy to a capital convict, may either grant him

image itself, because it is not an intellectual being,' and from this he concludes that any respect due to it is merely on account of the original which it represents. (*Summa 3a. Quest. xxv. art. 3.*)

"But the vicar of Northallerton is not the only one who still continues to throw upon Catholicity the now almost obsolete, and often refuted, calumny of idolatry. He has found a second in the person of the rector of Stanhope. Dr. Phillpotts, in the fervour of his zeal, has again been pleased to pour upon us the venom of his spleen, and the vial of misrepresentation. 'This saint, too,' says Dr. Phillpotts, speaking of Pius V., 'is worshipped in Ireland and in England; but what were the high virtues, the heroic degree of charity, [such, Mr. Butler tells us, is requisite in this case,] which raised him to the celestial glory, and entitled him to the thankful commemoration, nay, to the worship and adoration, of the subjects of the British crown?' (*Dr. Phillpotts's Letter to the Rt. Hon. G. Canning, p. 120.*)

"That a man like Dr. Phillpotts, who has so long been courting the smiles of the public, and running the race of ambition, who has wooed with success the goddess of fortune, and is eagerly contending for the prize of literary fame, should step out of his way to calumniate his neighbour, and stoop to the degrading artifices of disingenuous misrepresentation, does certainly excite my surprise. Does Dr. Phillpotts believe that Pius V. 'is worshipped in Ireland and England' and 'entitled to the worship and adoration of the subjects of the British

a remission of all punishment, or may leave him subject to some lighter punishment : of course he

crown?' If he does, I can only reply, in the words of an eminent writer, that 'evidence which is deemed satisfactory by the rest of mankind, is condemned to lose its force in the county of Durham, and that prejudice seems to have drawn a magic circle around it impermeable to the rays of truth.' But Dr. Phillpotts cannot, does not believe the accusation. His judgment has been overshadowed by the clouds of prejudice, and he has been led into error by his hatred for Popery. Or has he the presumption to suppose, that what *he* will assert, the public will believe? In the name of Christianity, of which he professes to be a minister, I call upon him to remove the stain which such a calumny must otherwise indelibly fix upon his character. Or, if his pride refuse to retract, I challenge him to the contest—let him prove his assertion, or run the risk of being hurled by public indignation from those heights to which he has been endeavouring to elevate himself. When once a man delivers himself to the guidance of passion, reason to him is folly, sense becomes nonsense, and logic no better than legerdemain."—(Corless's *Reply*.)

It may serve to illustrate the subject of some portions of this work, and to show what degree of confidence is to be attached, even to the written opinions of a Protestant divine, to present the reader with a specimen of the consistency of these two able controvertists, both prebendaries of the same cathedral, both ministers of the same Church, both pastors of the same flock. "The powers," says Mr. Townsend, "which were granted by Christ to his Apostles, WERE NOT GRANTED TO THEIR LAWFUL SUCCESSORS."

will allow that the Almighty may act in either of these ways, with respect to sinners. 2dly. I equally suppose that no person, who is versed in the Bible, will deny, that many instances occur there of God's remitting the essential guilt of sin, and the eternal punishment due to it, and yet leaving a temporary punishment to be endured by the penitent sinner. Thus, for example, the sentence of spiritual death and everlasting torments, was remitted to our first father, upon his repentance; but not that of corporal death. Thus, also, when God reversed his severe sentence against the idolatrous Israelites, he added: *Nevertheless, in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them.*^(p) Thus, again, when the inspired Nathan said to the model of penitents, David: *The Lord hath put away thy sin*, he added: *Nevertheless, the child that is born*

SORS. The Apostles were able to read the hearts of men, and their absolution might properly therefore be judicial." — (*Review*, p. 32.) "After his [Christ's] resurrection from the dead," says Dr. Phillpotts, "when 'all power had been given to him in heaven and in earth,' he conferred on his Apostles, AND IN THEM ON THEIR SUCCESSORS TO THE END OF TIME, the power of absolution, soberly and soundly understood."—(*Letter to the Rt. Hon. G. Canning*, p. 101.) "But why," says Mr. Corless, in his happy observations upon this discovery, "why should I express surprise that error should err, or inconsistency be inconsistent?"

^(p) *Exod.* xxxii. 34.

unto thee shall die.^(q) Finally, when David's *heart smote him, after he had numbered the people*, the Lord, in pardoning him, offered him by his prophet, Gad, the choice of three temporal punishments, war, famine, and pestilence.^(r) 3dly. The Catholic Church teaches, that the same is still the common course of God's mercy and wisdom, in the forgiveness of sins committed after baptism; since she has formally condemned the proposition, that 'every penitent sinner, who, after the grace of justification, obtains the remission of his *guilt*, and of *eternal* punishment, obtains also the remission of all temporal punishment.'^(s) The essential guilt and eternal punishment of sin, she declares, can only be expiated by the precious merits of our Redeemer, Jesus Christ; but a certain temporal punishment, God reserves for the penitent himself to endure, 'lest the easiness of his pardon should make him careless about falling back into sin.'^(t) Hence, *satisfaction* for this temporal punishment has been instituted by Christ, as a part of the sacrament of penance; and hence, 'a Christian life,' as the Council has said above, 'ought to be a penitential life.' This council at the same time declares, that this very satisfaction for temporal punish-

^(q) 2 Kings, alias Sam. xii. 14.

^(r) *Ibid.* xxiv.

^(s) *Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. can. 30.*

^(t) *Sess. vi. cap. 7, cap. 14.—Sess. xiv. cap. 8.*

ment, *is only efficacious through Jesus Christ.*^(u) Nevertheless, as the promise of Christ to the apostles, to St. Peter in particular, and to the successors of the apostles, is unlimited; *WHATSOEVER you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven,*^(x) hence the Church believes and teaches, that her jurisdiction extends to this very satisfaction, so as to be able to remit it wholly or partially in certain circumstances, by what is called an *INDULGENCE.*^(y) St. Paul exercised this power in behalf of the incestuous Corinthian, on his conversion, and at the prayers of the faithful;^(z) and the Church has claimed and exercised the same power, ever since the time of the apostles, down to the present. Still this power, like that of absolution, is not arbitrary; there must be a just cause for the exercise of it; namely, the greater good of the penitent, or of the faithful, or of Christendom in general: and there must be a certain proportion, between the punishment remitted and the good work performed.^(a) Hence, no one can ever be sure that he has gained the entire benefit of an indulgence, though he has performed all the conditions appointed for this end;^(b) and hence, of

^(u) *Sess. vi. cap. 7, cap. 14.—Sess. xiv. cap. 8.*

^(x) *St. Matt. xviii. 18. xvi. 19.*

^(y) *Trid. Sess. xxv. de Indulg.*

^(z) *2 Cor. v. ii. 10.*

^(a) *Bellarmin. Lib. i. de Indulg. c. 12.*

^(b) *Ibid.*

course, the pastors of the Church will have to answer for it, if they take upon themselves to grant indulgences for unworthy or insufficient purposes. Lastly, it is the received doctrine of the Church, that an indulgence, when truly gained, is not barely a relaxation of the canonical penance enjoined by the Church, but also an actual remission by God himself, of the whole or part of the temporal punishment due to sin in his sight."

The canonical penances were imposed upon the same principle, namely, a commutation of punishment due after the forgiveness of the transgression. When the number of Christians was comparatively few, and their fervour great, this system of severe discipline was practicable, but, in the progress of time, it was judged better to dispense with it; and to substitute indulgences in its stead. An indulgence, therefore, of one hundred days, or seven years, &c. &c. signifies a commutation of that length of punishment formerly enjoined by the canons.

By the following decree of the Council of Trent, it will be seen that all that we are bound to believe of indulgences is, that the Church hath power to grant them, and that they are beneficial to the soul.

"As the power of granting indulgences was given by Christ to the Church, (*Matt.* xvi. 19. xviii. 18. *John*, xx. 22-23.) and as she exercised it in the

most ancient times : this holy synod teaches and commands that the use of them, as being greatly salutary to Christian people, and approved by the authority of Councils, shall be retained ; and she anathematizes those who say they are useless, or deny to the Church the power of granting them : but in this grant, the synod wishes, that moderation, agreeably to the ancient and approved practice of the Church, be exercised ; lest by too great facility, ecclesiastical discipline be weakened." (*Sess. xxv. de Indulg. p. 340.*)

How different is all this from the prejudiced notions which most Protestants have so unfortunately imbibed in their infancy, acted upon in their manhood, and cherished in their age ! When will rational men be taught to imagine, that the tenets of Catholics are more likely to be explained with clearness, and learnt with accuracy, in the decrees of their own councils, and in the authorized expositions of their faith, than in the false, angry, and interested declamations of their enemies ?

That indulgences have been abused is matter of history : but that abuse has never been sanctioned by the Church, much less has it ever been its doctrine. On the contrary, we know that the anathemas of the Church, as well as the zeal and piety of its ministers, have frequently been directed against the avarice and iniquities that have turned

the most sacred institutions into sources of profit, and into excuses for wickedness. In questions of this nature, we must ever be careful to distinguish the principle, wisely and authoritatively practised, from the impious and unlawful profanation of it. In the most scandalizing moments of Catholicity, was there ever an abuse equal in magnitude or importance to the simony so universally and so openly practised in these kingdoms at the present day, when the cure of souls is advertised for public sale, and chapels are built upon speculation, to be let to the highest bidder! Was ever profanation of sacred things carried to such an extent as in the dispensation granted to the Landgrave of Hesse, to marry two wives at the same time?

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

HAVING thus shortly attempted to detail some of the reasons which govern Catholics in their non-conformity to Protestantism, and serve to attach them so firmly to their own faith; I beg the indulgence of my readers for a moment, whilst I offer a few desultory observations, intimately connected with, and naturally arising from, the subject of the foregoing pages. Of the importance of religious controversy, I need say nothing. All who believe in Revelation, all who value the morality of the Gospel, all who ground the hope of their salvation upon the doctrine of our Redeemer, must acknowledge the necessity of a firm, a lively, and a *steadfast* faith.^(a) This being the case, and since it is the misfortune of Christendom to be harassed and divided by such a variety of religious creeds, out of which we are bound to adopt ONE as the only true one, the utility and necessity of polemic controversy appears to be incontestably established. So long as there

^(a) 2 St. Pet. iii. 17.

are *false prophets and lying teachers among the people* ;^(b) so long as we should always be ready to give an answer to every man that asketh us, a reason of the hope that is in us, with meekness ;^(c) so long as it is necessary to distinguish the spirit of truth from the spirit of error :^(d) so long, also, will religious controversy be necessary to furnish us with a knowledge of the points in dispute, and for the defence and the confirmation of our faith.^(e) I must apologize for again reverting to

^(b) 2 St. Pet. ii. 1. ^(c) 1 St. Pet. iii. 15. ^(d) St. John, iv. 6.

^(e) If the Protestant practice in cases of divorce, were the only instance of a violation of the morality of the gospel on the part of the Reformers, it would of itself be amply sufficient to justify a continual controversial discussion. If divorce is attempted to be justified by the letter of the gospel, the letter of the gospel will be discovered to be diametrically opposed to it ; and if an appeal be made to the spirit of the gospel, that spirit will rise up in judgment against it. The solitary text of Scripture upon which it is so vaguely attempted to justify divorce, is susceptible of a very different interpretation from what Protestants endeavour to impose upon it. The corresponding passages in St. Mark (x. 11, 12), St. Luke, (xvi. 18), St. Paul (Cor. vii. 10), and even in St. Matt. himself (v. 32.), most unequivocally point out the manner in which we are to understand it, namely, that *whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting for the cause of fornication, committeth adultery ; and whosoever shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, committeth adultery*. If not, the sacred

See origin of divorces by the Parliament of England in Lingard, Vol. VII, page 507 - 4 to -

the subject of misrepresentation; but it is the most cruel and the most successful weapon which our

penmen are all at variance and in contradiction with each other; and the positive injunction of our Saviour, *What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder*, (St. Mark, x. 9.) is a false and nugatory precept. It was even in the very act of abrogating the ancient law of divorce, that these words were pronounced; and instead of permitting divorces upon any terms, the object was to do away with them altogether. But to revert to the text of St. Matthew, since, without any contortion, it will bear the interpretation which the Catholic church affixes to it, and which St. Matthew himself has clearly given it in another passage (*Chap. v. 32.*);—and since we know by incontrovertible historical evidence, that it was understood in that sense during the earliest ages of the Church, there is an end to the argument of Scripture authority being in favour of divorces. So far for the literal interpretation of this text; as to the spirit of it, there is no passage in the sacred writings, the misinterpretation of which is of more serious and permanent detriment to domestic happiness and morality, than this. How many would restrain their passions, were it not for the previous knowledge that those passions may in the end be legally indulged! Is it not an incentive to adultery to know that it may be pursued almost with impunity? Is it not a temptation to every species of villainy and hypocrisy, to be aware that the sacred bond of matrimony may, at any time, be broken asunder, and transferred to another object? It is this state of things, which has occasioned in this country violations of the laws of matrimony, that have made us the scorn and contempt of every civilized people in the world.

enemies employ against us. It is, however, a signal triumph to us, that none can ever attack Catholicity, without first enlisting falsehood and

The divorces which take place yearly, not to say monthly, in the British empire, (though, thank heaven, they are not yet become the law of the land,) are an infringement upon every law, both human and divine, ecclesiastical and civil. I have already shown that they stand in opposition to the law of God; they are also prohibited by our civil code, which recognizes only a separation *à mensâ et thoro*; they are also contrary to our ecclesiastical law, which permits no more (both being the laws of ancient Catholic times); and it is necessary to call on the omnipotent power of a British parliament, which arrogates to itself a superiority over every power in the world, to break down all the fences which reason, law, and revelation have united to erect for the security of domestic life, and the durability of the sacred vows of matrimony. As to the regulations respecting divorces, and the facilities afforded them in Scotland, they would almost disgrace a tribe of savage Indians.

As in every thing else that is the offspring of Protestantism, there is so much inconsistency in the principles and the laws of divorce, as to render the whole system a complete paradox. The bishops in their own courts acknowledge no such practice; but the bishops in the House of Lords lend their sanction to them. The trial of the late Queen is a striking instance of the incalculable evils of such a system; it may with truth be said, that a more disgraceful scene was never exhibited in any Christian country.

calumny into their cause. That religion must, indeed, be in itself invulnerable, which obliges her opponents to forge a new creed for her adoption, before they can hope to make any impression upon her ; which, having no blemish of its own, compels malice to seek her gratification at the expense of truth ; to surround her with ideal forms, and then, with hypocritical knavery, to exert all her might to destroy the wicked phantoms of her own creation. But so it was, from the commencement of Christianity, and so it will be, to the end. The primitive Christians, and the Catholics of the present day, are severally accused of the same crimes, and subject to the same calumnies. The reverential honour in which the primitive Christians held the cross, was divine worship to images ; their miracles, were magical enchantments ; their loyalty to Christ, was treason to the state ; their adoration of the One Eternal Author of all things, was atheism and infidelity to the gods.^(f) To such an extent has misre-

^(f) Both in pagan and in Christian times, the cry of disloyalty and treason has ever been the signal for the most atrocious crimes, the war-whoop against virtue and religion. Socrates, perhaps the most virtuous Athenian that ever lived, was condemned to death, for teaching that immortal truth, the unity of the Godhead : and his crime was called disloyalty to the state, because it was treason to its religion. It was disloyalty, always imputed, but never proved, that raised the cry of *Ad Leones!* against the primitive Chris-

presentation been carried, that it would be no very bold defiance to stand pledged to discover a false-

tians, and that has continued *to shed the blood of prophets and of saints*, in every age, and in every nation, that has been darkened with the spirit of bigotry, and stained with the horrors of persecution. “It was the imputation of disloyalty to Cæsar, which led St. Paul to prison, and condemned our Saviour to the cross! It is a proud and honourable distinction, that our loyalty to God, the King of kings, our eternal prince, and supreme ruler, should bear the dishonourable title of disloyalty to our temporal sovereign, and treason to the constitution.” *Blessed are they who suffer persecution for justice’ sake. Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you, UNTRULY, for my sake....It is enough for the disciple to be as his master; if they have called the master of the house, Beelzebub, how much more them of his household!*

The Almighty has said, through the mouth of an inspired teacher: *Let every soul be subject to the higher powers: for there is no power but from God. Therefore, he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation. And again, Thou shalt not speak evil of the prince of thy people.* Hence, in serving and honouring our king, we serve and honour our God; and it is a most extraordinary expedient to make us more faithful to our prince, by endeavouring to make us unfaithful to our Creator: which most undoubtedly, we should be, did we subscribe to the Test now required of us. We must ever remember that while we *give to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s*, we must also *give to God the things that are God’s*, and that in all cases, *we must obey God rather than man.*

hood in the very first argument of every book that has come from the pen of our adversaries. *They stand about us objecting many and grievous accusations, which they cannot prove.*^(g) As far as

^(g) *Acts* xxxv. 7. Unless it were to shew the furious extremities to which our enemies allow themselves to be carried, it would be beneath a Catholic to notice that crowd of abominable and impious tracts, which, at this moment, are so widely and so industriously circulated amongst the poor and the ignorant of this country, and that, too, by members of the Established Church, with the absurd intent of proving that the pope is Antichrist. I allude to them principally for the purpose of replying to them in the eloquent words of Dr. Doyle: "To such extremities did these men proceed, as not only to confound the power claimed by some few popes of Rome, over the temporal interests or rights of kings and kingdoms, with the spiritual jurisdiction of St. Peter's successor, but, in addition to this misrepresentation, they actually designated, not one or other, but a whole series of those successors, as Antichrists, and excited the deluded multitude to hate them, and curse them, as the capital enemies of our Lord and Saviour. Yes, the very men, who maintained from the beginning, and still maintain, against an infidel or Arian world, the divinity of the Son of God, the very men who designate themselves as the last of his servants, and who, without any doubt, have caused his name to be published and adored throughout nearly the whole Christian world, these men, who never ask anything of the Father except through the Son, and identify him in their daily prayers with the King of ages, the immortal and invisible

regards us, it is bad policy, for it does but confirm the Catholic in his faith, to find it so invulnerable ; and to those who are sincere in the pursuit of truth, the exposure of such deception frequently forms a strong inducement to their conversion. But, among the weak and the timid, among those who have little leisure, and perhaps less opportunity for examining the question, it does much mischief. It blackens us in the eyes of many, who are otherwise inclined to look favourably upon us, and makes them turn away in disgust from that investigation, which, in justice to themselves, they are bound to go through—an investigation which would terminate so much to *our* honour and to *their* satisfaction. To what other possible circumstances can the following rebuke of our Saviour to the Pharisees be more applicable? *Woe to you, doctors of the law, for you have taken away the key of knowledge; you yourselves have not entered in, and those that were entering in you have hindered.*^(h)

God to whom alone ~~we~~ are due, and given, all honour and glory,—these very men have been called, by the ferocious leaders of the revolt, ‘ Antichrists!’ and the Church in which they have always presided, and whose faith was from the beginning, and is still spoken of throughout the entire world,—this Church they called ‘ Babylon,’ and the ‘ great apostacy,’ with all manner of opprobrious and insulting names.”—(*Reply to Magee*, p. 42.)

^(h) *St. Luke*, xi. 52.

That no one into whose hands these pages may chance to fall, may henceforward unknowingly subject himself to a similar denunciation, and that none may in future plead ignorance for their errors or their prejudices, I have annexed to this volume a copious list of Catholic controversial writings.⁽ⁱ⁾ Almost any one of them is sufficient to satisfy an impartial mind, a mind seriously and sincerely engaged in the pursuit of truth. Let them be considered as counterparts to the writings of our adversaries; let them be consulted as mirrors, in which our principles and our doctrines are reflected in their true light. They will remove that dismal mask from the fair face of our religion, first imposed upon it by the malice of its enemies, and afterwards continued by the ignorance and credulity of mankind: they will exhibit it as it really is, pure, holy, spotless, and undefiled.^(k)

There is another point on which we feel particularly jealous, because we are particularly innocent; namely, BIGOTRY. If by bigotry is meant a blind and ignorant attachment to our tenets, we

⁽ⁱ⁾ See APPENDIX, No. XVII.

^(k) For a clear and simple exposition of Catholic doctrines, see also the *Declaration of the Catholic Bishops of Great Britain*; followed by *An Address from the British Roman Catholics to their Protestant Fellow-countrymen* APPENDIX, No. XVI.

plead *not guilty*, upon the credit of this single fact, that for one Protestant who can give any sort of plausible *reason for the hope which is in him*,^(l) there are at least ten Catholics, who will produce strong and solid arguments in defence of their creed.^(m) But if by bigotry is meant an uncharitable, illiberal, and sweeping condemnation of all who differ from us in belief, it is certainly no difficult matter to prove ourselves not only far less bigoted than any of our accusers, but indeed altogether exempt from the charge.

In the second chapter of an excellent work entitled “Charity and Truth,” first published many years ago, and recently republished under the sanction of the venerable prelates of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, a work most deservedly held in the highest estimation among us, the following positions are to be found:—1st. That whatever be the religious belief of the parents of a person who is baptized, and whatever be the faith of the person who baptizes him, he becomes, in the instant of his baptism, a member of the Ca-

^(l) 1 *St. Pet.* iii. 15.

^(m) It stands to reason that a Catholic should be better instructed in matters of religion than a Protestant, since all our Catechisms and Books of Devotion contain a vast deal more information both on faith and morals, than any that are in use among Protestants.

tholic Church, as the true Church of Christ.—2dly. That he receives in his baptism justifying grace, and justifying faith.—3dly. That he loses the former by the commission of any mortal sin.—4thly. That he loses the latter by the commission of a mortal sin against faith; but does not lose it by the commission of any mortal sin of any other kind.—5thly. That without such wilful ignorance, or wilful error, as amounts to a crime in the eyes of God, a mortal sin against faith is never committed: and 6thly. That, except in an extreme case, no individual is justified in imputing, even in his own mind, this criminal ignorance or criminal error to any other individual.—From an admirable sermon ON UNIVERSAL BENEVOLENCE, delivered by an eminent Roman Catholic preacher,⁽ⁿ⁾ in the year 1816, both in Bath and London, and which has been published and widely circulated under the authority of the Vicars Apostolic of this country, the following passage is extracted:—“ Never be so uncharitable and so gross, as indiscriminately to give the harsh and odious appellation of *Heretics* to all those who belong not to our communion.^(o) That word implies *guilt* as well as *error*.”

⁽ⁿ⁾ The Rev. Dr. Archer.

^(o) That such have always been the sentiments of the brightest luminaries of the Catholic Church, the following passages from St. Augustine will tend to shew: ‘The

You have been taught in your catechisms, that heresy is an *obstinate* error in matters of faith.

apostle Paul,' says this great man, in his one hundred and sixty-second letter, 'has said, *an heretical man, after one reproof, avoid*; knowing, that he who is of this sort is subverted and sins, and is self-condemned; but they who defend not with an obstinate animosity, their own opinion, though false and perverse, especially if it be an opinion which they did not originate in the assurance of their own presumption, but which they received from their parents, seduced and fallen into error, and who, seeking the truth with a cautious solicitude, are ready on finding it, to be corrected, they are not by any means to be reputed among heretics.'

Let us hear Dr. Doyle himself: "It was a question," says he, "amongst the Jews, what was the greatest commandment in the law, whether to worship the Deity by Sacrifice, which was a profession of faith — of absolute dependance on the Supreme Being, and an act of prayer, or to love him with the whole heart. The Redeemer decided the question in favour of the love of God, and of our neighbour; and St. Paul, having enumerated faith, hope, and charity, the three great Christian virtues, says, expressly, that charity, which lasts for ever, is the greatest of the three. Sins, therefore, against faith, such as heresy, are very grievous; perhaps, next to apostacy, this vice is the worst of all, as it cuts up the root of justification; but, abstracting from this character of it, it may not be so malicious, not so much opposed to the nature of God, as those sins which conflict with charity;—and this is a reflection which ought often to occur to those, who, agitated by a fiery zeal, and swoln with a selfishness, which they

He *only* is a *heretic*, who, when he has discovered truth, wilfully and perversely, from human re-

mistake for faith, break down all the charities of human life, sow dissensions amongst brethren, and totally forget the divine command of doing to others what they would that others should do to them. We should reprobate heresy as we reprove drunkenness or theft, usury or oppression of the poor; we should denounce schism as we proclaim the guilt of calumny or detraction: but as we should exercise patience and long-suffering towards the drunkard, the thief, or the calumniator, so we should use forbearance and charity towards the wilful and obstinate heretic, hoping that the Lord may, perhaps, yet give him repentance, like to other sinners. But, if the person who is in error, has been seduced into it by others, if he have received it as an inheritance from his fathers, and if his education, his habits, his passions, his interests, his connexions, raise a barrier about him, which the light of truth cannot, morally speaking, penetrate, or the force of argument approach, still less break down; to cherish for such a person any other feeling than that of the most unmixed and ardent charity, would not only be unchristian, but inhuman; to consign such a man to future suffering, on account of his errors, would be an usurpation of the divine knowledge and power, and whosoever should pass judgment on him, should fear that a similar judgment, without mercy, would be passed upon himself. It is the duty of those who are ministers of Christ, to exhibit the truths of the Gospel, and the errors opposed to them, to display virtue in all her beauty, and exhibit also the deformity of vice; to exhort and beseech men in all patience and doctrine, to adhere to truth and virtue, and

spects, for worldly interests, or some such unworthy object, shuts his mind against it; or who obstinately or negligently refuses to be at the pains necessary for discovering it; and how can you presume to pronounce of any individual man, that this is his case, unless he acknowledge it? Can you assert that the doctrine which *you know* to be true, has been proposed to him in such a light of evidence, as to give conviction to his mind; or that he is not so satisfied with his own creed, as to preclude every idea of an obligation to make further inquiry? Those who carefully

to fly from vice and error; to minister the aids of religion to all who seek them at their hands; to exclude from their assemblies and communion all who obstinately adhere to vice or error, but to leave the judgment of men's souls to Him who created and redeemed them, who alone is able to discern the innocent from the guilty, and who will repay to every one according to what he did in the body, whether good or evil.

“ There is no person who rightly understands the spirit in which Christians are called, and which spirit created and preserved that unity amongst the members of the Church, who will not subscribe to these sentiments. They are the dictate of charity and liberality, rightly understood; but far removed, certainly, from that novel opinion now so prevalent amongst Protestants, which would open the Church to all sorts and descriptions of sects, and erase from the catalogue of vices revealed to us by Almighty God, the crimes of heresy and schism.” — (*Reply to Dr. Magee.*)

seek the truth, and sincerely follow the best light they can obtain in their respective circumstances, are innocent in the sight of God, and secure of his acceptance, whatever may be the errors into which they involuntarily fall. *Who art thou, then, that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth.*"^(u)

Again, in a most learned, temperate, and conciliatory work, from the pen of an eminent French divine (now Bishop of Strasbourg) we find the following note:—"Errors do not constitute heresy; but only that perversity which induces men to remain obstinately attached to them. Hence the expression of St. Augustine: 'I may err, but I will never be a heretic.'—(*Epist.* clxii.) Catholics do not hesitate to join this great light of the Church, in making a complete distinction between those who established a heresy, and who, afterwards, being born in its bosom, have involuntarily imbibed error with their mother's milk. They regard the former as rebels to the divine authority of the Church; the latter as being without any bitterness against her, and for the most part without obstinacy against her decrees, of which they even know nothing. She believes that these latter, although they belong not to the body, yet belong to the soul of the Church. They think, with the same Doctor, that the Church produces for itself

^(u) *Rom.* xiv. 4.

children, both from her own womb, and from that of her servants, that is to say from foreign Communions. *Generat per uterum suum, et per uterum ancillarum suarum;*^(w) and that, consequently, heaven prepares elect from out of heretical societies, by the particular graces it is pleased to bestow. They moreover cheerfully maintain with the same Father, ‘that a person imbued with the opinion of Photinus, and believing it to be the Catholic faith, ought not to be called a heretic, unless, after being instructed, he choose rather to resist the Catholic faith, than to renounce the opinion he has embraced.’^(x) In fine, they admit, with St. Augustine, ‘that we must not rank among heretics those who carefully seek after the truth, and who are in a disposition to embrace it as soon as discovered.’—(*Epist. clxii.*) According to these principles, the learned Bishop Challoner teaches that, ‘if error comes from invincible ignorance, it excuses from the sin of heresy, provided that, with sincerity, and without regard to worldly interest, a person be ready to embrace the truth immediately it shall present itself to him.’^(y)

“ Catholics cheerfully adhere to this conclusion of the judicious and profound Nicole: ‘It is therefore true, according to all Catholic theolo-

^(w) *On Baptism, against the Donatists, b. i. ch. x.*

^(x) *Ibid.* ^(y) *Foundation of the Christian Doctrine, p. 9. 12th. edit., London.*

gians, that there is a great number of living members and true children of the Church, in communions separated from her ; since there are so many infants, who always form a considerable part of them, and since there might also be some among the adults, although she does not pay attention to it, because she does not know them.'—(*On Unity, vol. i. ch. iii.*) They maintain, with the skilful theologians of the university of Paris, ' that children of the uninstructed partake neither of heresy nor of schism ; that they are excused by their invincible ignorance of the state of things ;....that they may, with the grace of God, lead a pure and innocent life : that God does not impute to them the errors to which they are attached by an invincible ignorance ; that they may thus belong to the fold of the Church, through faith, hope, and charity.'—(*Censure de l'Emile.*)

“ In fine, leaving to themselves certain morose and ill-informed minds, Catholics love to repeat, with regard to the greater number of persons who live in schism and heresy, what Salvian formerly said of the Goths and Vandals brought over to Christianity by the Arians : ‘ they are heretics, but without knowing it : they err, but with perfect sincerity.’ *Qualiter pro hoc falsæ opinionis errore in die judicii puniendi sunt, nullus potest scire, nisi solus judex.*’—(*De Gub. Dei. Lib. v.*) Religion teaches Catholics to judge the doctrines, and forbids them to judge the persons, of men.

Of course, therefore, they maintain the principles, and never allow themselves to condemn those who are out of their Church; they leave them to the judgment of God. He alone knows the bottom of the heart and the graces that he gives: he alone can read the actual disposition of the souls that he calls to his tribunal.

“This doctrine is conformable with the spirit of Christianity, and shews to greater advantage the extent of Catholicity, whilst it forbids us to mark out its precise boundaries. It also fully exculpates Catholics from that imputation of enmity, and that spirit of intolerance which people are fond of lodging against them.”

It would be useless to swell these pages with numberless other quotations in proof of the charitable and liberal interpretations of our exclusive doctrine, since the most sceptical must acknowledge, that sufficient has been advanced to expose the mistake of those who accuse Catholics in general of bigoted and uncharitable tenets. But if there be any individuals amongst us whose outrageous zeal might induce them to entertain opinions on these points, which their creed neither obliges nor authorizes them to hold, let not those opinions be imputed to the whole body.—The bare dogmatical tenet, that “out of the Catholic Church, there is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation,” unaccompanied by any explanation, and

which is so to be found both in our formularies of faith, and in the writings of our most able and most liberal controvertists, might, at first sight, appear to warrant the charge of bigotry against us. But when it is considered that in the application of this doctrine we always hold those only to be heretics, who *wilfully* believe or *obstinately* profess errors in matters of faith;—that, in declaring the Protestant religion to be a heresy, we do not condemn its professors as heretics,^(*) (“which appellation implies *guilt* as well as *error*”);—that we leave the *guilt* of every individual between his God and himself;—that we count all within the pale of Catholic unity, who do not perversely refuse to enter it;—and lastly, that the Church contents herself with the simple declaration, that “wilful heresy is deserving of condemnation;”—there is surely clear and ample evidence on which to acquit us of bigotry and illiberality.

It now remains to be seen if we cannot more justly charge our adversaries with that, of which I

(*) We do not say, You are a Protestant, and therefore a heretic, and consequently, have no chance of salvation; we only say (and it is the doctrine which we all learn in our Catechism) that he *only* is a heretic who *wilfully* believes or *obstinately* professes errors in matters of faith. So that when the Church pronounces judgment against heretics, she always pre-supposes that they have a *knowledge* of their errors, but have not the *will* to correct them.

trust it now fully appears, they have most unjustly accused us. Protestants, as well as Catholics, hold the Athanasian Creed, which says, “ that unless a man doth keep entire and inviolate the Catholic faith, without doubt, he shall perish everlastingly.” We have collected the meaning and interpretation attached, by us, to this dogma; let us see if the doctrine of any of the Protestant Churches will give them an equal right to so charitable an explanation. The eighteenth Article of the Established Church is couched in the following harsh terms: “ They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect that he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature.” The Protestant Church of Scotland holds, that out of *their* Church, “ there is neither life nor eternal felicity to be hoped for, and that it is blasphemy to affirm, that men who live according to equity and justice shall be saved, in whatever religion they may have lived.”—The Protestant Church of France propounds in her catechism: “ that no one obtains pardon of his sins, who is not incorporated with the people of God, and the *unity* of *their* Church, out of which there is nothing but death and damnation.”—How the Roman Catholic Church can be accused of bigotry and illiberality, by men who profess tenets like these, I am at a loss to understand; and how the excluding doctrine,

couched in such harsh and forbidding terms, can possibly be susceptible of the same charitable interpretation which we give to our declaration, "that out of the Catholic Church there is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation," it is equally difficult to imagine. Still, among the many inconsistencies of Protestant belief, many of her most learned Divines have admitted, that we can be saved *by* the faith of the Catholic Church, since all points necessary for salvation are contained in that faith.^(y) The Protestant Divines of the university of Helmstadt decided, in 1708, that Catholics are not in fundamental errors, and such as are opposed to salvation:^(z) thus disowning the exclusive doctrine altogether, and virtually making a renunciation of Protestantism; for, as the Catholic Church is the parent stock from which all other sects and religions are derived, by what arguments can she defend her separation, if she admit that every necessary truth,

^(y) See the third chapter of *The Faith and Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, proved by the Testimony of the most learned Protestants, &c.* 1813. Keating, Brown, and Keating.

^(z) Whoever is curious to examine the motives for this candid and liberal decision, may find them detailed at length, at the end of a little pamphlet, entitled: *The Duke of Brunswick's Fifty Reasons for abjuring Lutheranism, and embracing the Roman Catholic Religion*; to be had of all Catholic booksellers.

that nothing opposed to salvation, is taught and practised by it? *I am the true vine, says our Saviour, and my Father is the husbandman....As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine; so neither can you, unless you abide in me.* By your act of unjustifiable separation, you have ceased *to abide in me....you are cast forth as a branch, and shall wither.*^(a)—These strange inconsistencies produce strange dilemmas. If Protestants reject the excluding doctrine altogether, they surrender the principles upon which they separated from the Church of Rome; if they maintain it, according to their authenticated tenets, they stand justly convicted, by their own evidence, of that illiberality for which they so unjustly condemn us.^(b)

Having already trespassed too long upon the patience of my readers, I will very shortly take my leave of them. If these *Reasons* should fortunately so far influence the minds of any, as to induce

^(a) *St. John xv. 1 & 4.*

^(b) The following definitions of bigotry and illiberality, will clearly shew to which party those epithets most properly belong. The Bigot is he who is blindly and passionately wedded to an opinion, for which he can neither show the authority of God nor the force of reason. The Illiberal Man is he who refuses to another the right of exercising his understanding where God has left him free.

them to enter more at large upon the inquiry into their moral conduct and religious creed, an inquiry the most important of all that can occupy the attention of man, it is much of what I desire. As conciliation and union, founded upon truth and justice, is my object, I will venture once more to express a hope, that what I have said will give offence to none. If I have failed in convincing, I trust, at least, that I have confirmed none in their errors; that, if I have not brightened, at least, I have not extinguished the lamp of truth; and above all, that I have not violated the strictest bounds of Christian charity. Let me exhort those who enter upon the discussion of religious controversy, to bring with them an humble and a docile mind, a mind disposed and desirous to be instructed, ready to subject their reason to *the obedience of faith*; ^(c) not with a determination to perpetuate their prejudices, and cherish their incredulity. There is nothing we should guard against more than an “ignorance, unwilling to be informed, and an obstinacy, resolving not to be convinced.” In the prosecution of this inquiry, let us candidly ask ourselves, if we are seriously and sincerely engaged in the pursuit of truth; and if so, whether we are determined, at all hazards, to embrace it,

(c) Rom. xvi. 26.

when we have succeeded in discovering it? By this standard alone can we determine our sincerity, and satisfy our conscience that we are performing our duty.—If those who are in error will but fairly and candidly put their religion to the test, I answer for it they will discover its falsehood; if, with the Bishop of Ephesus, in the Apocalypse, they will but *try those who say they are Apostles, and are not,*^(d) I will pledge my existence that they will find them *liars.*^(e) Controversy is the most simple and the most easy of all studies; it resolves itself into one question—*The Infallibility of the true Church of Christ.* We have no occasion to torment ourselves in a vain endeavour to reduce each separate proposition to the standard of reason. Revelation is paramount to reason: the authority of the Church is the authority of God: and the faith of Christianity, while it subjugates the passions of the human heart, likewise imposes silence upon the pride of the human intellect. We have no need to explore each doctrine, and trace it to its source, because we know they all spring from the same fountain, and flow for the fertility of the same soil. They are all salutary and healing waters, to slake the thirst and refresh the drooping strength of the pilgrim, as he journeys through the vale of tears. But, having once tasted of the

^(d) *Apoc.* ii. 2.

^(e) *Ibid.*

fountain-head, we have received the fullness of knowledge and of wisdom, and have no occasion to draw again from the same source. Having, then, once satisfied ourselves of the identity of this sacred fountain, that is of the true Church of Christ, and surely her characteristics are so marked that none can mistake them, then all that remains for us, is to bow in humble submission to her decisions in all matters of doctrine.^(f)

(f) Whatever that almost universal licentiousness in religious belief, generated by Protestantism, may hold to the contrary, I am here only advancing true Church of England doctrine. King Charles I. in his declaration, prefixed to the Articles of Religion, says: "Being by God's ordinance, according to our *just* title, *Defender of the Faith** and *supreme governour of the Church, within these our dominions*, we hold it most agreeable to this our kingly office, and our own religious zeal, to conserve and maintain the Church committed to our charge in unity of true religion, and in the bond of peace; and not to suffer unnecessary disputations, altercations, or questions to be raised, which may nourish faction both in the Church and Commonwealth. We have, therefore, upon mature

* Whether a Protestant King of England has a *just* right to the title of *Defender of the Faith*, may be ascertained by a reference to the circumstances under which that title was first obtained. It will, I believe, appear, that so far from this title having been bestowed by a Protestant Pope on a Protestant sovereign, for the defence of Protestant doctrine; it was given by the head of the Catholic Church to a Catholic king for his defence of Catholic doctrine, against the extravagant innovations of the great apostle of the Reformation, Martin Luther!

Let us, then, no longer suffer ourselves to be *tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine* ;

deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our bishops as might conveniently be called together, thought fit to make this declaration following :—

“ That the Articles of the Church of England contain the true doctrine of the Church of England agreeable to God’s word ; which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said articles. . . .

. . . .“ We will, that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God’s promises, [Quere. That the spirit of truth should abide for ever with his Church, teaching her all truth ?] as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures, [Quere. In the 16th chap. of St. Matt., v. 18, 19 ?] and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of *England* according to them. And that no man hereafter, shall either print or preach, to draw the Articles aside any way ; but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof ; and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.”

Such is a Declaration proceeding from the head of their Church, binding upon the consciences of every member of the Establishment, under pain of *the Church’s censure* and of the monarch’s *displeasure* ; and subscribed to by every man who subscribes to the 39 Articles. Who shall henceforth revile Catholics for the dutiful submission demanded of them by their Church, and for their ready com-

but, in accordance with the apostolic precept, listen to the authority of the Church: *we are of God; he that knoweth God, heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth us not: by this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.*^(g) With this view let us also put the same question to ourselves, which Philip put to the Eunuch who was reading the Scriptures: *Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest?* And if we answer in the same spirit, and with the same docility, *How can I, unless some man shew me?*^(h) no doubt we shall be rewarded with the same success. Though, in hearing the Church, we seem

pliance with it? Who shall call us slaves to our priesthood, and traitors to our reason?

As all must stand upon the basis of historical evidence, hence in discussing this or any other tenet or controverted point, it is surely the most natural method to refer, in the first instance, to the most ancient written evidence, namely, the Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church. If the Scriptures are not sufficiently full and satisfactory, we then go to those who followed nearest, in point of time, to the Apostles, and in whose writings we readily discover the sense in which the particular doctrine in question was understood in their days; from them it was handed down to the succeeding generation; and from thence we may trace it, always with an accumulating weight of testimony, to our own times.

(g) 1 *Epist. St. John*, iv. 6.

(h) *Acts*, viii. 30, 31.

to listen to men; yet it is not men who speak therein, but God who speaks, by the ministry of men. Let us then listen, with proper dispositions, and we shall find her wisdom and her spirit irresistible.⁽ⁱ⁾ It is thus, and thus only, that “the ignorant can be delivered from the seductions of false teachers, and the learned from the pride and delusion of false wisdom.”^(k)

Neither is it any reason for us to be satisfied, because, without diligent inquiry made with the necessary dispositions, we may feel already convinced. “They who allow their passions,”—and I will add, their prejudices, “to confound the distinctions between right and wrong, are criminal: they may be convinced, but they have not come honestly by their conviction.” They are in that state in which it is to be feared, that the Almighty *has sent them the operation of error to believe lying;*^(l) they are amongst those *unbelievers in whom the God of this world hath so blinded their minds, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not*

⁽ⁱ⁾ Acts vi. 10.

^(k) Though error may be innocent because it may be sincere, yet there can be no sincerity without inquiry, nor any inquiry without a solicitude to discover the truth, and a determination to follow it when discovered.

^(l) 2 Thess. ii. 10.

shine unto them.^(m) They are suffered to be deceived, because they love deception: they are permitted to be confirmed in error, because they have been unwilling to behold and to embrace the truth. But if we wish to be preserved from such callous hearts and darkened understandings, let us, with the advice of the Apostle, *anoint our eyes that we may see*⁽ⁿ⁾ with sincerity and humility. Let us beseech the God of light to remove from us all blindness of heart: let us not forget that those who think themselves wise, may make themselves fools,^(o) by the folly of their *own conceits*,^(p) by vanity, pride, or obstinacy: let us fervently pray, that *through the mercy of God, ... the orient from on high may visit us, may enlighten them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, and direct their feet in the ways of peace.*^(q) As we cannot be too strongly impressed with the necessity of such dispositions, I will again request the reader, in the words of a pious, an excellent and an amiable man, now no more, to bear in mind, “that candour and impartiality, necessary in all discussions, are particularly so where the passions are all engaged on one side; that truth must come from the *Father of light*; that it behoveth the sincere inquirer to remove the obsta-

^(m) 2 Cor. iv. 4.

⁽ⁿ⁾ Apoc. iii. 18.

^(o) Rom. i. 22.

^(p) Rom. xii. 16.

^(q) St. Luke, i. 78-79.

cles which the ignorance and the pride of the human mind oppose to it; and, in fine, that only the pure of heart see God, and that into a malicious soul wisdom will not enter, nor dwell in a body subject unto sin.”^(r)

(r) “ The great reason, however, which renders men in general unwilling to resign their errors, and seriously investigate the truth, is this:—that truth is rigid and austere, condemning the self-love, and restricting all the bad propensities of the human heart. Hence, our divine Redeemer has told us, that “ Men love darkness better than the light.” So that when even this great Being inculcated his heavenly doctrines,—although he did it with all the force of the most tender eloquence, yet did the public refuse to believe him. It was so, too, with his apostles. For, when these holy individuals preached, although they also enforced their preaching by the attestation of miracles;—still, St. Paul informs us, they “ were every where contradicted.” The fact is, that to engage men to embrace the truth, or to resign their errors, there is required a spirit of fortitude and piety; a spirit of disinterestedness and humility;—qualities, which, as they are extremely rare in the public walks of life, render it, hence, easy to understand, why falsehood and illusion prevail there so generally. It is, in short, with the understanding, when once it has been seduced by error, as it is with the will, when once it has been corrupted by vice:—exactly as it is difficult, without some peculiar impulse, to reform the latter,—so, without some great cause, it is next to impossible to correct the former. There is, usually, when the attempt is made, some obstacle or other in the

If, in the course of the inquiry, we meet with that which it is impossible to comprehend, and difficult to believe, we must remember that the Almighty has so ordained it for the exercise of our faith; for *faith is the evidence of things that appear not.*^(s) We must equally adore in humility and silence, the revelations of God to man, and the inscrutable counsels of heaven in the government of the world; and we must apply to both, these words of the apostle, *O the depth of the riches, of the wisdom, and of the knowledge of God! how incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways!*^(t) If we cannot reduce every thing to the standard of human reason, nor to the narrow comprehension of our capacities, we must recollect that omniscience is an attribute not granted to man; that *we see now through a glass, and in a dark manner*; but the time will come when we shall see *face to face: now we know only in part, but then we shall know even as we are known.*^(u) We must be satisfied that every thing is in conformity with the inscrutable decrees of the wisdom of the Deity, because we know we are not to enter into judgment with God, nor call our Creator to account for his con-

way,—some fear, or interest, or self-love, or perplexity: *Vestigia nulla retrorsum.*—(Dr. Fletcher's *Comparative View.*)

^(s) *Heb.* xi. 1.

^(t) *Rom.* xi. 33.

^(u) *1 Cor.* xiii. 12.

duct towards his creatures. The God of all knowledge has revealed to us enough for the purposes of our salvation, and that is sufficient. *His* is the province to command, ours to obey ; his counsels are righteous and his ways are unsearchable ; and it is not for us to question the equity of his providence, nor penetrate the depths of his designs. He has taught us his holy will, and we must perform it with alacrity ; not wait to discuss its utility, or question its propriety. Though in revelation there is much beyond reason, yet there is nothing contrary to it. It is only the ‘sophisms of reasoning pride’ that would lead us into contradiction and absurdity. Let us not lose ourselves in the intricate mazes of human speculation ; but taking a straight-forward path, let us ‘adhere firmly to the sacred laws of truth, of reason, and of revelation : of truth undisguised by fashionable error ; of reason unbiassed by worldly motives ; of revelation unsullied with the infectious breath of pretended reformation.’

In conclusion, let me call upon those who engage in polemic combat, to shake hands upon the field of battle, and to cleanse the venom from their weapons. We extract the sting from controversy, by discarding acrimonious invective and passionate hostility. Freedom of discussion is necessary in the cause of truth ; but that freedom must not be suffered to degenerate into licentiousness. As

reason should be subject to revelation, so should zeal be obedient to charity ; and though we differ in belief, we may live in harmony. Let it be our endeavour to promote the happiness of each other ; and if we are not likely to concur in opinion upon all points, let us rejoice that we agree in many ; and knowing with how much difficulty truth is sometimes found, let us not wonder that some should miss it. Whenever we are arrayed as adversaries, let it be under the banners of ‘ the meek and humble Jesus ;’ and may the motto blazoned on them be that golden sentence of an eloquent Father of the Church : *IN NECESSARIIS UNITAS, IN DUBIIS LIBERTAS, ET IN OMNIBUS CHARITAS* ; and while we display our triumph, let us also learn to show our moderation. Thus will error be overthrown, the troubled passions be allayed, and the olive branch of peace proclaim that the waters of discord have subsided. May they never flow again, but be dried up in their sources, absorbed by *CHARITY* and *TRUTH*.

FINIS.

POSTSCRIPT.

IN offering to the reader the Traditionary Evidence of the Doctrines of our Church on the points to which it relates, contained in No. XI. of the following APPENDIX, I beg leave to call his attention to a rule laid down by the Bishop of London, in his Charge of 1826 (*p.* 17). “When we are acquainted,” says he, “with the true state of the controversy, we may form our own conclusions :and how is this to be done? Not, surely, by retaliating mis-statements, invectives, and calumnies, or *crudely asserting an unqualified right of private judgment*, but BY REFERENCE TO PRIMITIVE ANTIQUITY; disproving the allegations of our opponents from the *silence* of Scripture, of general tradition, of ancient writers, which, in a case of this nature, is *decisive*; appealing to the proceedings of Emperors, *the acts of councils*, the *language of Fathers*,^(a) of Bishops, and even of Popes,

(a) “The different manner in which these venerable witnesses of the faith are used by Protestants, is worthy of observation. While they imagine they can derive any support from their testimony, they treat them with becoming deference. But, on finding them opposed to their own doctrine, then they condemn and renounce their authority. Of the latter class are the Socinians, in parti-

which *contradict* the pretensions of the Papacy, &c.“ *The genuine records of ancient usage and practice*, will, in like manner, supply us with *proof*, &c.” — Now, with all deference to the Rt. Rev. Prelate, we may surely be allowed to ask, what this *silent* evidence, to which he appeals, can weigh against the *positive* and *speaking* testimony which we can produce? As to the *contradicting* evidence, except on the point to which his Lordship refers, it is no where to be found: and even on that point, it will be seen only to contradict, *not the lawful and spiritual authority of the Pontiff*, but the *pretensions* of the Papacy. To deduce *proof* from *the genuine records of ancient usage and practice*, is an admirable rule, and one by which every Catholic, in common with the Bishop, is ready to be judged. I trust I have shewn in another part of this work, that the *silence* of Scripture is not *proof*. The *contradiction* of Scripture certainly is: for, if a doctrine be *contrary* to Scripture, it cannot be true. But till the Scriptures

cular. Of the former, are Protestants of a more mitigated cast, who are fond of preserving some relics of mystery in their creed, and of authority in their government. These latter wish to enlist the Fathers in their service; but, like many an impressed auxiliary, they are found, when free from restraint, to abandon their service, and join the ranks of the enemies.”—*Evidences of the Catholic Church*, vol. ii. p. 268.

can be proved to be *an independent rule of faith*, and to have been delivered to us in this capacity, which the Catholic Church has *always proved* not to have been the case, by *ancient usage and practice*, — the mere silence of Scripture cannot be taken in evidence. And as to the *speaking* and *positive* testimony of the Sacred Writings, *this unerring rule of ancient usage and practice* will shew that the Church, and the Church alone, has ever been considered as the authorized expounder of **them**.

In evidence of this, I will here content myself with citing the sentiments of only one of those great and learned men, whom all Christendom has agreed to honour with the distinctive title of *Fathers of the Church*. St. Irenæus, writing during the second century, observes :—

“ Paul says : ‘ God appointed in his Church Apostles, prophets, and doctors.’ Where, therefore, the holy gifts of God are, there must the truth be learned; with them is the succession from the Apostles, and there is the society whose communication is sound and irreproveable, unadulterated and pure. These preserve the faith of one God, who made all things; increase our love towards his divine Son, and expound, without danger, the Scriptures to us, not blaspheming the name of God, nor dishonouring the patriarchs, nor contemning the Prophets.’ (*Adversus Hæres. l. iv.*

c. 45, p. 345.)—"To him that believeth that there is one God, and holds to the head, which is Christ—to this man all things will be plain, if he read diligently the Scriptures with the aid of those who are the priests in the Church, and in whose hands, as we have shewn, rests the doctrine of the Apostles." (*Ibid.* c. 52, p. 355.)

The infallibility of the Church of God, in expounding the Scriptures, and delivering the doctrines of Christ, is the only question which our adversaries have any right to attack; for till this point be carried, all others must remain invulnerable: but it wears 'a panoply against which every arrow falls blunted to the ground.' There is no proposition more true than this—that if a Catholic be once separated from that great sheet-anchor of his faith, the indefectibility of the Church of Christ, he is drifted as a mere wreck upon the waters, and, in point of religious belief, becomes as mutable as the waves, and as uncertain as the winds. "Where such are the pretensions advanced," *viz.* to infallibility, says the writer of the Charge to which I have alluded, "the truth or the falsehood of particular articles of faith becomes a secondary question. If Christ has appointed the Church of Rome the exclusive possessor of his promises, the sole depositary of his authority, the infallible judge in controversies regarding the faith, it is useless to debate on other matter. If this point is decided

in her favour, our only resource is to acknowledge our errors, to sue for reconciliation, and accept the system of doctrines which is proved to be true by her sanction.”—(p. 16.) Now, *if this point be not decided in her favour*, by the Bishop’s own rule,—*the language of Fathers and of Bishops*, and *from the genuine records of ancient usage and practice*,—I pledge myself to desert her communion on the morrow.^(c)

^(c) Any one who chooses may see the proofs in the work from which the following extracts are taken.—*The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the first four Centuries of the Church.* Booker, 1812.

The learned Dr. Machale, whose immortal work* on the “Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church,” has just appeared, thus introduces his argument on the authority of the Church :—

“Having thus conducted my reader to the establishment of the Christian Church, it might have been naturally imagined that our labours would here terminate. But, unfortunately for the repose of the world, those who have thus far combatted for the truth, now strenuously controvert the nature of the revelation ; and no sooner do they triumph over the enemies of Christianity, than

* In this work, worthy to be incased in cedar and gold, the philosophy of Christianity has been delineated with a beauty and sublimity worthy of the subject. The most refined and classic elegance, united with the rich genius of the writer, has strewn the rugged paths of theological disquisition with the choicest flowers, and bestowed fresh life and fertility on the trodden and exhausted field of controversy.

their strength is mutually wasted in intestine contention. Hence, every age has witnessed the most angry controversies amongst those, who, acknowledging the truth of the Christian religion, have zealously disputed its genuine possession.

“In vain, then, should we have proved the existence of the Christian Church, if we were not able to distinguish it from the counterfeit impostures with which it is attempted to be confounded. It is not enough to show that revelation has been once imparted; it is likewise necessary to prove that this revelation has reached us unadulterated. Among the various claimants to the inheritance of Christ, we must determine who are they whose pretensions are best founded. The name of Christianity does not necessarily imply the true profession of the religion of Christ, since Christianity itself has branched out into as great a variety of discordant systems as the ancient philosophy. Yet, amidst this strange confusion, all are equally confident that they have inherited the religion of Jesus Christ. As then, the true Church, whatever it may be, can pretend to nothing more than the faithful possession of the Christian doctrine, it must be confessed that that Society is best entitled to the name, whose principles are best calculated to preserve and perpetuate its purity.

“Important as the controversy always has been, it has acquired fresh interest since the era of that religious revolution, called the Reformation; in no country, however, more than our own, where the division of Christians into two powerful bodies has kept alive an incessant contest among the adherents of the rival Churches. Though there are many points at issue between Catholics and Protestants, on which much of polemical skill has been

displayed, yet the simple question of the authority of the Church, is that which is most deserving of their mutual attention. Instead of an intricate maze of disputation, through which one might wander for ever, without coming to any definite conclusion, the controversy on the authority of the Church is palpable to every apprehension. It is one which, though not beyond the reach of the humblest capacity, may yet employ the range of the most vigorous and excursive intellects. Hence, ever since the celebrated conference of Bossuet and Claude, the two most distinguished champions of their respective creeds, the authority of the Church has been an important and unceasing theme of discussion. As it has been the centre of the union of Catholics, it has been the common point of the hostility of Protestants; and however adverse the creeds, and rancorous the jealousies of the reformed sects, their mutual impatience of control has often suspended their intestine division, to league them in opposition to that authority by which they have been proscribed.

“In contemplating the character of the revolution, which, in the sixteenth century produced the separation of a large portion of the Church from the parent stock, we shall find it marked by a peculiarity which distinguishes it from every other. Each preceding error was opposed to some particular tenet of Catholic belief; and if it was cherished for some time, it was because authority was rather eluded than resisted. The most contumacious unbelievers were ready to profess their respect for the decisions of the proper tribunals; and if they refused acquiescence, it was because they affected to doubt the legitimate exercise of its power, rather than to question its existence. The restless love of novelty exhausted,

at length, the circle of human errors, by resting upon one when driven from another, until, finding no new ground on which to repose, it turned upon that authority by which it had been pursued through the labyrinth of its wanderings. This is the new feature that discriminates the errors of modern times. If the Donatists protracted their schisms, it was because they pretended the bishop of Carthage, from whom they separated, in consequence of the crimes with which he was charged, had been absolved by corrupt and interested judges. If the followers of Eutyches defended that there was but one nature in Christ after the incarnation, it was, they said, because such a doctrine was included in the definition of the Fathers of Ephesus. The council of Chalcedon, it is true, soon corrected their mistake, and those who were animated with a love of truth and unity, soon returned to the bosom of the Church: such, however, as resisted the authority of the council of Chalcedon, affected to believe that it was opposed to that of Ephesus, and thus would fain palliate their resistance under the mask of respect for authority. These observations are applicable to almost every error that deformed the faith of the Church as well as to every schism that disturbed its tranquillity during fifteen centuries. The necessity of some coercive authority was generally acknowledged by all, while, in the application of this truth, they ingeniously discovered reasons to justify them in eluding its exercise. The doctrines of one, it was said, had been misrepresented by envy: malevolence had imputed false crimes to another. The Roman Pontiff had been often imposed on by the artifices of individuals, interested in misinforming him on distant transactions; and the Fathers of a general council were not unfrequently represented as the factious

partisans of some powerful patriarch, jealous of the influence of a rival. Such were generally the arguments by which the heretics of former times endeavoured to shield themselves against the spiritual terrors of the Church, and such are the apologies that are still advanced by those historians who are partial to their memory. It was reserved, however, for the spirit of a later age, to assert an unlimited independance of thinking, on the most important subjects of religion. Not content with controverting the truth, it controverts the authority by which truth has been decided. While others have sought to diminish Christ's doctrine, by the subtraction of some previous article of belief: it is now attempted to dissipate the whole, by wresting it from the possession of those to whom it has been entrusted. Heretofore, the New Testament was considered as a precious inheritance, bequeathed by Christ to his spouse, for the benefit of her children. To protect it from profanation, it was confided to the apostles as a sacred deposit, and transmitted by them to their successors, who were to guard it with similar care. Equally vigilant against the craft of the thief and the violence of the robber, they have preserved it unimpaired. When persecutors strove to destroy this legacy, by consigning the Sacred Volume to the flames, it was preserved by their zeal from the danger with which it was threatened: and when the prodigal children of the Church, abusing her bounty, would fain squander their portion of the inheritance, and wander into a far country, like a tender parent she wept over their errors, recalling them again to feast in their father's house, and to partake of the banquet, in which they might still share, but which she would not suffer to be dissipated.

Now, however, the Church experiences a revolt unex-

amplified in the history of former ages. The natural alliance which mutually converts the Testament of Christ and its guardians—an alliance sealed with his blood—is violated; and the rich deposit which he bequeathed, is attempted to be scattered abroad; not only to be enjoyed by the observers, but to be rifled by the violators, of his covenant. Mixed with the impure errors that cover the earth, the truths of this divine Testament, when dispersed out of the Catholic Church, gradually disappear. Like the manna which fed the Israelites from heaven, and which, if collected as God had prescribed, became substantial nourishment, but vanished from those who sought it any other way; the Word of God becomes life to those who seek it from the Church, while it eludes the search of all who follow their own caprices. In vain, then, is the world inundated with bibles: the dead letter may be circulated, without being informed by the Spirit, which maketh wise unto salvation. All may be invited to slake their thirst with the divine word, but let them recollect, that after being forced out of the inclosures of that Church which is called, ‘the sealed fountain,’ its contents, instead of being pure, are the poisoned ‘waters of the broken cistern.’

“Hence, the strange alliance between infidelity and fanaticism, that characterises our period. Retaining, by the principle of resistance to authority, the very root of infidelity, men still affect to insult the inspired writings for what they ought to believe; the result is such as might be expected. Under the common name of Christianity, infidelity lies disguised; and from the latitude of belief which has resulted from each one’s sense of the inspired writings, unbelievers have discovered that to abandon them to the interpretation of each individual, is

the most effectual plan to propagate their infidelity. The contest does not now, as heretofore, turn on any peculiar tenet of the Catholic Church: its very authority is aimed at; and the abettors of the perfectibility of the human mind flatter themselves that they have superseded the authority of the Church, by having erected the monstrous system of Bible Societies. This is but giving another name to the principle of private judgment, from which the pretended Reformation sprang. The spirit of man is inventive, and one folly quickly succeeds another. However, in this vast design of reducing the world to a uniformity of faith, by the dumb authority of the Bible, the ancient feuds of the sectaries seem to suffer a temporary respite. In the hope of deposing that authority which equally proscribes them all, they forbear advancing their own claims to any peculiar election. Weary of an incessant struggle, in which they had wasted each other's strength, without any prospect of victory, they have adopted more moderate counsels, in order to effect a stronger opposition against the authority of the Church. But this confederacy will soon be dissolved: the elements of discord, of which it is composed, are incapable of strong or lasting cohesion. Like the leagues which were often formed against the Church, this too will soon pass away, and its fleeting existence will be only remembered as another trophy of the strength of that Church, which it was intended to overthrow.

“To fix then the faith of the true believer, as well as to enable those who have strayed from the paths of truth, to retrace their wandering footsteps, shall be the object of the succeeding chapters. In the prosecution of a work, in which the elucidation of truth is my aim, I shall abstain from every topic that can be considered only a subject of

barren disputation. If candour and temper are deemed essential qualities in every writer, who wishes to make a favourable impression, much more necessary is it for him who labours to promote the interests of charity and the salvation of mankind, to lay aside every acrimonious feeling. In entering on a discussion, in which the spiritual interests of millions are involved, a writer must not lose sight of the nature of the object in which he is engaged. It is not a philosophical discussion, of which the issue is to depend upon the subtlety of argument, or the variety of learning, with which either champion shall vindicate his cause. Much learning and ingenuity may be displayed in the support of an erroneous position; and, if truth were never supposed to triumph, until the spirit of cavil should yield, the sum of certain and indisputable principles would be reduced to a small number. Of the force of subtle and metaphysical arguments, the people are incompetent judges; nor can he be supposed the best calculated to guide their belief, who leads them through a labyrinth where but few can follow. The advocate of one system may be satisfied with the evidence by which it is supported. But if the process of reasoning, by which he has arrived at his conclusions, be intricate, while he displays the force of his own mind, he ought to reflect that such a process is not obvious to every capacity. As the present controversy, then, regards principally the great bulk of mankind, it might happen that the mode of reasoning, in which most ingenuity could be displayed, would be the least adapted to their apprehensions. We are to recollect that it is to the poor that Christ chiefly preached the gospel, and that he gave thanks to his heavenly Father, for having revealed to the 'little ones, what he had hidden from the wise and prudent of the world.' (*Luke* x. 21.)

Having, therefore, in view, these words of Christ as our motto, we shall leave to others the subtlety of disputation, conscious that the poor and the little ones are our clients; and our cause, the interests of their salvation."

After a long and very able argument, on the method adopted by Christ of communicating and preserving his doctrines among mankind, or, in other words, on *the Rule of Faith*, the learned writer goes on to say :

"To preserve these truths, then, which will never cease to inform and vivify the great Catholic body, there must be an authority to guard them. This authority resides in the living pastors of the Church, who transmit the sacred doctrine, which they inherited, to their immediate successors. Between them and those successors, there is a sacred covenant not to violate this inheritance. The study of each individual is to preserve unaltered the precious deposit, which he has received; and thus, while the Protestant, like the prodigal child, dissipates his share of the patrimony, the Catholic is careful to treasure it up in the house of his Father.

"In vain will it be insinuated, that in the Catholic Church, this treasure is studiously locked up from the necessities of the faithful. No, they are encouraged to use it, they are forbidden to abuse it. The treasure is destined for purchasing an everlasting inheritance; and not for being wasted according to each one's caprice, in profligacy and riot. For, alas, how often have the profligate abused the authority of the sacred text, in giving a sanction to their own disorders! In teaching the principles of morality, her instructions are always enriched by the truths of revelation; and, in illustrating her own doctrines, she appeals to its written testimony. In the great voyage through life, the Protestant may have the chart,

but, wanting the knowledge which it requires, and bereft of a guide, he is exposed to all the perils of the way; while the Catholic enjoys all the confidence inspired by the two-fold assistance of chart and guide. If he be ignorant, he trusts to the guide that has already conducted thousands through the same path; and if he be enlightened, so far from his confidence being diminished, it is still heightened when he beholds the Church fearlessly spreading the Scripture before his view; and finds the most admirable accordance between the instructions of the chart, and the skill of his conductor....”

“Thus, the New Testament contains the inheritance which Christ has bequeathed to his children. Though destined for the benefit of all, therefore, it does not follow that all have a right to its administration. Nay, it is for the benefit of all, that this right should be reserved to a particular body, whose authority and wisdom might moderate those disputes, which could not fail to spring from the passions or ignorance of the people. Behold, then, the simple but infallible rule, by which the Catholic is guided—an adherence to the traditionary doctrine of those, to whom the Redeemer promised that they should never go astray. But it may be asked: is not this infallibility of the Church proved solely from the Scripture? No: its promise is registered in the Scripture, it is true, but its operation lives and is felt through the entire history of the Church. Thus, infallibility was in operation before the promise which sustained it was committed to writing. If, therefore, it never had been recorded in the Scriptures, our certainty of its existence would be still the same, since it reaches us through the equally infallible medium of the writings of the Holy Fathers; and through the still more unequivocal medium of the power which the

Church has always exercised. In the uniform authority which her pastors always enforced, and in the uniform reverence with which her decrees were received, notwithstanding the angry passions, which this exercise of power often awakened in the discontented, we behold a stronger evidence of the promises of Christ, than any writings could convey.

“How different, therefore, the confidence of him, who thus relies on the collected wisdom of all ages and nations of the Christian Church, from the perpetual anxiety of the man, who trusts solely to his own, or to the fleeting opinions of a few individuals? But is not the confidence of the Catholic unreasonable, who thus reposes on the authority of others? Not more unreasonable, than when he commits his life and property to the guardianship of the civil authority of the state. If the moral and metaphysical truths, which form the source of our obligations to God and to society, are inherited by children from their fathers, without the reproach of credulity, why not communicate the more mysterious truths of revealed religion, through the same medium of authority? Those principles which are connected with the preservation of society, are suffered to be strengthened by all the natural prejudices of infancy and education; are the saving truths of the gospel, the only ones that should not be allowed to take such strong root, but be rudely torn from the soil, under the pretext that man himself had no share in planting them? Alas! in spite of all our efforts, the prejudices of education will prevail, and those who attempt to deprive truth of their alliance, must give their strong assistance to error. As well, then, might you say, that man is unreasonable when he adopts, on the authority of mankind, those metaphysical truths, which he cannot comprehend; as that

the Catholic is unreasonable, when he reposes on the authority of the Catholic Church. Every assent which is not founded on previous examination, is not, therefore, unreasonable. If it were, the number of truths of which we should enjoy conviction, would be limited indeed. Is it by a previous process of reasoning, that each individual is fortified in the conviction of the existence of a supreme Being? If so, it is a process which few are able to analyze. Though it forces itself on the conviction of every mind, still it is so vague in the mode of its conception, that no one can define its form, or trace its origin. Yet, however undefinable, it is still so strong in its operation, that its faith could not be shaken in the most illiterate mind. The evidence of truth, then, is quite distinct from the process of reasoning, by which it is unfolded. Nay, the truths which are the simplest in their nature, and the least susceptible of argumentation, are those which act most strongly on our convictions. Such is the order of nature, observes St. Augustine, that when we learn any thing, reason is anticipated by authority. This profound observation is illustrated by the universal influence of authority over our education. But though truth may be poured into our infant minds, before we could distinguish it from error, we are not, on that account, when our faculties are developed, the less sensible of its evidence or force. This is the reason of the calm and settled tranquillity which accompanies the Catholic through life : and which the Protestant may mistake for an unreasonable prostration of his intellect. Having found the truth by that method by which it has been transmitted, it would be folly for him to enquire for that, of which he is already in possession ; and, hence, he is secure from that anxiety which must agitate those who wander from one error to

another. All the arguments of uniformity, antiquity, and universality, which fail not to strike every mind, have their silent but powerful influence on the education of every Catholic, and must operate in checking those doubts which are generally the associates of error. From infancy to manhood, from the narrowest state of his intellect to the utmost expansion it can assume, the Catholic finds, in the treasures of his religion, sufficient truth to satisfy all the cravings of his mind.

“If, in his youth, he is indebted to his parents for the rudiments of his faith, it is because, as St. Augustine remarks, the relations of nature require such subjection. His feeble mind must be yet fed with the milk of Christian doctrine, because it is incapable of stronger nourishment. He then receives those seeds of Christian faith, of which he beholds in every future instruction, nothing else but a fuller developement. Examination, therefore, instead of awakening doubt, only strengthens conviction. From his pastor he learns the same doctrine which he learned under his mother’s tutelage, with this difference only, that it is accompanied with stronger reasons, which are accommodated to his growing understanding. Could we suppose that the activity with which man thirsts after knowledge, should prompt him to distrust the narrow source from which his science has been hitherto derived; his distrust is checked or anticipated by the instruction which refers him to more abundant sources of information. He hears his pastor confidently declare: “The doctrine which I preach is not mine, but that of him who sent me.” (*John*, vii. 16.) Instead, therefore, of requiring that any rest their faith on his authority, the pastor raises the confidence of his people to a still higher authority on which his own is dependent. The Catholic, then, far from seeing his curiosity checked,

finds it still invited to a more ample investigation. He hears the bishop preach from his episcopal chair; who, instead of arrogating any power to himself, declares that he, too, is the organ of a Church, from whose decisions he cannot depart. The immutable decisions of this Church, to which the sincere and docile Christian is ultimately referred, he finds written in her liturgies, and embodied with her public worship. They are identified with her ceremonies, they are palpable in her festivals; and, if he can trace back her history, they will meet him in every period of her existence. Thus he discovers nothing isolated or solitary in his inquiry; nothing partial or mutilated in his faith. Every testimony which he consults, is only a link which connects his belief with some other monument; thus, as it were, stretching through every age, and spreading over every country; in a word, he finds that the faith which he drank in his infancy, was but a partial stream, conveyed to him from the pure, the ancient, and the universal doctrine of the Catholic Church."—Dr. Machale's *Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church*, Vol. I. pp. 268-279, 365-366, 379-386.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

Observations on the Claim of the Reverend John Daniel on the French government, rejected by the British Commissioners; and which rejection has been confirmed by the judgment of the Privy Council.

The Claim of the Reverend John Daniel, President of the English Secular College at Douay, to compensation for property confiscated by the execution of decrees passed in France since the beginning of the year 1793, was duly presented within the time prescribed by the treaty of 30th May, 1814, and by the convention of 20th November, 1815, to the honourable Commissioners appointed to execute the said treaty and convention.

It has been shewn, to the satisfaction of the British Commissioners and of the Lords of the Privy Council, that the Reverend John Daniel was a British subject; and that the property held by him at the time of its confiscation, on the 12th October, 1793, and then seized in execution of the decree passed on the 10th October, 1793, for the confiscation of the property of all subjects of his Britannic Majesty in France, was confiscated in consequence of his being a British subject.

The claim of the Reverend John Daniel having been rejected by the British Commissioners, not for want of evidence in the documents produced to support it, but on the ground (as alleged) that the English college at Douay was deemed a French establishment, and was not included in the view of the treaties; reasons which the claimant deemed unsatisfactory:—an appeal was preferred to his Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, against the award of rejection given by the Commissioners.

On Friday, the 25th November, 1825, the judgment of the Lords of the Privy Council was pronounced by Lord Gifford, confirming the rejection of the Claim.—The following is a correct extract of the judgment, taken from Mr. Gurney's short-hand notes.

Lord Gifford.—“ In considering this question, it is necessary to attend to the nature and object of these establishments, and to the intent and meaning of the treaties under which the indemnity is asked.—Now the institutions in behalf of which the Claims are made, although their members were British subjects, and their property derived from funds constituted by British subjects, were in the nature of French corporations: they were locally established in a foreign territory, because they could not exist in England; their end and object were not authorised, but were directly opposed to the British law; and the funds dedicated to their maintenance were employed for that purpose in France, because they could not be so employed in England; and if other circumstances were wanting to fix their character, it appears that these establishments, as well as their revenues, are subject to the control of the French government; and the conduct of that government, since the restoration of the monarchy, shews, that if all had been suffered to remain entire during

the period of the revolution, the monarchical government would have taken the whole under its superintendance and management.—We think, therefore, that they must be deemed French establishments.

“ Then are such establishments, though represented by British subjects, to claim under the treaties? — Treaties, like other compacts, are to be construed according to the intention of the contracting parties; and looking at the occasion and object of those treaties, we think that it was not, or could not have been in the contemplation of the contracting parties, that the British government should demand, or the French government grant compensation for property held in trust for establishments in France, and for purposes inconsistent with British laws, and which were subject to the control of the French government. We therefore think that, having regard to the nature and character of the establishments which the claimants allege themselves to represent, and to the purposes to which the property, in respect whereof compensation is claimed, was dedicated, the claimants have not brought their case within the meaning or spirit of the treaties; that the rejection of their claims, therefore, by the Commissioners was right, and that consequently the award must be confirmed.

“ Upon the hearing of the appeal, however, it was further insisted, that the appellants are entitled to compensation for the loss they have individually sustained, by having been deprived (in consequence of the seizure of the possessions and property of the establishments) of the salary and income enjoyed by them as members of those establishments, and that it should be referred back to the Commissioners, to reconsider their award in that respect.—It is to be observed, that no such claim appears to have been

made before the Commissioners; and therefore that, in strictness, it cannot be urged upon this appeal; but supposing that it could, we are of opinion that, as no compensation can, for the reasons already given, be demanded for the corpus of the property seized, no valid claim can be sustained by any members of those bodies for the income derivable from it."

Though the claims of the Reverend John Daniel for the English college at Douay, of the Reverend John Bew for the English seminary at Paris, and of the Reverend Francis Tuite and others, for the English college of St. Omer, were presented as distinct and unconnected claims, yet they were confounded together by the Commissioners and by the Privy Council.

The English secular college of Douay, for the property of which the Reverend John Daniel claimed compensation, merely existed on French soil as an isolated English establishment, and was foreign in every respect to France; to the government of which country neither the members nor superiors were ever bound by any oath or promise of allegiance. It had continued, from its beginning to the period of the French revolution, in the free exercise of its administration, and of the administration of its property, independently of any authority, superintendance, or control in France. It was, indeed, subject to the municipal laws of the town in which it was situated, as any English commercial house in France would be subject to the same. This college was never connected with any French establishment or institution. It was not incorporated in the university of Douay, neither was it subject to the rector or master of the university. The presidents of this college, all subjects of his Britannic Majesty, were never chosen, nor presented, nor nominated, nor appointed by any per-

son, power, or authority, civil or ecclesiastical, in France. In no respect, therefore, before the French revolution, could this English secular college of Douay be deemed a French establishment.

The Commissioners themselves, in their "Case in support of the Award," of rejection, after citing an edict of the King of France, issued in the year 1763, which provided for the future government of all colleges not depending on the university, whether the same were under the direction of "Congrégations Seculières ou Regulières," or not, made this acknowledgment (p. 10 of the Case):—"the Board further find, that there is no proof before them whether any letters patent were or were not issued by the King of France relative to the said college of Douay, in virtue of this edict." The continuation of the ancient form of administration of this English college of Douay, after the issuing of the above edict to the time of the French revolution, was a public proof that it was not affected by the provisions of the said edict, but that, being an English college, it was left, as before, to the free exercise of its own administration. This fact further shews, that, before the revolution in France, the college of Douay was not treated, nor considered as a French establishment.

The revolutionary government of France considered and treated this college not as a French but as an English establishment. It sequestered and confiscated the property of this college, in the year 1793, not as the property of a French but of an English establishment, at the time, and not till then, when the property of all English individuals and companies was confiscated.

In proof of these two assertions, it was shewn in evidence, that when the French National Assembly, on the 5th

November, 1790, decreed the property of all establishments of education in France to be national property, and ordered it to be disposed of as such, the same Assembly passed a law on the 7th of the same month and year, exempting the British property of this college, as well as that of other British Catholic Establishments in France, from the operation of the above-mentioned decree of the 5th. This law was grounded on the "Rapport des Comités Ecclésiastiques et Diplomatiques," made by M. Chassey, on the 28th October, in which these establishments were presented to the deliberation of the Assembly as foreign establishments. "Tel est l'objet de petitions des établissemens étrangers dont vous avez renvoyé l'examen à vos deux comités réunis, pour y faire droit. Devez vous conserver dans le sein de la France des établissemens étrangers?" See Chassey's Report of the law of 7th November, 1790, from which it will appear that the National Assembly in exempting this college from the decree passed against French establishments, considered this not as a French, but as an English establishment.—Moreover, when the National Convention made a decree on the 8th of March, 1793, relative to the sale of goods belonging to colleges and other establishments of public instruction in France, it made an express exception in favour of the foreign establishments mentioned in the law of 7th Nov. 1790, article VI. "Sont exceptés pareillement les biens de tout genre formant la dotation de tous les établissemens étrangers mentionnés dans la loi du 7 Novembre 1790." And under that exception the English College of Douay continued until the decree whereby British property was confiscated.

2ndly. It was shewn that the decree of the 10th October, 1793, by the execution of which the property of the

English College of Douay was confiscated, did not affect any French establishments (all which had been dissolved and disposed of as national property by the decrees of 5th November, 1790, and 8th March, 1793) but that it affected only British establishments and British property in France, whether held for the purposes of commerce or education.

Therefore, this English secular college of Douay, for the property of which Mr. John Daniel claims compensation according to the treaties, was not considered or treated by the revolutionary government of France as a French establishment, any more than English commercial houses established in different towns in France, and having property in the French funds, were considered as French houses of commerce.

As the Reverend John Daniel was deprived of his college in October, 1793, because it was a British Establishment, and because he was a British subject, he had reason to expect, that if compensation should ever be made to British subjects for the losses they had suffered by the execution of the confiscatory decrees of the revolutionary government of France against British property and British subjects, he should be admitted to his share in the compensation.

On the 30th May, 1814, a treaty was made, and on the 20th November, 1815, a more explicit convention was concluded between the French and English governments, for granting compensation to all subjects of his Britannic Majesty who had been deprived of their property in France in consequence of decrees of sequestration or confiscation passed by the French government since the beginning of the year 1793. The late much esteemed and respected Marquis of Londonderry, was the English minister who carried on and perfected the said treaty and convention.

As the Reverend John Daniel is a British subject, and was deprived of the property of which he was in possession, on the 12th October, 1793, by the execution of the decree of 10th October in the same year, for the confiscation of the property of all subjects of his Britannic Majesty, it is submitted that he is included within the treaty and convention.

As the Rev. John Daniel has this clear and positive right to compensation, it is submitted that he cannot in justice be deprived of it, unless it can be shewn that by the express terms and conditions of the treaty and convention, he is excluded from the benefit of compensation thereby stipulated for in favour of all subjects of his Britannic Majesty, whose property had been confiscated.

The treaty makes no exception, the commissioners can make none.

The next question is, whether the claim to compensation for the confiscated property of this establishment of Douay College was not within the spirit of the treaty and convention, or whether the same was excluded therefrom in the intentions of the contracting parties, the French and English governments?

It is true, that treaties, like other compacts, are to be construed, where the construction admits of doubt, through the intervention of the intention of the contracting parties, if such intentions can be ascertained. But whether it was, or was not, the intention of the contracting parties to exclude from the benefit of the treaties made in favour of all subjects of his Britannic Majesty, this Claim presented by the Reverend John Daniel, a British subject, for the value of the property of his establishment, which had been confiscated like other British property in France, is a question of fact. No positive proof whatever of the

fact of this intended and alleged exclusion has been produced, and all that is said in the Judgment is, " Looking at the occasion and object of these treaties, we think it was not, and could not, have been in the contemplation of the contracting parties, that the British government should demand, or the French government grant, compensation for the property held in trust for establishments in France, and for purposes inconsistent with British laws, and which were subject to the control of the French government."

Whether it could or could not have been in the contemplation of the contracting parties, to stipulate for compensation for such establishments, is a matter of speculation, but not of fact. The question is, whether both the contracting parties, with the knowledge of the nature of this establishment, positively meant to exclude it from the benefit of the treaty which was made in favour of all British subjects?

And whether it is not virtually comprised therein, as well as all other British claims admitted to be so comprised?

Two Roman Catholic seminaries, and two religious houses in Canada, had property in the French funds before the Revolution, which was confiscated, in 1793, by the same decree as confiscated the funded property held by Mr. Daniel for Douay College.—Did the contracting parties in the treaties actually intend to grant compensation for the property held in trust for Douay College? Can it be positively shewn by any document, that the latter was not as much in the contemplation of the contracting parties as the former? The Commissioners having awarded a compensation for the confiscated property held in trust for the seminaries and religious houses in Canada, why have they rejected the claim of Douay College?—The

compensation to the Canadian establishments was granted by an Inscription in the Great Book of the Public Debt of France, according to the mode of payment prescribed by the treaty. Would it have been inconsistent with any British law, if the Rev. John Daniel had received his compensation in France, according to the treaty, by a similar Inscription in the same Book?

Against the assertion, "That it was not in the contemplation of the contracting parties, that the British government should demand, or the French government grant, compensations for property held in trust for such establishments in France as Douay College," positive documents and proofs may be adduced.

I. ON THE PART OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT.

The convention was signed November 20th, 1815.

Considering that some sequestered property, belonging to Mr. Daniel's college of Douay, still remained unsold in 1816, and that there might be a considerable delay before the Commissioners appointed to execute the treaty would be able to put Mr. Daniel in possession of it, a petition was presented to the King of France for the immediate restoration of that unsold property to Mr. Daniel. It was restored to him in his quality of President of Douay College, by an ordinance of the King of France, dated 25th January, 1816. But lest this act, putting Mr. Daniel in possession of the property which still remained unsold, should prejudice his right to claim by the benefit of the treaty and convention, that portion of the property of Douay College which had been confiscated, the King added this clause in the first article of the ordinance: "Le tout néanmoins sans préjudice de l'Article IV. additionnel du Traité de Paris, du 30 Mai 1814, et des Articles

1^{er} et V. de la Convention de Paris, du 20 Novembre, 1815.”

This was an affirmative acknowledgment on the part of the French government, that compensation should be granted through the treaty and convention for property which was held in trust for Douay College, and which had been confiscated as British property.

As the King of France, in 1814 and 1815, was the party made responsible, and who granted a compensation to British subjects for their property which had been confiscated by the revolutionary government in 1793, an official act on the part of His Most Christian Majesty, referring a British subject to the Commission appointed to execute the treaty and convention, in order to his receiving compensation for the value of his confiscated property, is surely a positive proof, that, in the intention of the French government, that person was included in the benefit of the treaty. Mr. Daniel was referred to that Commission for compensation for the value of that very funded property which has been claimed of the British Commissioners.

By the Ordinance of the 25th January, 1816, above alluded to, Art. I., Mr. Daniel was to be put in possession of all moveable and immoveable property, not sold, belonging to his college. It appeared to some, that the term moveable property might include the funded property of the college, or the Rentes sur l'Etat; an application was, therefore, made to the Minister of Finances to have the value of this funded property transferred by a new inscription to the name of the Reverend John Daniel, in the great Book of the Public Debt of France. The Minister answered, that this could not be done but through the Commission appointed to execute the treaty and convention made for the purpose of granting compensation to

British subjects.—The following is a translation of the official answer from the Ministry of Finances (the original of which is in the hands of Dr. Poynter) on the subject of this application, dated 5th April, 1816, and addressed to Mr. Deshayes, Public Notary, in Paris, who was employed to transact this business at the Treasury for Dr. Poynter, who acted in virtue of a power of Attorney from the Rev. John Daniel.

Ministry of Finances. *The Chief Clerk of the Financial Department to Mr. Deshayes, Notary in Paris.*

————— Sir,

Department for the Debt
inscribed.

—————

The Minister has received, together with your letter of the 29th ult. the statement of the Rentes to which the English Colleges and Seminaries established in France are proprietors on the government.

Office of the Great Book.

—————

I am directed by his Excellency to apprise you that he cannot, according to the legislation now in force, proceed in getting the Rentes in question inscribed without a previous liquidation, which liquidation he is not legally authorised to effect, and which can only be done by the Commissioners appointed in pursuance of the Treaty of the 20th November last; it is therefore absolutely necessary that Bishop Poynter of London, should, as has been recommended to him by the Minister, present direct to the said Commissioners, the

Nota.—All letters in answer, or others, must be addressed, under cover, to his Excellency the Minister of Finances, in default of which they will not be taken in.

Observations relative to the Inscription of the Rentes claimed by the English Colleges and Seminaries.

claims which he has to prefer on account of the Inscription of Rentes belonging to the Establishments, the concerns of which are entrusted to him.

I have the honour to salute you
very sincerely,

(Signed) HARMAND.

(Superscribed) *Mr. Deshayes, Notary,
No. 9, Quai de l'Ecole, Paris.*

By this official answer from the French government, directions were given to Dr. Poynter to present to the Commissioners appointed to execute the convention of 20th November, 1815, his claims for the inscription of the rents belonging to this establishment, for the inscription of that very funded property which has been claimed through the Commissioners.

Probably this is the only British claim which was directly and expressly referred by the French government to the Commissioners for compensation.

As it appears from these documents, that it was in the intention and contemplation of the French government to grant compensation for the property held in trust for the establishment of Douay College, whether that establishment was or was not inconsistent with British laws, or subject to the control of the French government; as the government of France did, in fact, place a sum of money in the hands of the British government, for the purpose of making compensation to the claimant for this establishment, as well as for the purpose of making compensation to other claimants for other British property confiscated in France, the British government, by accepting this money, engaged itself to pay the compensation to this claimant, in furtherance of the intentions of the French

government, provided the claimant should, like other British subjects, prove his right to compensation, according to the terms of the treaty and convention.

If the British government had conceived, that it could not with propriety undertake the commission of paying the compensation which the French government granted "for property held in trust for such establishments in France, and for purposes inconsistent with British laws, and which were subject to the control of the French government," it is humbly submitted, that the British government ought not to have received money from the French government for that purpose ; or, having received it, it ought either to pay it in France, according to the treaty, to the claimant for this establishment, or to return it to the French government, leaving to that government the charge of satisfying the demand itself.

This claim was before the Commissioners in 1818. When the British government, in 1818, received a capital producing three millions, five hundred francs interest, as the final payment to satisfy the claims of all British subjects on the French government, which were then before the Commissioners ; if it had in its calculation positively excluded the value of the claim of Mr. Daniel for Douay College, the British government would, and, as it is humbly submitted, ought to have signified to the French government, that it had reduced its demand in favour of British claimants, according to the probable amount of the excluded claims, and would and ought to have declared to Mr. Daniel and other similar claimants, that they must now seek compensation from the French government, and not through the British Commissioners appointed to execute the treaty, and would have signified to the Commissioners that they should not proceed any further with this claim.

The Act of Parliament of the 19th May, 1819, to enable certain Commissioners fully to carry into effect several conventions for liquidating claims of British subjects, and others, against the government of France, thus enacts relatively to the last convention of 1818: "And whereas a convention, between His Majesty and His Most Christian Majesty, was signed at Paris, on the 25th day of April, 1818, for the final arrangement of the claims of his majesty's subjects on the government of France, by the first article of which said last mentioned convention, it was agreed, that, in order to effect the payment and entire extinction as well of the capital as of the interest thereupon due to the subjects of his Britannic majesty, and of which the payment had been claimed in virtue of the additional article to the treaty of 30th May, 1814, and also in virtue of the first herein before mentioned convention of the 20th day of November, 1815, there should be inscribed in the great book of the public debt of France, a perpetual annuity of three millions of francs, representing a capital of sixty millions of francs, &c.—And whereas his Royal Highness the Prince Regent was pleased, by this commission, under the great seal of the united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, dated the 15th June, 1818, to nominate and appoint Colin Alexander Mackenzie, Esquire, George Lewis Newnham, Esquire, and George Hammond, Esquire, to be his commissioners of liquidation, arbitration and award, for the purpose of acting on behalf of his majesty in England, according to the provisions of all the said herein before recited several conventions, and to take into consideration all the claims of his majesty's subjects, which may have been at due time and in proper form presented to them, and to award the payment of such sums, as may appear to be justly due, to his majesty's said

subjects—Be it therefore enacted, that in order to enable the said commissioners to complete the exoneration and liquidation of the claims of such persons who shall have caused their names to be duly inserted in the herein before mentioned registers, &c.”

According to this Act, made since the assignment of the last sum called for in order to effect the payment and entire extinction, as well of the capital as of the interest thereupon due to the subjects of his Britannic majesty, we see that compensation was to be granted for property, the payment of which had been claimed, in virtue of the additional article to the treaty of 30th May, 1814, and also in virtue of the Convention of 20th November, 1815.—Hence, the claims grounded on the treaty and convention of 1814 and 1815 were not shaken or changed by the convention of 25th April, 1818, nor by this Act of Parliament, but they were thereby confirmed. The Commissioners were thereby appointed to act according to the provisions of all the before recited conventions, and to take into consideration all the claims of his majesty's subjects, which may have been at due times and in proper form presented to them.—It is not pretended that this claim was not presented in due time and in proper form.

This claim of Mr. Daniel was grounded on the treaty and convention of 1814 and 1815, and was presented to the Commissioners in due time and proper form; consequently it was not shaken or changed by the convention of 25th April, 1818, and the commissioners having a deposit in their hands for the payment of this as well as of all other British claims which have been presented in due time and in proper form, were bound to grant an award of compensation, in favour of this, as well as of others which are supported by such documents as are required by the treaties and conventions.

This claim is supported by such documents.

If no other arguments or observations were added, it is humbly, but confidently submitted, that the preceding appear to be abundantly sufficient to shew, that the claim of the Rev. John Daniel was included in the treaties, and that he is entitled to the benefit of compensation.

II. ON THE PART OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

The late Lord Londonderry was the negociator on the part of the British government in the treaty of the 30th May, 1814, and of the convention of the 20th November, 1815, and being Secretary of State for the Foreign Department, he must well have understood the scope of all the articles and conditions of the convention of the 25th April, 1818.

The constant support which Lord Londonderry gave from the year 1818 till August 1822 (the time of his death) to Dr. Poynter, who prosecuted the Claim for the property of Douay College, in virtue of a power of attorney from the Reverend John Daniel, was an undeniable proof that it was in the intention and contemplation of the British government, as a contracting party, to allow compensation for the property of this establishment, according to the treaties and conventions.

It should here be remarked that, after the convention of 1818, and the act of parliament of 1819, the Commissioners proceeded with this Claim; and when, in 1819, the Commissioners had some doubts concerning the admissibility of this Claim to the benefit of the treaty, Lord Londonderry, in consequence of an application to him by Dr. Poynter, by a Letter addressed to his lordship, and dated the 11th June, 1819, directed them to proceed in it.

The Commissioners did in consequence proceed with great activity for several months, in examining documents relating to this Claim, and preparing for its liquidation, till their work was suspended for want of certain papers, which the French Commissioners in Paris refused to furnish.

The British Commissioners in London directed D. R. Morrier, Esquire, Br. Commissioner of Deposit in Paris, to demand the documents wanted. In their letter to Mr. Morrier, dated the 8th September, 1820, they express the conviction they were come to on this point, that they considered Dr. Poynter, who was prosecuting this Claim for the property of Douay College, "as an object of the convention, and entitled to liquidation." (See the letter to Mr. Morrier.)—In fact, why did the British Commissioners claim these documents, which they then deemed requisite for the liquidation of the Claim of Mr. Daniel, if they had not considered this Claim as included in the contemplation of the treaties they were then executing?

The documents called for were not obtained; which was chiefly to be ascribed to the opposition of one of the French Commissioners in Paris. To overcome this difficulty, Mr. Mackenzie, one of the British Commissioners, on the 29th August, 1821, made a proposition to Dr. Poynter, as coming from Mr. Hamilton, Under-secretary in the Foreign Department, that the English government would afford its assistance towards procuring the documents required, if the English Catholic Bishops would sign a declaration, that the value of the property claimed by the Reverend John Daniel, when received, should be employed in ecclesiastical education in England, and not in France.

The following declaration was signed by Dr. Milner,

Dr. Poynter, and Dr. Smith, and was confirmed by Mr. Daniel, as soon as it was made known to him.

DECLARATION. — “ The undersigned declare to his Majesty’s government, and to the honourable Commissioners, that as soon as, by their kind interposition and assistance, the value of the property attached to their English secular college, formerly at Douay, shall be restored to them, the whole of it shall be remitted to England, as it shall be awarded; shall be placed in the English funds, and be for ever employed in England, and not in France, for the proper purposes of its ecclesiastical destination.”

This declaration, signed as above, was delivered by Dr. Poynter to Mr. Mackenzie, and presented by him to Mr. Hamilton, in the month of September, 1821; and Mr. Mackenzie reported to Dr. Poynter, that the declaration gave complete satisfaction.

Is not this an affirmative proof that the Marquis of Londonderry, from whose office this proposal was made through the Commissioners, considered that this Claim for the property held in trust for Douay College was included in the contemplation of the treaty of the 30th May, 1814, and of the conventions of the 20th November, 1815, and of the 25th April, 1818? This proposal was made by the British government, not only with a knowledge of the ecclesiastical destination of this property, but even with a requisition that it should be employed in England for the proper purposes of this destination.

The Catholic Bishops in England having performed the condition required on their part by the British government, the British Commissioners, by a Letter of the 28th day of September, 1821, addressed to the Marquis of Londonderry, requested his lordship to favour them with his

diplomatic assistance, to overcome the difficulties opposed to the production of the documents called for: they submitted to his lordship the propriety of instructing his Majesty's Ambassador at Paris to demand the documents in question.

Lord Londonderry wrote to his Majesty's Ambassador at Paris, Sir Charles Stuart, in strong terms to that effect. The letters were at the house of the Embassy in 1823.

It is submitted, that these facts constitute a continued chain of positive proofs that Lord Londonderry, than whom nobody could be better acquainted with the meaning of the treaties, considered the Claim of the Reverend John Daniel (for the liquidation of which he lent his diplomatic aid to obtain the required documents) included in the contemplation of the parties to those treaties.

The documents were not obtained.—In August, 1822, Mr. Mackenzie, the Commissioner, informed Dr. Poynter that, if they were not procured, the claim of the Reverend John Daniel must be rejected.—Dr. Poynter went to the Marquis of Londonderry, to solicit his effectual interference. His lordship promised to demand the papers in a diplomatic way, if the Commissioners would officially inform him that the documents had been called for and refused. He added to Dr. Poynter that, if he should go to Paris to expedite the business, he would give him a letter to Sir Charles Stuart.

Dr. Poynter went to Paris, with a diplomatic letter of recommendation to Sir Charles Stuart. Still such was the obstinacy of the French Commissioners, that, notwithstanding all the demands and efforts of Sir Charles Stuart, the documents could not be obtained.

Dr. Poynter stated these difficulties to the successor of the late Marquis of Londonderry, the Right Honourable

Mr. Canning, in a letter, dated the 14th February, 1823, in which, citing article V. of the convention of the 20th November, 1815, applicable to this case, Dr. Poynter requested Mr. Canning to be so good as to direct the British Commissioners to proceed in liquidating Mr. Daniel's claim (as they might be authorized to do according to the article cited) without the formal documents, which had been refused by the French government, provided the Commissioners judged that other authentic documents, which Dr. Poynter had delivered to them, would supply the want of the papers refused. In his letter to Mr. Canning, Dr. Poynter clearly stated the nature and purposes of the monies which were the object of his Claim. Mr. Canning was pleased to give directions to the Commissioners to the effect desired.—Mr. Mackenzie communicated to Dr. Poynter the agreeable news of Mr. Canning's instructions, and congratulated Dr. Poynter on his success.

The Commissioners, in consequence of these instructions, immediately invited all other Catholic claimants for property belonging to their former ecclesiastical or religious establishments in France, to furnish them with the strongest proofs they could in support of their respective Claims. The following is an extract of the circular, dated London, the 2nd April, 1823, which was written by the Secretary of the Commissioners to the superiors of the religious communities claiming compensation in virtue of the treaties.

“ The French government having refused to deliver up the papers belonging to the British Catholic establishments subsisting in France in the year 1793, and for which Claims were entered at this office,—the Commissioners have received instructions from his Majesty's government

to proceed without further delay to the adjudication of these cases on such other proofs as can be adduced.

(Signed.) “CHAS. B. BALDWIN, *Secretary.*”

These claimants are not called upon to bring proofs to shew that they were included in the intentions of the French and English governments, the contracting parties in the treaties, but only to produce the strongest evidences they could to support the items of their Claims, and to supply for the absence of some formal documents, which might be called for, to prove certain particular points relating to the sums they formerly held in the French funds.—This carries, without doubt, it is submitted, an acknowledgment of their admission to the benefit of the treaties, provided they satisfy the conditions required for the liquidation of claims within the contemplation of the contracting governments.

But what is it that the Commissioners here acknowledged?—They acknowledged that “The Commissioners have received instructions from his Majesty’s government to proceed, without further delay, to the adjudication of these cases (of the Claims for property belonging to Catholic ecclesiastical or religious establishments) on such other proofs as can be adduced.”

How could his Majesty’s government give instructions to the Commissioners appointed to execute the treaties made between the French and English governments for granting compensation to British claimants on the French government, and direct them to proceed to the adjudication of the cases of particular British claimants, unless his Majesty’s government considered these particular claimants as included within the benefit of those treaties?

With all these affirmative proofs supplied by the late Marquis of Londonderry, the British negociator in the

treaty and convention, by Sir Charles Stuart, by Mr. Canning, and by the Commissioners themselves, shewing that, in fact, the Claim of the Reverend John Daniel was not excluded by the British government from the benefit of the treaties, but that it was equally included in the contemplation of the British government as the claim of every other British subject; it is difficult to conjecture on what documents, or on what information, the statement, that it was not in the contemplation even of the British government to include this Claim within the treaties made in favour of all British subjects, was founded.

By the general terms of the treaties and of the act of parliament, this Claim is included; and by the conduct of the late King of France and of his ministers, explaining their sense of the treaty, there cannot be a doubt that the claimant for this property was considered by them as within the provisions and benefit of those treaties.

The French government, which granted the compensation, the English negociator, who accepted the compensation, both knew perfectly well the nature and object of the Catholic establishment of Douay College, and neither excluded it from the benefit of such treaties in common with other British demands. The property claimed was confiscated because it was British property; why should not an indemnity be granted for it as such? If the British government had intended to exclude the claimant, the Rev. John Daniel, from the compensation he had a right to claim, according to the express tenor of the treaties, why was not this declared from the beginning? Why did Lord Londonderry during so many years support Dr. Poynter, the agent for Mr. Daniel, in the prosecution of this claim before the Commissioners appointed to execute the treaties? Why did he direct the Commissioners

to proceed in preparing for its liquidation, when they had entertained some doubts concerning its admissibility?—Why did he require the before-mentioned declaration from the English Catholic bishops, the vicars-apostolic? Why did the Commissioners include this claim in the list which they annually delivered to Parliament, of claims which still remained to be liquidated? Why was the claimant put to great trouble and expence in prosecuting this claim, and in carrying it before the privy council; when, by telling him at the beginning that he was not included in the treaty, all this would have been saved?—Who was more qualified to know than Lord Londonderry, whether the claimant was an object of the treaty or not? His lordship supported the claimant, as being entitled to the benefit of its provisions.—It is quite impossible to suppose that his lordship knew that the claimant was excluded from it, and, at the same time, gave him constant encouragement and support in the prosecution of his claim.

N. B. Consistently with the existing laws, the lords in council might not have had it in their power to pronounce any other decision, than that which they have placed upon record; but had the claimants been any other description of persons, with a similar impediment in their way, there can be no doubt but a bill of indemnity would have been demanded, and passed, to enable the council to liquidate the claim, with the money which had been appropriated to the purpose, and which had been paid by the French government with that view.

APPENDIX.

No. II.

SPEECH OF MR. SHEIL,

At the Association, on moving an Address to the King, on the last Day of the Fourteen Days Meeting.

MR. SHEIL rose and said—I gave notice that I should move that an address should be presented to the King, founded upon the letter written by the authority of his Majesty, by Lord Sidmouth, on the 23rd of September, 1821. I hold that letter in my hand. The following passage deserves to be extracted:—"I am commanded (says my Lord Sidmouth) to state, that the testimonies of dutiful and affectionate attachment which his Majesty has received from all classes and descriptions of his Irish subjects, have made the deepest impression on his mind; and that he looks forward to the period when he shall re-visit them, with the strongest feelings of satisfaction. His Majesty trusts, that, in the mean time, not only the spirit of loyal union which now so generally exists, will remain unabated and unimpaired, but that every cause of irritation will be avoided and discountenanced, mutual forbearance and goodwill observed and encouraged, and a security be thus afforded for a continuance of that concord among themselves, which is not less essential to his Majesty's happiness, than to their own, and which it has been the chief object of his Majesty, during his residence in this country, to cherish and promote." (*Loud Cheers.*)

I have read this extract from this epistolary sanative of the evils which afflict this country.—But, in reading it, I found it difficult not to pause and break into exclamation, at almost every section of this piece of amiable diplomacy—for, in reading it, the events by which this utterly abortive admonition, unsustained by any practical measure for the conciliation of Ireland, has been followed, pressed themselves upon my recollection, and I could not shut out from my memory, the scenes of ferocious discord which succeeded, almost immediately after the departure of our gracious Sovereign, and the bequest of his benevolent recommendation. Let me be allowed to revert to the passage which I have read, and put it into a free but respectful analysis. The interpreter of his Majesty's sensibilities, my Lord Sidmouth, speaks of “the affectionate attachment” of the Irish people, and “of the deepest impression which had been made upon his Majesty's mind. Well might he speak of the “affectionate attachment” which was manifested towards our Sovereign. Do you remember, (you cannot fail to do so) the glorious spectacle which was presented upon his arrival amongst us? I do not believe that in the annals of romantic loyalty, and in all the records of the wild chivalry of allegiance, an example could be found of more high and unanimous enthusiasm, than was displayed by the universal masses of ardent and devoted population, which hailed the entrance of King George the Fourth into this great metropolis. If most of you had not witnessed that extraordinary scene, I might attempt to describe it:—but the reality is too deeply imprinted in your recollections, to admit of any successful delineation, and you could not fail to feel that any picture, no matter how richly tinted, must be greatly below the dignity and grandeur of that important

national event. I will not, therefore, attempt to paint what is inlaid in such fresh colours in the memories of every one of you. I will not tell you in what a noble triumph of peace, in what an ovation of concord, the Sovereign of the empire, of which Ireland constitutes so large a department, entered this great city. I will not recall to you the array of myriads, who were assembled to greet him, and who, with uplifted eyes and hands, and with voices, into which their hearts were thrown, sent up their invocations for his welfare:—I will not tell you how George the Fourth looked, and must have felt, upon that lofty and almost sublime occasion. If I made such an attempt, you would stop and chide me—you would say, that I fell far beneath the glory and magnificence of the scene which I should endeavour to present to you.—It is enough, therefore, that I should make a simple mention of that singular exhibition of national enthusiasm, in order to bring it back, in all its vividness, to your minds. It is stated, that the “deepest impression” was made upon his Majesty’s mind. I entertain no doubt of it. How was it possible that he should behold such demonstrations of affection and of fidelity, without a profound appreciation of the qualities of the people from which those noble feelings derived their origin? How was it possible that he should witness what he beheld on his arrival—but above all, how could he behold what took place on his departure, without a profound and thrilling emotion? He stood upon the shore—he was surrounded by his people—he heard their prayers for his happiness offered up from hearts as honest as ever sent an orison to heaven—he saw the tears that flowed down many a manly cheek, and he beheld many a brawny arm stretched out to him in an affectionate farewell. He ascended the ship that was to

waft him from the island, in which the traces of his footsteps ought to have been left in measures of benevolence behind. The winds filled the sails—the vessel went slowly and majestically through the ocean. He stood upon the deck, and thence looked back towards Ireland, and saw the hills by which she was encompassed, crowded to the tops by hundreds of thousands, who sent their benedictions along with him. Is it possible that at such a moment his heart should not have melted and dissolved within him? Did not the tears of a generous sensibility rush into his eyes, and, as the shouts of his people came from the receding shores, across the water, did he not exclaim: “I will—I will do something for Ireland.” But, I forget myself. I am hurried away by the emotions which the recollection of those striking scenes cannot fail to awaken in the bosom of every one of us. I should resume a more sober and befitting tone of sentiment—and yet, even now, I cannot avoid relapsing for a moment into the feelings which had swept me beyond the limits of temperate discussion, and exclaiming: “What, after all, has he done for Ireland?” But I return. His Majesty proceeds to say that he hopes “that every cause of irritation will be avoided and discountenanced.” Alas! what imperfect views his Majesty must have taken of the real sources of the calamities of this country? How little he knew of the real character of the faction, which has so long trampled upon Ireland, when he conceived that his mere behest could have the effect of subduing the spirit of insolent domination, by which that ferocious confederacy, as long as they are sustained by the law, never can cease to be influenced! What took place almost immediately after his Majesty’s departure? He left us his advice, and gave us nothing else. How did the Orange-

men of Ireland fulfil it! at their civic banquets, the watchword of ascendancy was almost instantly proclaimed. The banners of Ireland's shame were unfurled in a still more ostentatious and offensive publicity. The Sovereign himself, was insulted in the person of his representative, and Justice, when called in to avenge the affront, appeared dressed in orange ribbons. The spirit of faction got possession of the public tribunals of the country; more vehement hatreds, and more relentless detestations ensued, than had ever before taken place, and the contending parties wanted but a pretence, to rush, in a sanguinary conflict, upon each other. His Majesty hoped, indeed, "that every cause of irritation would be avoided." Did his Majesty then know so little of Ireland?—Had he himself learned so little from his Royal observation, or had he derived so few useful instructions from his early friend and adviser, Mr. Fox, as to think it possible that as long as the exasperating disqualifications, which disgrace, and brand, and burn upon us, are permitted to continue, that the "causes of irritation" could be avoided? His Majesty talks of "the continuance of concord." How can he imagine that concord can exist in a country where the law itself is the hot-bed of rancour, and foment and throws up nothing but poisoned plants? Does his Majesty conceive that his mere admonition is sufficient to divest the spirit of political domination of its insolence, and to take from the consciousness of deep wrong, the indignation which, in all generous minds, it cannot fail to generate? But, it is better, at once, to speak openly and unequivocally. I will no longer pursue the spirit of this letter throughout all its phrases, or dissect its syllables. Better to give a direct and undisguised utterance to the feeling which the perusal of that letter, with the commentary

which events have furnished, cannot but create.—The King came here—he was received with acclamations—he told us to live in union, concord and peace—and he has done nothing to effectuate his benevolent wishes, and carry his own gracious injunctions into execution. What did our most gracious Sovereign mean, by directing his minister to indite such a document? I repeat the question—what did he mean? we are told “that our concord is as necessary for his happiness as for our own.” Would to heaven, then, that he had adopted some more effectual means of promoting his own felicity. Let him look at the condition of Ireland, and pronounce how far his beneficent aspirations for our welfare have been realised. Perhaps more deadly animosities exist at this moment, than at any previous period in those annals of discord, the history of Ireland. The two great classes into which the population is divided, are marshalled in a deep and well-disciplined array against each other. A most monstrous state of things has grown up, whose features of anomaly are every day becoming more enlarged and marked. Seven millions of the people of Ireland have become so much habituated to self-government, that they move and are regulated by exact and uniformly operating principles of universal organization. A great precedent of the power and of the union of the people has been established—on a single day, seven millions of the Irish people assembled simultaneously round the altars of their religion. Can things remain thus?—King of England, enjoiner of concord, answer the question!

I have prepared an address to his Majesty, founded upon Lord Sidmouth's letter, in which some of the topics which I have adverted to are introduced, but with that tone of respect which should mark the language of sub-

jects towards their sovereign. Although I think that we have a good deal of reason to complain that his Majesty has not followed up his own advice by any measures for the effectuation of his purposes, yet I think that his letter furnishes indications of a disposition to do so, whenever circumstances will allow of his royal interposition in our behalf. The conclusion of his letter is remarkable:—"His Majesty well knows the generosity and warmth of heart which distinguishes the character of his faithful people in Ireland, and he leaves them with a heart full of affection towards them, and with a confident and gratifying persuasion that this parting admonition and injunction of their Sovereign will not be given in vain." It has been given in vain: but it depends upon his Majesty to take away from it the character of nullity and invalidity which is attached to it, and to embody his own wishes for the peace of Ireland, in an act of substantial and permanent conciliation. That he left us "with a heart full of affection," I entertain no doubt; but it is to be desired that the cordiality of his attachment should be exemplified in some legislative exemplification of his royal predilections in favour of Ireland. He has rightly said that we are a generous people; let him also give us some materials for the exercise of our gratitude. He has a noble opportunity, not only of embodying his solicitude for our welfare in some practical act for the pacification of Ireland, but of commending his own name to an everlasting glory. How splendid an epitaph (for even Kings must die) he may procure for himself. He has to make his choice. What shall be written upon his sepulchre?—Shall it run thus—"Here lies the King who was beloved by Ireland in his youth, who beguiled her in his manhood, and betrayed her in his age;" or shall it be—"Here lies

the King who, by the tranquillization of Ireland, not only received for himself the attachment of seven millions of his subjects, but bound a great and powerful people in an indissoluble allegiance to the state, and while he imparted prosperity and concord to a vast portion of his dominions, gave an imperishable security to the empire, and rendered England immortal."—Let me be permitted to pursue the train of thought into which I have fallen, and enquire what sort of monument would George the Fourth desire? What emblems does he wish upon his tomb? Shall Ireland be presented upon it, with her arms bound in fetters behind her, with shame and sorrow, and reproach in her countenance; or shall she stand, with her manacles fallen to the earth, and with her unfettered arms uplifted in freedom to heaven? (*Loud and continued cheers.*)

APPENDIX.—No. III.

SPEECH OF EDWARD BLOUNT, ESQ.

AT an Open Meeting of the General Committee of the British Catholic Association, held at their rooms, on Saturday, the 21st of July, 1827, Lord Stourton in the Chair,

MR. BLOUNT said,—I feel it my duty, as Secretary to this Association, and Chairman of that Committee whose peculiar province it is to repel unfounded calumnies upon our principles, to bespeak your attention for a few minutes.—On Friday, the 29th of last month, a General Public

Meeting was held at the City of London Tavern, for the purpose of forming an Auxiliary Society in the City of London, to the British Society for promoting the religious principles of the Reformation. The Right Hon. Lord Farnham was in the Chair. The Hon. Granville Ryder moved the formation of the Society, and Captain Gordon seconded the resolution. General Ord moved the next resolution, which was seconded by the Rev. Jos. Ivimey. It is to the substance of the speeches of Captain Gordon, and the Rev. Mr. Ivimey, that I think it my duty to call your attention, premising that not one word of disapprobation at the assertions made by these persons, or at the sentiments uttered, was expressed by the Chairman, or by any person present; and we are therefore compelled, with regret, to regard their sentiments as adopted by the meeting.

Captain Gordon, after stating that "the vast mass of the population of Ireland were in a state of the most grievous moral degradation; and that crime, rapine, and bloodshed were the effect of this moral degradation," inquired to what this alleged depravity was owing; and he replied, that "he had no hesitation in answering, to the nature and essence of the Roman Catholic religion, and to the total ignorance of the word of God prevailing in that community. Hence the necessity of a standing army of 30,000 men, and an armed police throughout the whole country." He then proceeded to enumerate the number of criminals tried and condemned at the late assizes at Cork, Limerick, Tipperary, and Westmeath; and exultingly declared again, that "all this he attributed to the nature and essence of the Roman Catholic religion." — (*hear, hear.*) — The Rev. Mr. Ivimey was not quite so strong in his pretended illustrations of alleged facts; but

in the coarseness of his abuse, the Rev. gentleman outstripped his competitor. "He was one of those who would use no measured terms when speaking of Popery: it was the abomination that maketh desolate; it was a great lie, a long lie, and made up of every species of aggravation. It exposed its wretched followers to every sort of misery here, and eternal perdition hereafter." The assertion made by these persons is, neither more nor less, than that the Roman Catholic faith produces the total breach of every moral obligation; and that the professors of it are the most abandoned and worthless of mankind. This is the proposition distinctly avowed at a meeting held for the professed object of promoting the religious principles of the Reformation, — my Lord Farnham in the chair, with names around him of still higher note than his own, — and not one murmur of disapprobation was whispered! — I should be wanting in my duty, did I not bring these facts before you. Are we then, indeed, the outcasts of society which these persons would teach the public that we are? Does that form of Christianity which we profess really inculcate every breach of morality? This was the religion of our Alfreds, our Henrys, our Edwards, of our Mores, and our Fishers; of the most splendid heroes, and exemplary characters that this country has known; of those who founded our seats of learning, to whom we are indebted for the preservation of science and of letters, and for very numerous editions of the Holy Writings. Does this religion necessarily cramp the genius, or debase the heart! God forbid that any form of Christianity should teach its votaries to violate the dictates of Christian charity, or the laws that are instituted for the well-being of society. The long catalogue of atrocious crime that now stains the moral character of this Protest-

ant country, and which is no where exceeded in enormity, is not attributed to the principles of the Protestant faith. These crimes sprang from the disregard of the moral obligations imposed by every form of Christian worship; and if any cause, more than another, tends to loosen the bonds of religious duty, it is the conduct of the professors of one form of faith, who shew so little of the vital spirit of Christianity, as to pour out the most rancorous and insulting denunciations on the heads of the professors of another. The vast mass of the people of Ireland, who are declared to be in a state of the most grievous moral degradation, are, beyond comparison, more moral in their habits than the people of England; nor is their ignorance so great as that of thousands here who affect a tone of insulting superiority over them. An immense unemployed population swarms over the land, without any legal claim to relief: and in such a state of society, where the severest pressure of distress weighs upon so many millions, crime must abound; but is it honest to look into their faith for the causes of it? Is there no source from which her various miseries may be deduced, without imputing them to the faith of the people? Suppose that England, regarding the strength of Ireland as injurious to her interests, had made it the leading feature of her policy to degrade, to weaken, and impoverish her, she might be steeped in misery to the very lips, without owing her misery to her faith. Had England proceeded still further: had she mocked by insult, the misery she had created by violence; traduced the morals as well as the religion of the population; and then, to complete the climax, had she sent forth her modern apostles, with the Bible in one hand and the bayonet in the other, to wean the people from their veneration for a priesthood who, in the worst of

times, had laboured to allay irritation; whose influence had always been exercised in the exemplary discharge of their pastoral duties; who had lived with their flocks, been sharers in their privations, and, in the midst of pestilence, had never shrunk from the bed of contagion; if England had acted thus, would there have been need to search into the faith of Ireland for the cause of the deplorable position in which she stands? That position is not, as Captain Gordon states it to be, the work of the Catholic religion: the Roman Catholic religion has taught the miserable victims of English cupidity to submit to injustice and oppression, and to seek consolation in the hopes of a better world; it has been their only solace, and has effected what was beyond the reach of human power,—it has kept them loyal: and let the modern reformist pause before he attempts to rob the poor Irish peasant of these pastors and this religion, lest he remove the only barrier between Ireland and despair.

No calculation of consequences, no estimate of political expediency, no debtor and creditor account of loss or gain, shall prevent me from raising my humble voice to repel such foul slanders on all that men of honour value most. Not that we will be induced by any provocation to retaliate: we know how to respect ourselves; and neither Captain Gordon, nor Mr. Ivimey, shall be able to reproach Catholics with being goaded by the foulest slanders into retaliation. We will not meet the insults cast on our religion, by imputing atrocities to the religion of others. Instances have frequently occurred of persons of other religious persuasions addressing our meetings, and expressing sentiments of hostility to our tenets; they have been always attended to, not only with patience, but with marked attention and courtesy. We violate not

the decencies of life ; on the contrary, if a person profess his opinions in the singleness of his heart, and from the real conviction of his mind, we can honour his sincerity, though we dissent from his belief. We take every occasion publicly to declare, on the word of men of honour, that we claim equal rights with our fellow-subjects, on the broad principle that human legislation exceeds its legitimate boundary when it presumes to visit with pains, penalties, or disqualifications, the conscientious followers of any form of Christian worship. We appeal from the verdict of violent and enthusiastic men, to a better tribunal,—to the good sense and honest hearts of our countrymen ; we implore them dispassionately to examine our principles and our conduct, and to decide which is the best subject, which best merits the approval of his country, the Catholic who is obedient to the laws, performs with fidelity every relative duty, and disavows on his honour, and his oath, every obnoxious principle or opinion, and sincerely desires to live in harmony with all the world ; or the votary of the new reformation, who foment religious acrimony by calumnious imputations, by reviving expiring prejudices, and invoking the continuance of those humiliating laws, that have been too long the bane of Ireland, and the disgrace of England. We court fair and honourable discussion ; it is the privilege of Englishmen, and the parent of truth : but we would ask Mr. Ivimey, and Mr. Gordon, and Lord Farnham, whether theirs is this description of discussion, this calm debate, that can alone advance a good cause ; whether these scandalous imputations, bearing falsehood on the face of them, are calculated or intended to promote the cause of truth ? We would ask whether Christian charity is a Reformation virtue ? In one word, we would ask the Protestants of

England whether they are parties to such accusations as these? If they are, let them no longer lavish abuse on others. The worst spirit of the darkest and most intolerant times cannot, in the estimation of any sober-minded man, be his faith what it may,—cannot have exceeded the virulent and anti-christian spirit that appears to have actuated these persons on this occasion, when they were met to promote the principles of the Reformation. If these are not the principles of the followers of the Reformation, and we should blush for our country if we thought they were, then do we implore them candidly to come forward, and to disavow being parties to such imputations, and by so doing, to rescue the principles of the Reformation from foul disgrace. Other meetings of a similar description will, perhaps, be held; and we do hope that persons who are not Catholics, will be found ready to wipe so foul an aspersion from the character of Christianity. We ask the public to examine us with candour, to judge us by our conduct, and not to give credence to the accusations of persons, who evidently bear towards us the most rancorous hostility. We call on that large portion of our countrymen, who certainly have not the leisure, perhaps not the means, to come to a dispassionate conclusion themselves, and who, from the first dawn of reason, have had their minds perverted with prejudices against us; we call on the well-intentioned portion of the community, who cannot judge but through the eyes of others, to be cautious to whom they give their confidence. The clergy of the Establishment, almost to a man, are against us. It is necessary to state the fact in our own defence; their hopes of advancement in their profession have been made to depend on their hostility to us. It is a fact beyond dispute, that no clergyman of the Establishment, had his learning,

his virtues, his attainments, been almost super-human, would have had a chance of preferment, if he had dared to advocate our cause : whilst, on the contrary, the bitterest rancour against us was the surest road to preferment. And are these the persons to whom those who seek impartial information on the merits of our question, ought to apply for the knowledge of our real principles? Is there no other quarter where impartiality may be more reasonably expected, where may be found as much information and talent, united with as much general reading, more knowledge of the world and of society, and a more perfect acquaintance with the practice and spirit of British law, and of the various institutions of this country? I mean the bar of England ; that bar, the members of which, without any solicitation from us, have become the spontaneous advocates of our claims. On one of the last days of the session, his Majesty's Attorney-General presented a petition to the House of Commons, signed by 239 Sergeants and Barristers-at-law, in favour of the Catholic claims ; comprising in their number a weight of legal talent, greater probably than ever before appeared at the foot of any document of a similar character. Can these distinguished persons be suspected of want of knowledge of the subject which their petition embraces? They must necessarily, from their general communication with the world, and the nature of their reading, be acquainted with it in all its bearings and details. Are they actuated by hostility to the institutions of their country? They are by education, by habit, by birth, the firmest supporters of them. Or do they espouse our cause from interested motives? No possible personal advantage can accrue to them from their advocacy of it. What must have been their motive for this voluntary act? Like honourable men,

they scorned to remain parties to a base delusion; they felt that their silent acquiescence in the state of the laws in our regard, stamped a share of the disgrace upon them, and they disdained to wear the imputation any longer. Are these the persons who would consent to lend themselves to the free and unconstrained practice of a religion, “the nature and essence of which is, to plunge the great mass of a people into a state of the most grievous moral degradation,” and, by their criminal delinquency, “to render necessary a standing army of 30,000 men, and an armed police throughout the country?” I do not hesitate to express my full conviction, that if fair opportunities were afforded to the people of this country of judging this question on its merits, without having their prejudices studiously fostered, twelve months would not elapse before they would see their own injustice, and join with the bar of England in petitions to the legislature for the total remission of the laws in force against us. The question is not now *whether* the Catholic Claims shall be granted, but *when* they shall be granted? Whether it is better to prolong a system of irritation and insult, producing exasperation and violence; or whether it be not more wise, and more just, to allay the discontent without loss of time? Were the law in Ireland accessible to all, equal to all, and mildly administered, the people would soon learn to regard it as a protection, and not as a scourge. Their acquired propensity to violence would soften into habits of patient industry; and that overgrown army, which helps to impoverish England, and to prolong the discontent of Ireland, would convert their swords into ploughshares, and join in promoting the common prosperity.

APPENDIX.

No. IV.

Extract from the DIARIO DI ROMA *of July, 1822.*

“ ON the second reading of the Bill proposed in the house of Lords for the admission of Catholic Peers into Parliament, we read in the English journals, that one of the honourable members, among other reasons for his opposition, adduces the following accusation against his Holiness :—‘ that he had manifested the greatest intolerance by refusing to the burial place of the Protestants in Rome, that protection which his predecessors had granted, and that he had moreover resisted the representations of *all* the ambassadors on the subject.’

“ To the above imputation we give the most unqualified contradiction, and will prove it to be perfectly false and calumnious ; indeed, we are at a loss to comprehend how it can be said ‘ that the present pope has refused to the burial place of the Protestants in Rome that protection which his predecessors had granted.’

“ Preceding pontiffs merely granted permission to Protestants to be interred in the *Campo di Testaccio*. This permission has been extended to the present day, and Protestants are still buried in the same place ; nor can it be said that this place is unenclosed or unprotected, being sheltered on one side by a part of the city wall, on another, by a wall which separates it from the public road, and on a third also by a wall which separates it from several

adjoining vineyards. There is likewise a guard stationed in the same field, and another in the field adjoining, for the protection of the gunpowder manufactory, and the pyramid of Caius Cestius. It is true that access to the above field is allowed to persons going to the *Monte di Testaccio*, which adjoins, as well as to those who visit the pyramid, yet it can by no means be said, that the burial ground of the Protestants is in an open, unprotected, or unguarded situation.

“ Nevertheless, several Protestants, (and not all the Ambassadors, as has been falsely asserted) having expressed a desire to have a burial ground which should be entirely enclosed, or to speak more correctly, *separated* from the rest of the field, and having afterwards requested permission to encircle with a wall that portion of land destined for the said burial ground,—the pope, so far from having refused to extend, as was most falsely stated, the protection of his predecessors to the tombs of the Protestants in Rome, even exceeded their generosity, by granting to the same Protestants, permission to surround with a wall that portion of land in the same field destined for their interment. If this concession was never acted upon, the cause must be attributed to the slight alteration which the Roman government found it absolutely necessary to make respecting the situation of the former burial ground. The ground then proposed, was in the same field, and only a few paces from the former. The following will clearly explain the whole.

“ In the first instance, the burial place of the Protestants was situated directly facing the pyramid of Caius Cestius, and almost immediately adjoining to it. It was no sooner reported that two walls were to be raised, one in front of the pyramid, and another on the side, to form the enclosure

for the burial place of the Protestants, than the *Accademia di San Lucca*, the *Società delle Arti*, and other establishments, as well as the commissioners entrusted with the inspection and repair of the public works of antiquity existing in Rome, immediately represented to the government in the strongest terms, that in case the said enclosures were effected, the consequence would be, that the height of the walls, and the trees which Protestants are accustomed to plant round their places of interment, would materially obstruct the view of so noble and interesting a monument as the pyramid, unique in its kind, holding so distinguished a rank among the ornaments of the capital, and claiming the attention and admiration of all connoisseurs and lovers of the Fine Arts. To these representations, made in very strong terms, were added other still stronger on the part of the public; carriages and pedestrians can at present approach the pyramid by a direct and short passage, but the new enclosure would oblige them in future to take an indirect route, at a considerable increase of distance, and much inconvenience. These certainly were arguments quite strong enough to excite in the public just cause for remonstrance and discontent.

“ After this, the government could not most assuredly consent to the formation of an enclosure in a place, where it could not be executed without sacrificing so much of the interesting view of the above remarkable monument, and without depriving the public of the convenience they now enjoy. Neither justice nor good taste could allow of such infringements. Still, in substance, his Holiness wished to comply, as far as laid in his power, with the request of the Protestants for the formation of an enclosure; and though the above reasons induced him to

refuse permission for the same in front of the pyramid, he expressed his willingness to grant a new portion of land for that purpose, situated in the same *Campo di Testaccio*, but on one side, and not in front, of the pyramid, and a few paces only from the site of the former ground. At the same time, he repeated his permission to Protestants to enclose it entirely, by surrounding it with a wall; thus fully providing for future interments, and even for the preservation, in part, of the former burial ground, a portion of which came within the precincts of the one about to be formed. The remaining part of the interred might, if it were thought proper, be transferred at any time to the new enclosure; if not, they would remain in perfect security in their present situation, which, as we have already shown, was neither unprotected nor unguarded.

“ Again, if the enclosure of the newly allotted ground was not carried into effect, the reason was, that the parents and friends of the deceased, finding themselves prevented by the urgent remonstrances made to the government, from the quarters already named, against surrounding with a wall the place where the greater part of the deceased actually lay, had withdrawn their names from the subscription necessary for the completion of the second enclosure.

“ Still, this circumstance did not prevent his Holiness from carrying his own concession into effect. He gave orders to the treasury to raise at their expence, the above mentioned wall on the side towards the pyramids; so that Protestants can no longer say that their place of interment is unenclosed.

“ The foregoing is a true and simple statement of the whole transaction, for the entire correctness of which we

can fully vouch. Let the public now judge whether it can be affirmed with truth or with justice, ‘ that the present pope has refused to the tombs of the Protestants in Rome, that protection which his predecessors had granted.’ It cannot be a matter of surprise, that, among the numerous foreigners who are received in Rome with the most courteous hospitality and marks of particular kindness, to which the generality of them are willing to testify, some should be found, who, instead of evincing the least grateful feeling for their courteous reception, take every opportunity of giving vent to their ill feeling by slander and falsehood. If to such men gratitude be too weighty a burden, we willingly free them from all obligation whatsoever; nay, if they even wish to dispense with those sentiments professed by every individual of proper education and feeling, they have our permission so to do: but honour will ever demand that due respect be paid to truth; and whatever may be our private opinions, we should not seek to support them by recurring to the base and dishonourable arts of misrepresentation and calumny.”*

Such are the merits of a case, which, as I know not that the calumny founded upon it has ever been refuted in this country, and especially in the place in which it was brought before the public,† I cannot, in justice to

* Since the above was written, the spot of ground which gave rise to this misrepresentation, has been entirely enclosed by a deep sunk fence.

† “ The intolerance of the Romish church at the present day, was also displayed in the most marked manner, by the present

our cause, pass it by unnoticed. It is important on many accounts;—from the quarter from which it proceeded—from the circumstances which accompanied it—from the total absence of truth which characterized it—but above all, because it was urged as an *argument* to prove, not the intolerance of the court of Rome, but of the *Romish CHURCH*; and, consequently, as a reason why the rights of free-citizenship should be denied to an immense portion of the subjects of the King of England.

It is evident that the noble lord was unconscious of the calumny he was uttering; but its effects have, hitherto, been precisely the same as if it had been founded on the most indisputable facts, instead of resting on hearsay and misrepresentation. An unfounded accusation, advanced upon slight authority, and circulated only within a narrow sphere, may, without much injury, be permitted to float its hour, and sink unheeded into the stream of oblivion. But, as the speech of a member of the British Parliament, travels not only into every village and every ale-house of the united kingdom, but to every region of the universe, and thus disseminates both the opinions and the statements which it contains, almost *ad infinitum*, and becomes either the fortunate harbinger of truth, or the evil messenger of falsehood, calumny, and injustice, to the larger portion of the civilized world; it is the duty as well as the interest, of the parties more immediately

Pontiff refusing to grant any protection to the tombs of the Protestants who have died at Rome, although that protection had been requested by the Protestants of all countries residing at Rome, and by the ministers of Protestant sovereigns.”—Lord Colchester’s *Speech, as reported in the Courier, on the second reading of the Catholic Peers’ Bill, June 21, 1822.*

concerned, to repel the accusation by every means in their power. Coming, too, from so grave a senator, from an individual who is considered to have filled one of the most arduous and honourable stations in the kingdom, with peculiar dignity and justice—who was known to have been upon the spot to which his statement relates—to have had every facility of information—and who may be thought to have himself borne a share in the transaction:—all these circumstances combine, by giving weight to the accusation, to render its refutation the more important. It is a grievance severely felt, and much to be lamented, that calumny of what kind soever, (so prone is mankind to believe evil rather than good,) is always sure to carry such a degree of conviction with it, especially among the weak and ill-disposed, as to leave the refutation, however complete, a difficult task to perform, in attempting to remove the stigma; ^{while} the tale is always sure to meet the eye of many who never see its disavowal, and the evil impression is carried with them to the grave.

The authority of the calumniator will also be weighed against the reputation of the calumniated; and it is not difficult to determine where, in the mind of prejudice, the better credit will be supposed to lie. People will feel it impossible to believe that a British senator, lately elevated by his merit to the House of Peers, from the first rank in the House of Commons, and who must necessarily have to maintain a character for truth and justice, should so far allow himself to be misled by prejudice, as to give implicit credit to mere reports, which he must have had a full opportunity of investigating; and that too, for the purpose of founding upon them an ungenerous accusation against a government from which he had received the

rights of hospitality in the most marked manner, and of establishing thereon an argument against extending the benefits of the Constitution to seven millions of his fellow subjects.

This, certainly, must appear incredible to all who are unacquainted with the darkness which habitual prejudice spreads over the mind, depriving it of the will to reason, and robbing it of the faculty of judging. Such men will rather question the testimony of the accused, though supported by facts, than believe it to be true, in opposition to such an authority.

But even supposing, for a moment, the accusation to have been founded in fact, was there a shadow of justice in the inference drawn from it? Does either the Pope, or the government of Rome, constitute the Catholic Church? How absurd, then, to bring forward any act of theirs, as a proof of the intolerant spirit of the Catholic Church in general; and how much more absurd, to make the declaration with the same breath with which so intolerant a speech was delivered!

But so far from a spirit of illiberality being prevalent at Rome, it is directly the reverse. The late venerable Pontiff, Pius VII., a man revered by all, and against whom, save in this solitary instance, the breath of slander never breathed, was proverbially humane, liberal, and enlightened: and, among the many proofs that the same spirit of liberality also presides over the councils of his successor, the election of Torwaldsen, as a member of all the academies in Rome, may be mentioned. Since academical honours are as much ambitioned there, as civil offices are here, this honour is a high and enviable object of distinction; and much to the credit of the capital of Catholic Christendom, which knows that merit is not the exclusive

possession of any religion or of any country, both Foreigners and Protestants are freely admitted to enjoy them. The same liberality allows the free exercise of their religion to Protestants: nay more—(unless according to the Bishop of St. David's *Protestant's Catechism*, it be a tenet of the Established Church to revile and calumniate Catholics, which I cannot yet believe) for though some, not content with the duties of their ministry, and with worshipping God in charity and peace, so far abused their licence, as to cast aspersions and obloquy on the religion of the state that tolerated them, from which, especially under the circumstances, good sense and good feeling ought to have protected it; yet no interruption was given to the free and continued exercise of the religion, during the celebration of whose service these insults had been offered. All this was going on at the very time the noble Lord is reported to have said, that the celebration of High Mass ought no longer to be tolerated in the dominions of the king of England!

Let me ask, was it charitable, was it just, was it politic, to send such statements and such opinions, into every tavern and every ale-house in the kingdom, among men heated with wine and liquor; extending the guilt of the imagined crime to every Catholic in the United Empire, teaching his fellow-countrymen to despise and to detest, perhaps, every tenth individual whom they met here, and nine out of ten whom they encountered on the other side of the water? It was a long series of calumnious accusations against Catholics which inflamed the public mind to that degree of insanity to which it arrived in 1780, when a mob of 50,000 Protestants put the very state into jeopardy, for the sake of demolishing what in their folly and fanaticism they believed to be, and what calumny had

taught them to consider, the temples of the idolater. It was a system of calumny and misrepresentation, carried on by a succession of writers, (copying one another, and darkened by bigotry—the blind leading the blind)—which at various periods during the three last centuries, caused torrents of innocent blood to be shed, and crimes to be perpetrated, which called to heaven for vengeance. It was the spirit evoked by this system, that, at one period, infuriated bigotry with such fiend-like rivalry, that the two conflicting parties in the state exhausted their strength in endeavouring to affix on each other the *odium of toleration*.

APPENDIX.

No. V.

EXTRACTS FROM “LETTERS shewing the inutility, and exhibiting the absurdity, of what is rather fantastically termed the New Reformation,”—
by GEORGE ENSOR, ESQ.—

This intelligent writer thus prefaces his work: “The following Letters, on what is called the *New Reformation*, were published at different intervals, the first in 1827, the last in the present year. They were written by one who could have no prejudices in favor of the Irish Catholics, his father being born in England, and all his relations, both by father and mother, being of the Established Church.”

LETTER I. . . . "This is, certainly, one evil of making the bible a sort of primer in schools. But, without pursuing this matter to its extent, we may ask, why should the Catholic priests be abused by the Kildare Street society, and the Established clergy, and the saints and missionaries, who are to the ecclesiastical body what the Cossacks and Guerillas are to the regular troops of their respective nations, because they (the priests) object to the bible being taught without note or comment. If persons are taught the bible without note or comment, they will, probably, be of no particular sect—at least this is the opinion of able and zealous churchmen, as well as of Catholic priests. Respecting this very circumstance, a right reverend bishop asserted, that learning in Lancaster's schools, where the bible only was taught, was an 'education without religion, and leaving the rising generation to pick up their religion any where or no where.' Professor H. Marsh, since Bishop of Peterborough, in a sermon preached in the Cathedral, St. Paul's, London, June 13th, 1811, says also :—

" "Where children go daily to school, the religion which they are afterwards to profess, should be an object of daily attention. They must learn their religion as they learn other things, and they will have much or little, according as their education supplies them. To assert that our religion is not dependent on our education, is to contradict the experience of all ages and nations."

"He proceeds to state, that the Bible, without the Church Catechism, &c. is *generalised* Christianity — asserting in aggravation, that such *teaching is calculated to create indifference and even dislike to the Established Church.* I could quote scores of authorities to the same effect. No Catholic clergyman has ever spoken so timo-

rously of such practices to his Church, as the Protestant divines of that identical evil to theirs. Therefore, let the saints be moderate in their censure of the Catholic priesthood, lest while they wound them, they slay the ministers of pure *Protestantism*.***

“ That any Catholic should, on judgment and consideration, honestly precipitate himself from the faith of his youth and manhood, and stop at Protestantism, is, I repeat, surprising ; but that hundreds, so excited and in activity, should not rush into the bye-ways and highways of dissent, is utterly incredible. I should as soon expect balls impelled along an inclined plane to stop at the brink of a flight of many steps. No—if they thought, and read, and changed, they would join the Presbyterians or the Quakers, who hate tithes as well as the parson loves them — or the Free-thinking Christian Dissenters, who are making war on that tyrannical law, which forces Dissenters in England to contract marriage inauspiciously, or they would form a new sect or sects. This is so obvious, that some zealots for conversion have dreaded that, if the Catholics be discontented with their religion, they will soon overleap the petty bounds of Protestantism, and that then the evils to the Establishment will be increased. The Rev. Mr. Phelan has remarked, ‘ if they (the Catholics) should become Calvinists, or Socinians, Baptists, Methodists, or Independents, what will they have gained in real edification, or the united Church in strength and security? On the contrary, is it not evident, as to this latter point, that the present peril of the Establishment will be fearfully increased—if, sanguine by nature as they are, and heated by fanaticism, as they would then be—the great mass of our lower orders should ever be drawn into the ranks of sectaries.’ And, most certainly, these

Catholic converts would necessarily settle in their ranks, if, as I said, they did not add new sects to the increasing Dissenters. Poor Protestantism! in jeopardy from the converted and the unconverted.

“ But whence should we conclude, that any great number of Catholics would be permanently converted? There is no trade—food is scarce and dear—some miserable men may give a willing ear to false friends, and to their desperate attempts. Neither do the rhapsodists consider, that in Ireland affairs advance by gusts, and revolutions follow quickly and fortuitously. No: they expect the paltry conversions will go on

‘ ————— like the Pontic sea,
Whose icy current and compulsive course
Ne'er feels retiring ebb.’

Yet, even now, the very speech that announces the converts, announces their relapse. ‘ Twelve or fourteen persons have reverted to Popery,’ says his Lordship.—What, could not the hungry and houseless be fixed by the good things of Cavan, till the swallows return? ***

“ Those who labour in tumultuary meetings, or insidiously in private conference, to disturb the faith of the people, act foolishly or wickedly.

“ There are various reasons to make wise men hesitate to convert ordinary men even from a less perfect religion; for it must occur to them that the convert may only suffer a transient conviction. Besides, almost all religions are based on morality; even the religion of Budh inculcates the following precepts:—‘ Not to take away life—not to steal—not to commit uncleanness—not to utter a falsehood—not to drink intoxicating liquors, &c.’ I wonder very much that our proselytizers do not reflect on the dangers and difficulties they prepare for their ignorant

hearers. If a Catholic be converted, what surety is there that he will be fixed in his new creed? and while I write this, it appears by the newspapers that a converted Jew has made a second slip in the settlement of his religious opinions; nor is it improbable that a slip more will bring down the whole fabric of Wolf's predispositions. Religious belief depends mainly on educated opinions; when these are so disturbed as to be rejected, the poor ignorant man is at the mercy of many accidents—he is torn up by the roots, which are too rigid to strike in a new and exposed situation. Suppose the man relapses—what must be his sorrow, and contrition, and agony? Suppose he wanders through different creeds—what his disquiet? Suppose he wanders out of all creeds, without intelligence, or those principles which secure morality in educated individuals—his race is sinful, and his goal may be the gallows. Suppose he stops at his first conversion—what does he not risk and suffer? Lord Farnham has mentioned the forlorn state of these very converts; they are reputed traitors—as having changed for mercenary motives—as reflecting on their kindred—as abandoning their countrymen, now seeking their emancipation; while their fellow Protestants have no one motive to treat them with confidence or kindness—they despised them as Catholics—they despise them as renegades—they dread them as impostors—and, moreover, they fear them as new competitors for the favours and the lands of the lords of the soil. Consider the freak of converting the Irish, politically, civilly, and religiously. The Irish have been an oppressed people for centuries; but the conquered and oppressed throughout the world are emerging or triumphant. The Irish were few and unknown—they are now many; and their afflictions command the sympathy of many nations,

while America feels intensely for them, as kindred by blood and situation, for they have not long, themselves, been relieved from colonial tyranny. Let governors, and proprietors, and hierarchs pause. It was a maxim older than the Protestant Church, 'that no prescription lies against the Church,' and the great civil code of Europe, concurring with natural right, declares, there is no prescription for masters against slaves. Will you, in power and place, lay and spiritual, not permit the despoiled and the abused to forego their rights; but force them, by your eternal persecution, to keep account in order to exact their entire dues? It seems so—thus shall you be signally punished for your vices, by your vices. Look to this, ye marauders, through Church and state. You endeavour, by your sermons and missionaries, and by grants of money to societies, the well-head of such infatuations, to render infuriate the devout passions of a very susceptible people. Are you prepared for the result? Is England disposed to aggravate the hate of one third of the empire? Thus acted the Jews, who warred in Jerusalem on points of faith, when the city was besieged by the Romans. England is now beset with a heartless, unbending aristocracy—an educated people—an unemployed and starving populace—a prodigious debt—decreasing means and increasing expenditure. Abroad she is involved in something worse than war—the Holy Allies are averse, and France inimical, through all her factions and parties. Is this a time to support Converting Societies by parliamentary grants, or to countenance, in any way, practices that must necessarily add another grievance to the Irish nation?"

LETTER II. — "I noticed, in the former letter, the conversions, and the acknowledged relapses in Cavan.

‘ Never came Reformation in a flood, with such a heady current.’ That some helpless persons recanted, under the auspices of Lord Farnham, I do not doubt. ‘ Misery acquaints us with strange bed-fellows.’ One great cause of slavery is hunger. To prolong life, men sell their children and themselves. Then, it is not wonderful, that some lied, to escape present distress. In Cavan, probably, malignity aided famine. She who brought a perjured charge of incontinence against a priest of the same county, would have, with equal ease, had it appeared as profitable, embraced, sacramentally, the New Reformation.

“ The New Reformation ! Indeed, Dr. Magee stated, that the Reformation had been only lately preached in Ireland. Yet, it began with Henry the Eighth, and was continued unremittingly in every reign. In Edward the Sixth’s reign, the Book of Common Prayer was printed in Dublin, and the Archbishop laboured to extend it to all those who could read English. In 1571, Queen Elizabeth sent over types to have the New Testament printed in the Irish language. Bedell endeavoured to protestantize through the Gælic, and Boyle had the Church Catechism published in the Irish language. The New Testament appeared in 1680, and the Old a few years afterwards, in the same dialect. Soon after this, the English was substituted for the Irish. This change of purpose fully evinced the impotence of the means used to *reform* the Irish. Then came the Revolution. Again and again, various efforts were made to bring the Irish to the Englishman’s creed. The means were complicated and extreme ; hope and fear, favouritism and persecution, remunerative and penal laws ; a Catholic was a *fera naturæ* ; his property lawful prize : there was a bounty for the breach of filial ties, and honours were promised to

make the inmates of families spies and informers; the nearest kindred were suborned by the most flagitious crimes, till man's homestead was more exposed than a beast's lair in an open country.

“ Other means were applied—the Catholic was bribed—so much by law, for the priest-convert, and *no questions asked*. The lay-convert was paid, according to his former station, by money and offices: and as there are spectacles for all ages, there were and are places and pensions, and perquisites for all sorts of converts. How they are fondled by the Law-Church! Yet, even the parsons, while they love the treason, detest, as all must abhor, traitors to their country. The converters employed other artifices; they attempted those afflicted with poverty, and they beset the infants. Catholic children were decoyed into charter schools; and every Viceroy's speech, even the present Lord Fitzwilliam's, inculcated the duty of parliament to provide liberally for this great engine of protestantising the rising generation of Irish. Even now, these miserable jobs are continued; when the linen board is dissolved, and the parliamentary vote is stopped for distributing wheels, looms, &c., while a grant for charter schools is continued—for these schools, ineffective in every way, as proselytizing seminaries, as places of instruction, as preparing boys for trades and service. For the last century, they have cost the nation about two millions of money. Last year (and I suppose in the present) they contained 1883 pupils, of whom 928 were above 21 years of age. Thus, these mature youths, these *school-men*, are a downright drug. Yet, let them remain at school, at the national charge, till they are grey beards: they are pets of the prerogative faith.

“ All these schemes, practices, and artifices, failed

against the Catholic Irish. Nothing disheartened, the Gospellers, conspiring with the sons of the Law-Church, resumed their operations: they acted with more caution; they adopted new courses; they actually proceeded in opposition to their former conduct;—by an Act of Henry VIII., Protestant rectors are sworn to keep schools in their respective parishes; yet, so late as Primate Stuart, they failed in this particular, and he called them, in his charge at his visitation, perjured for their neglect. Yet, on a sudden, the clergy of the Established Church became school-mad and Bible-mad, though they had been prudent in granting Bibles to all. The perversions and contradictions of the times are numerous. Those clergymen who considered appearing in the pulpit once a month, a task only fit for the curate, drudging at less than sawyers' wages in the country, became, at once, controversial preachers twice a week. Thus the Sybarites of the Law-Church toiled in the service of the New Reformation, rivalling Hercules and his labours. Never was such energy displayed, since St. Paul preached and worked!—nay, endurance sublime! Rectors also examined, at fixed periods, the children of the parochial schools, and it was an edification to hear how the saintlings blundered, without note or comment. The restlessness and the extravagances in the late efforts, recognised nothing reasonable or ordinary; and this was particularly evinced by the agents employed to work the 'New Reformation.' The Protestant clergy had hitherto despised the Methodists, and other interlopers on the episcopal domain—yet, in this gossiping time of theology, this sacerdotal saturnalia, the lowest tradesmen were employed to read the Bible to the unreading Catholics. It was considered necessary, that if they could read, they could, of course, understand the

Bible; but it was admitted that, if they could not read the Bible, the inherent force of the original revelation could not communicate its contents. It was, therefore, to be read to the Catholic ignorants. Bishop Mant, in his former bishoprick, advised his clergy to obtrude or insinuate themselves into the cabins of the poor Irish. This deep scheme the good Bishop inculcated from the pulpit, and he further proclaimed the trick, by printing this capital artifice. He fled for the same, and the bishoprick of Down received the episcopal fugitive. Instead of rectors and curates sculking into cottages, and acting the part of evangelical eaves-droppers — the rectors have employed tradesmen to assail the Catholics with Bible-reading. I have personal knowledge that a broken-down journeyman shoemaker was employed for this righteous purpose. In this instance, the New Reformation tallies with the Old. Glanone says, speaking of Luther's time, 'every cobbler in his stall discourses on St. Paul's epistles,' old and new; the adage *ne sutor ultra crepidam* has been forgotten.— This was an humble course for propagating the exalted religion of England, of which the King is the head and patron: however, amid all these vagaries, I cannot avoid asking why those Protestant divines do not proselyte their own nominal Protestants? * * *

“Yet more than all these means to convert the Irish; the Protestant saints laboured to effect their purpose by schooling the rising generation. As a sort of sharp-shooting before the battle, they insinuated or proclaimed that the Catholic priesthood were inimical to the education of the people — though by the Protestant code, no Catholic could keep a school—though Catholic children were sent beyond sea to Catholic seminaries; and though, in 1769 it was stated, by the highest authority, *that a great*

number of Popish schools were dispersed in different parts of the kingdom, contrary to the spirit of many acts of Parliament. In the midst of these falsehoods, the Kildare-street Society, endowed by the British parliament, and patronised by saints and simpletons in Ireland, rose like an exhalation. This was to educate *all*. The principals were professed liberals. They would have no Catechism nor Articles. No—nothing but the Bible, without note or comment: and no one could object to ministering the Word of God to infants and children—in short, the matter was so craftily enforced, that some consented, lest they should be branded as enemies to all religion, as traitors to God, and rejectors of his Holy Word. Some questioned them. The saints of Kildare-street seemed infinitely shocked at their suspicion. What! they mean to convert under any sinister scheme!—abominably slanderous!—while others, with the most amiable ignorance, declared that the society teachers were taken indiscriminately from the Church of Rome, or any other Church. Thus, while all *good* Protestants furiously laboured to convert the Catholics, the Kildare-street Society was unmoved, ‘like peaceful seas, which know no storm.’ They only wished to educate the Irish, to which the Catholic clergy, they said, were averse. Dr. Murray has brought the sincerity of Church, and state, and commissioners, and boards, to the test. He says, ‘the board has created for itself a needless difficulty, by requiring, as a matter of necessity, any Scripture compilation to be used in schools, for the purpose of general instruction. Were the religious instruction of the children confined wholly to the care of their respective pastors, what appears to be the only remaining ground of disagreement, would be removed.’ But this, which is an obvious remedy, and which would

be complete, cannot be admitted by the league offensive against the Catholic people; for it would end the means of tampering with their children's religion. Such has been the practice of the Law-Church at all times, and now particularly, when this Church has staked its remaining credit on that fantastic conceit, that stupid crusade—the New Reformation.”

LETTER III.—***“The English extend their missions to the Muga of Astratan, to the unnameable Indians; a mission is preparing for a questionable region lately discovered in the heart of Africa, which will connect the line of missions through that continent, to the kingdom of *Prester John*; and, in a short time, the Bible, without note or comment, or Apocrypha (for the Apocrypha, being respected by the Catholics, is, henceforward, not to be published by the Bible Society) will be soon sown *broadcast*, over inhospitable Africa. Now, why do not these converters, who print the Bible in a hundred barbarous dialects, first settle their domestic affairs?—Many English are destitute of religious knowledge; I do not speak of whimsical individuals, like that strange man, who thought that all St. Matthew's Gospel had been written by Sir Matthew Decker—but of multitudes. Sir Thomas Bernard speaks of many thousands in London, who know no more of Christianity than the veriest Pagans.—Why are these not sought and instructed, preparatory to gadding to Malwa and the Mohawks?—Why are the Londoners without any religion neglected, while the English are so zealous to convert the Catholics of Dublin and Ireland: or is the Catholic religion, and the Irish who profess it, worse than the English, who, in respect of religion, are as ignorant as the six score thousand inhabitants of Nineveh, who could not discern their right hand from their left.

“If the Catholic religion be bad, how can the Protestant be good. The Protestant comes through the Catholic, and it is said interrogatively, ‘who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean—not one?’ It must be admitted, that the Catholic religion is of great antiquity, older than Edward, whose reign prescribes in our law, older than Henry, who first got sacrilegious footing in Ireland. But this does not silence the Protestants: they who hold that the essential English constitution is not older than William, of glorious memory, fall back to the apostolic ages to justify their opinions, and to discredit Catholicism. Is effrontery so monopolized by them, as that they should insinuate, that the Protestant regal episcopalian parliamentary Church of England, is according to the primitive apostolic age? Let all those who love to go to the beginning, reflect, that Christ said to the Apostle, “Lo, I am with you to the end of the world.”—Now the apostles were to the Catholic Church, what the Catholic Church is to the Protestant clergy, who derive their ordination from the Catholic Church. I should like to hear the right reverends on that point.

“The converters dogmatise, that they depend on the words of Scripture, and not on tradition, in order to traduce the ordinances of Catholicism. If the Catholic religion errs, it is at least not contradictory; it claims the support of tradition, but the Protestant, denying tradition, draws mainly on tradition for its support. If we are to be ruled dogmatically by what is ordered, independent of tradition, I ask why should the gospels be read—‘Search the Scriptures,’ which by repetition stuns the groundlings—refers to the religious books of the Jews—for the New Testament was not then written, and the gospels, especially, are traditions of traditions.* * *

“What benefit could society obtain by making the Irish Catholics Protestants? Are the Protestants so decidedly superior to the Catholics in morality? I will not compare the Catholics and Protestants of Ireland; it would be invidious, and both suffer: one by their over-bearing prerogatives; the other by their iniquitous humiliation. But compare the Protestant English and the Catholic French. The judicial crimes of England approach those of France in number, though England’s population is little more than one-third that of France; and this disparity occurs, let it be observed, after such a revolution; or, rather, such successive revolutions; and to make the wonder still more extraordinary, the *Quarterly Review* asserts in the last number, that the French are now in the lowest state of *Romish superstition*. Yet, the English, loyal to the core, possessing a House of Lords of gothic antiquity, and a House of Commons uncontaminated with any speculative improvement—kings, lords and commons, also building churches at the expence of millions, and all enjoying the reformed religion, with a saintly distribution of infinite bibles and other good books; yet are the English, with all their paradisaical felicities, less moral than the regicide, noble-cashiering, democratic revolutionary French, and who, we are told, are now prostrate before the Catholic priesthood. Truly, England is in what may be called an unsatisfactory state—for the progress of crime and the means of virtue move together—the great issue of bibles, testaments, catechisms, and the small ware called tracts, began about 1806, and, from that to the present year, the commitments have quadrupled. And what is more, schooling the people has been as inefficacious, morally, as bebibling them—for at present, in London, 15,000 children, from ten to sixteen years of age,

are daily employed in pilfering and plunder. Nor is this viciousness confined to the capital, it spreads through the country and the towns. Yet in France much of this intestine war on property is unknown, and in some towns and even seaports, as St. Servan, connected with St. Malo, having 20,000 people, the houses are without a bar or a lock to the street, and wanting both lamps and police—yet depredations are unknown.

“Having settled the topic of morals, look to the liberality of the countries, France and England. There are Protestants in the French parliament, while the Protestant legislators, in taking their seat in the British parliament, swear that Catholics are idolaters and damnable. There is another trait under this head. No rash man, in either of the French chambers, has justified Negro slavery by the Scriptures? That did Lord Eldon; and, at still greater length the *Quarterly Review*, March, 1826, p. 502, justifies slavery by Genesis—by the decalogue, and by the New Testament history. Such wretched Protestants distaste us of literature and religion.

“Again I ask, are the Catholics defective in thrift and industry? I have heard the number of holidays noticed as discreditable to that Church. I am no hired advocate of any sect or religion; but I would not willingly let an oppressed party be falsely slandered. With this impression, I consider that the institution of holidays, when society was divided into lords and servants, taskmasters and slaves, tended to give, indirectly, ease to the drudges; it was communicating the repose of Sunday to other days of the week—freeing occasionally from toil, those who could not be freed from dominion. I say that Catholics are not deficient in economy and exertion.—Look to Tuscany, which is altogether Catholic—look to the Nether-

lands, and even to Ireland, all that Irish Catholics possess, (and many are opulent,) is the effect of extreme labour, and toil, and saving—their lands and subsistence were seized, and the means of redeeming or recruiting either were eradicated by the laws and their executioners. What then is to be gained by converting the Irish Catholics, or any numbers of them, and parading them before the altar of this or that church? It has been said that it is an attempt to convert bad Catholics into worse Protestants—that is too favorable a statement—for it is an attempt to convert bad into the worst Catholics, as such converts are for the most part urged by whim, or spite, or some worldly advantage. * * *

LETTER IV.—***“A season of great distress, want of food, and want of employment, prepared the Cavan conversions—to these were added the Malthusian doctrines of clearing estates of a redundant population, in order to increase surplus produce, which concurred with a period of unexampled political asperity after the general election. All these accumulated evils pressed intensely on the people of Cavan, in which county political weakness had lately been declared. Here the *Forties* had failed in determining the fittest representatives—in a great measure, I admit, by the breaking down of one who had been supposed to quarter all the vulgar virtues of Hibernia. When the people of Cavan failed as electors, they were prepared to make another step downwards. While, on the contrary, in Louth, where the brave *Forties* performed their duty, as far as that duty was signified to them, the people stood firm to their faith, though beset by evangelical landlords, and driving bailiffs—so intimately are Catholicism and patriotism connected with the habits of the Irish people. The boasted Cavan conversions have ceased—they ceased

when the famine price of food declined ; with the prospect of subsisting, conscience returned, and the converts relapsed. ‘Men do not despise a thief if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry.’ The converts did not steal, but they were exposed to *practices*, and the transient boon purchased occasional conformity. The converts were like birds, which visit milder climates at intervals—but their coming is proof of a great severity in their native country, and they return when the iron days are passed and the sun cheers them home.* * *

“Another question I should propose—have the converters exposed the whole case to the Catholics they would convert. Have they, in their abuse of Catholicism, shewn how near the Protestant Episcopal Church approaches to the Catholic, and how remotely other sects, Presbyterians, Dissenters, &c., vary from it. This they do not—they act as if there were only two religions—and, that if a man deny one, he must approve the other.

Incidit in Scyllam, qui vult vitare Charybdim.

The whole machinery of conversion is a cheat. The converters attack the weak people, but they do not develope the sectarian principles to those whose original creed they have disturbed. Again, why are they disturbed in their belief? Is it pretended this interference proceeds from love of the Catholics—of their souls, and future happiness? Did they ever evince any affection for them as members of this world? No! Though those saints disregard the life interest of the Catholics, they are overwhelmed with anxiety for the reversionary state of the same people.* * *

“There was a starving, senseless, frightened crew, sons of Esau, whom the saints seized, and who eat and drank at the altar of the Established Church ; but of those how many did not taste in that cup of wine, waters of bitter-

ness? How many of them who walked to church, ran back to chapel? Beside the converts, if, indeed, flickering about the decoy, or liming the pinion feathers, or pecking among the springes, can be called a conversion, how many *bonâ fide* Protestants were at the same time Catholicised. As far as my knowledge extends, the Protestants have lost more than they have gained. But the clerks of the New Reformation never drew up a balance sheet,—they exhibit no debts:—if they did, even after giving them credit for all their imputed converts, they would soon perceive that the conversion trade was altogether a bankrupt concern.* * *

LETTER VII.—“The *new reformation* has entirely failed to effect the purpose of its promoters. The eager sectarians and the angry dissenters of the society, have not, however, laboured in vain. Their call on men to overhale their creeds, and re-construct their religious opinions, by studying the Bible in the text, without gloss or comment, must necessarily multiply sects and persuasions. This will, of course, strengthen the sacred cause of dissent, and render the Established Church still more a burthen and encumbrance to the state. So far the *new reformation* has succeeded. But, in respect to the Catholic religion, its failure is sudden and complete. Weak and uneasy from the beginning, this society shifted its ground. They may make a shew of advancing, but they have truly sounded a retreat. They began by parading the convert in new clothes, to make him *respectable* at the parish church. Now, that is abandoned, and the writer in the *British Critic*, January, 1828, p. 28, informs the public, that conversions are going on by a *silent conformity*. Assuredly, if the conversions were going on, they would be *shewn off*; yet the conversions are going on, but rather awkwardly for the *new reformation*, for very lately, in the

neighbouring parish to me, three Protestants have been received into the Catholic Church. This I know.

“So sad are the reformation men, that they add pathos to their exalted pretensions. It is an edification to hear how they magnify their labours—there is not one of those itinerants who does not consider a jog in his own throng, like the stoning of St. Stephen. Nay, in a letter in a Belfast Journal, a reverend reformation man, in meditated seriousness, writes the following sentence: ‘There is a startling similarity between the reception which the agents of this society have met in the north of Ireland, and that of Christ and his disciples among the persecuting Jews.’ I will only allude to the decorum of assimilating, in any way, Gordon and the other agents, to Christ and his disciples. But what have these agents of the society suffered? Let us know—that mankind may add their sobs to the sufferers’ sorrows. According to the public journals, all went smoothly and prosperously with them, till they attempted to stick a *branch* into Derry. There Dean Blakely attended a public meeting—he made a speech against the proposal of Gordon, the meeting almost unanimously agreed with the minister of the Established Church. This, as far as I have heard, is the amount of the Northern persecution of Gordon and fellows. The truth is, their tour was not adorned by any incident that could be wrought into an adventure or a grievance. In Belfast, their proceedings were as insipid as an after-play rehearsal—so uninteresting was the business felt, that the Rev. Doctor Singer lamented that Dr. Crolly, the Catholic Bishop of Down, offered no opposition. Yet, the reception of the agents of the Reformation society, in the north of Ireland, is likened to Christ’s treatment by the persecuting Jews. This is at once blasphemous, and false, and absurd.

“The agents of the society may declaim, and place themselves on the level with Jesus and his apostles. They may talk of *silent conformity*, but the project of transplanting the Catholics into the Protestant Church, has notoriously and avowedly failed. I state further, that it could not have succeeded, and I proceed to assign the reason for that opinion.

“Compare the incidents connected with two religions. Both religions are founded in faith—one main ingredient in faith is length of time; but Protestantism, in respect to Catholicism, is the creed of yesterday. Then, as to the number of believers—the majority of Catholics is considerable, whether we limit our view to Ireland, or extend it to the world. As to the direct merits of the two religions, I leave those to their respective clergy, who must be best qualified to argue that complicated question. One dispute, lately before the public, I may, however, advert to. Dr. Elrington rebukes the Catholics for adoring angels—the Catholics profess, however, only to honour them. Yet the doctor, in spite of their assertions and greek lexicons, will fix adoration on them.—Dr. Elrington, before he again repeats the insult, had better reform some of his own order. A fellow of Trinity College, at an Orange dinner, at Omagh, professed that he *adored* Magee.

I see a chief, who leads my chosen sons,
All armed with points, antithesis, and puns.

Abstaining from comparing the two religions, I may express the general opinion of the superior attractiveness of the forms and ceremonies of the Catholic Church. This is admitted by the lamentations of good Protestants, who dwell on its seductive and theatrical display. Let us now proceed to the clergy of the two Churches.

“ For the Protestant Church, it frequently happens that the destined parson is the least capable boy ; while for the Catholic, the brightest of the family is prepared for the ministry. The reason is obvious ; one is advanced by patronage, and the other must depend on his ability for attaining the higher grade. In the Catholic Church also, the squint-eyed, persons deformed by disease, and cripples by nature, are excluded.

“ Protestant aspirants for ordination profess that they are moved by the Holy Ghost. What they mean on this occasion by the third person of the Trinity, it would be almost unrighteous to conjecture ; but they certainly pursue the vulgar object of tradesmen greedily, in their ecclesiastical vocation ;

Of all the views, the first and chief request
Of each, is to be richer than the rest.

Yet these are the men who would reform others !

“ The next topic to which I would direct the attention of the reader is, the Thirty-nine Articles. These constitute the great theological puzzle, and must be subscribed by Protestant clergymen. Yet, Dr. Paley admits, that these Articles cannot be credited ; he held it impossible. However, by a wonderful process, this multifarious affirmative confusion is reduced, according to him, to three negatives ; namely, the subscribers should not be abettors of Popery, nor Anabaptists, nor Puritans. Is there any thing in the Catholic Church at all equal to this labyrinth, with Dr. Paley’s clue ? Ministers of the Establishment, reform your own Church.

“ From subscriptions I proceed to oaths, and I shall confine myself to those taken in respect to education. By a law passed in the reign of Henry the Eighth, bishops were directed to administer an oath to all persons admitted

into holy orders, that they would keep, or cause to be kept, a school within the place or parish into which they might be inducted. It happened that the persons who had been expressly moved by the Holy Ghost, forgot this solemn promise ; and so late as 1823, about one-fourth part of the sworn continued oblivious of their oaths ; for, in that year, 135 benefices still remained without schools, and 83 benefices sent no returns. Yet, these are the sanctified characters who arraign the truth of the priests, and their disposition to educate the people. Are the Catholic priests sworn to educate the people ? Have they perjured themselves ? There is also a statute of Queen Elizabeth, which requires that a school shall be established in every diocese in Ireland ; which schools shall be supported at the joint expence of bishops and incumbents. Yet in 1823, there were only 16 of these diocesan schools, and these are the men, who, with profligate effrontery, reprobate the Catholic priesthood for negligence and indisposition to educate the people. They are themselves most unfriendly to legitimate education—neither laws nor oaths can rouse them to their duty. Mark their hostility to popular improvement by their opposition to Mechanics' Institutes.—They would convert indeed, and this was the object of all their efforts, from the origin of Charter Schools to the establishment of the Kildare-street Society. It pervades all times and places—the eastern world—the western dependencies ; and the passion to pervert is as strong in Canada as in Ireland. In Canada large funds were employed in education. On the conquest of that country by England, they were possessed by the government. The people remonstrated—in 1817 it was ordered that twenty-four persons should be chosen to manage the education of the inhabitants. What was the result ? The Protest-

ants of the Establishment obtained 20 of the 24 places—a majority equal to the English members above the Irish members in the imperial parliament. The Canadians were disgusted with this notorious imposition. Let me, however, observe, that this mockery must be rectified. The Canadians, though few, in comparison to the Irish, are not helpless—they have a legislature—their House of Lords is, to be sure, much like the other, and named by the crown; but their House of Commons is elected by independent voters. This house abounds in popular and economical views—they will grant supplies only by the year, and these thriftilly; and they have not long since voted 27 to 3—that the superfluous property of the Church should be disposed of for the benefit of the nation.—Hear this ye sticklers for the New Reformation—this is a reformation both of church and state.

“An objection is made to the Irish Catholic Church, that its ecclesiastics are nominated by a foreign power—and are the ecclesiastics of the Irish Protestant Church appointed by domestic authority? No!—The king of England is truly foreign to Ireland, and he sometimes appoints foreigners—Englishmen to fill the offices of archbishops and bishops in Ireland. But it is false that the pope appoints bishops—they are elected in Ireland, and truly the pope merely countersigns the return. The appointments in the two Churches are not to be compared, but contrasted. In the Catholic Church there is no simony, nor its similar—no quartering of sons and sons-in-law on dioceses—no *incumbency bargains*—no transfers to *pluralize* according to law—no grand touring, perambulating the ecclesiastical domain, north and south, first as rectors and then as bishops. The Protestant Church is just so much stuff for patronage and influence—to be

preyed on by boroughmongers, to relieve the beggarly afterbirth of the aristocracy, or as perquisites for minions and mistresses. Thus the Protestant Church corrupts religion, debases the mind and morals, and utterly perverts the principles of legislation and government. Hence, the clergy are idle and sordid—returning nothing, seizing all, and while possessing the revenue of principalities, griping, heartless, and rapacious. But the Catholic priests are uncontaminated by the court—they labour and are beloved—they are paid by voluntary oblations. Can, then, their people be won from them by the hierarchy of the establishment?—If so, the powers and propensities of matter and mind are inverted.

“ Here I must notice the prodigious insolence of those saints, who hold a gibing warfare with the Catholic priesthood, respecting certain dogmas, and who insinuate the insincerity of their belief in them, because they do not square with their own interpretation. They who say so are ignorant of the grounds of belief, and of the history of the world. But I charge the Irish Established Church as proclaiming by its acts a disbelief in its principles—not whether this or that expression should be understood literally or figuratively, and the like; but by the practices and habits of the clergy contradicting the clearest injunctions of Christ repeatedly enforced.

“ No topic was ever more pertinaciously enforced by writer or speaker, than the destructiveness of riches. The salvation of a rich man is compared to a camel passing through the eye of a needle. Again—‘ Verily I say unto you, a rich man can hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven.’ Yet those whose self-salvation is in jeopardy, are the savers of the souls of others. The Munster bishops have, according to bishop Jebb, only £5000 annually, on

an average; but others have £12,000, £14,000, and £20,000 a year, and every year adds to their greediness. Bishops raised their rents; and the fines, from being paid every five or six years, have become an annual exaction: hence, a late bishop of Clogher died worth 300,000 pounds, and the late primate's hoarding exceeded this sum, which was transferred to England. The beneficed clergy prepare themselves for bishoprics, by similar demands, insidious and exorbitant—the tormented peasantry are cited to the bishop's court, where an aggravated selfishness prevails. There the bishop acts by deputy. Is he better in his personal acts? A few months since, the rector of the parish of Armagh did, after some negociation, agree to receive a certain revenue under the Composition Act. Yet the primate refused to sanction the agreement, though one tithe proctor (the rector of Armagh has three) served 400 processes for tithes. The system destroys justice, and reasoning, and humanity, even in the best. The bishop of Cloyne, a man distinguished for science, and for that science which should eminently approach him to heaven, refused a high rate composition for tithe, for a parish held by him *in commendam*—not because he thought it too little, but, as he intimated, because, if he consented on his own account, he should be obliged to authorise similar compositions by others. Thus, it seems, the ease and satisfaction of the man, and his own notions of propriety, as regarding himself, were postponed for the possible reduction of a few clerical expectancies. On the same principle he should have stopped his observations on the parallax of the fixed stars, or sunk his discoveries, because his brother astronomers could not see what he had observed; but had he so comported himself, he who should have obtained the first prize, would not have received, nor deserved any prize whatever.

“ The Church is the worst of money-getting corporations; every unfair practice is used to enforce dues and swell exactions: even at this instant, in this city, while one man is pressing the New Reformation, the son is raising a three pounds rate on most miserable houses. These are the primitive Christians: ‘ where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.’ The clergy have been requested to pay the *quarta pars* to the poor, which practice existed until a late period in Connaught. The Protestant clergy pay to the poor their ancient appropriation! They who with unsparing avarice force many from comfort to poverty; they who hope only to obtain consequence by their riches. Hence Mr., now Lord Plunkett, said, last session:—‘ I believe, if we had not a respectable hierarchy, holding valuable possessions in the state, in times like these, religion itself would sink into contempt.’ Riches are the Established Religion. The Protestant Established Church is respectable as are the Jews in Change Alley; and this Church is to the state what the national debt is to the happiness, or rather misery, of all payers of taxes. The earth and nature are weary of this Establishment—it is not with them *virtus post nummos*—no; money first, and midst, and last. They cannot contribute to their own special purposes;—if churches are to be built, parliament is resorted to—if churches are to be repaired, the Catholics pay;—they pay for the elements of the Sacrament;—the Protestant clergy refuse the first fruits granted them by the crown for church purposes—this Church which holds two millions of acres in Ireland, and the tithe of the capital and labour employed in agriculture, with various other exactions: and this is the Church which shall win the Catholics from their teachers,—for the Protestant clergy, gloating and unsatiated with riches,

announce themselves to be the primitive state of Christianity. They Christians! 'You cannot serve GOD and Mammon.'—Christians?—Mammonites! 'They are dumb dogs which never have enough, they all look their own way, every one.'

"These are the persons who are to succeed against the Catholics and their priests, when there are various schisms in their own Church, and one Archbishop condemns openly the New Reformation. Their prime of might, their Pope has seceded—their congregations are melting away in every direction; 150 Methodist preachers alone are now in full itinerancy in Ireland. Thus old sects are increasing, and new sects rising up, separable from the Establishment, like suckers round a decaying stock. What, if some Catholics change and change; is there no counter operation—no controlling influence? To expect that the New Reformation would succeed in Ireland, from what happens by varying individuals, is not less vain than to pronounce, from the precession of the equinoxes, the upset of the world.

"The prospect of converting the Catholics could not succeed. Christianity is, in the letter and the spirit, the religion of the poor and humble—it began with the people, and will continue with them. Besides, no rich Church ever succeeded, by tranquil means, against one systematically poor. As a Church becomes rich, it loses its activity; it becomes gouty and paralysed—it has so many spurious wants, that it cannot afford means for its own necessities; while the poorer Churches, as the Catholic and Dissenting, always raise means to build Chapels, and supply stipends to the teachers of their respective congregations.—Opulence and decline are associated even in sects of the same Church. The Knights Templars, so celebrated for cou-

rage and enterprise, became voluptuous and enervated by their wealth, while the rival order, the Knights of St. John, continued their virtue with the mediocrity of their circumstances. But the Protestant Church is not only enormously rich, but its members are aristocratic. The aristocracy, when not recruited by the people, have, in all countries, ceased to exist. The people are the source, and they must continue so. The Malthusians may say, that men will multiply with the means of living — all aristocracies contradict the position. — The Protestant Church consists of the prerogative class, and is rich to plethora.

“ But the Catholic Church is poor and popular; and it enjoys also a principle of great vitality and excitement—it is persecuted. Religions spread by persecution, as the surface of the dry earth kindles and expands against the wind. Christianity sprang into vigorous life by the opposition it encountered—so with sects and persuasions; and with none more than the Catholics in Ireland, which, like the distinctive herb of the soil, thickens and multiplies on the trodden land. * * * *

“ The whole system is breaking down. The British and Foreign Bible Society has been exposed by the *Quarterly Review*. This strong hold of the saints is unmasked. Their rage for translating the Scriptures was boundless, for they read, ‘ teach all nations;’ but wanting ‘ the gift of tongues,’ they sought the sons of Babylon. They employed one man, with a name as long as three Welsh mountains, Teyoninhokorawen, to translate the Gospel of St. John into the Mohawk language—no doubt a valuable work; and among other achievements, they printed the Testament in the Irish character. This effort of the conversionists was denounced by St. George Daly and Leslie

Foster, as *containing material and very numerous errors*—yet, with all these errors, the Society to which those two very gentlemen belong — hear this, all saintlings! requested that two thousand copies should be struck off, of this very erroneous version, for present circulation, for great was the demand. The facts are published by Thomas Pell Platt, M.A. F.A.S. in his defence. Such is the bewildering zeal of the Irish Society. Moreover, the officers of this British and Foreign Bible Society, seem to have had itching palms—£8,450 are charged for managing £40,333; and Leander Van Ess distributed his own version, at the expence of £360 annually to the Society—but the report states without requiring any *earthly emolument*. Thus they lie, in a righteous dialect, and the very essence of saintship is peculation. Before these good men evangelise the Mohawks, let them reform their expenditure; and before the Irish Society converts the benighted Catholics, I advise them (as, according to the ancient Romans, things sacred should not be used, though they might be destroyed) not to distribute, but to destroy their Irish version.”

APPENDIX.—No. VI.

DOCUMENTS RELATIVE TO THE STATE OF IRELAND, IN 1828.

N.B. The following Extracts are thrown together merely with a reference to dates, which will be found sufficient to shew their general connexion.

THE CASE OF DANIEL O'CONNELL, AND THE CONFUSION OF THE LAW.

WE have arrived at the *ne plus ultra* of legal absurdity ; and have gone on piling one law on another ; repealing, in part, or in the whole, or enacting, in the same degree ; at one time for England only, then for Ireland only ; now in the character of one state—separate and independent ; then in the name of another, in the like manner ; and following them in the united name of *both*, or of *two-thirds* of the state ; and these in the name of the whole three, until the *dependency and relation of statute on statute* have rather been *presumed*, than digested and studied, with each fresh addition to the multifarious code. The cunning of law sometimes overshoots its purposes ; the craft of one intolerant is amended by the superior and more intense bigotry of another ; and the game is followed up until, as in a patched garment, you can neither trace the original form nor colour. The 5th of Elizabeth calls for the oaths of supremacy, &c., to be taken by members of parliament, under penalties stoutly set forth, and making the non-performance of them as a *vacation* of the seat obtained. The Pope-denouncing Charles II. added the declaration against Transubstantiation. *But these acts do not relate*

to Ireland, except so far as they are referred to in the Act of Union. The 3d of William and Mary, to the same general intent, relates exclusively to Ireland and to the Irish parliament. The 6th of George I. was repealed. The repeal recognised the independence of Ireland; and hence the act of George I. was considered as null and void. Next in succession are the 21st and 22d of George III. of the Irish Parliament, called *Yelverton's Act*; the 33d of George III., and the 39th and 40th of George III. (the Act of Union), and on the *construction* of which the question of Mr. O'Connell's power to sit in the House will, as it is said, depend. The Act of Union of England and Scotland directs, that all persons not taking the oaths thereby prescribed, shall be subject to the same penalties and disabilities as are imposed by the statute prescribing them; but there is *no such provision* in the Act for the union of England and Ireland. There is the 41st of George III., which recapitulates former disabilities in a summary sort of way; but not *distinctively*. The act of the 39th and 40th George III. enjoined the oaths, &c., but *attached no penalties* on non-compliance; and it is conceived that, in an extreme and severe act, penalties cannot be enacted by *implication*. The result of this legal research seems to be, that Mr. O'Connell's refusal to take the oaths can only be made a subject of *indictment*, on the *resolution of the House*; and here a thousand obstructions may be formed, and the matter fenced off *ad infinitum*. The last act applying to the subject is the 41st of George III., but it disables a Catholic from sitting for *any place in Great Britain*. It likewise says, that *persons disabled from sitting in the Irish parliament* shall be disabled from sitting in the united parliament. There is another clause which would attach at once, if there were any act of the English,

Irish, or united parliament, that prevented Mr. O'Connell *from sitting for any place in Ireland*; but this is not the case. From all that we learn from this chaotic jumble of the statutes—the affair of Mr. O'Connell is *in the hands of the same majority that voted (substantially) for emancipation*. The great terror of this new stumbling-block in the way of the ultra tories is, that Mr. O'Connell will, in all human probability, *enter the House of Commons, and take his seat*; and that it must rest with the majorities of that House to place a *construction on the statutes* which affect his presence there; and supply the light which the denseness and complexity of the law have shut out from common eyes. “There is more terror in *this fact*, than in a thousand swords;” because, if it come to a mere disputed point, on which men will judge differently, all the tories in Christendom will never be able to carry a new law, that shall replace the arbitrary power of the Church in a *monopoly* of Christian qualifications for the post of an honest man. Supposing the post to be thus gained, and that a proscribed race of our fellow-citizens shall advance *edge-ways*, as it were, into the exercise of their rights and privileges as men; it could no longer be contended—supposing the old barrier to remain good against the Catholic peerage, or that the *majority* of the upper House were able to wield a different power—that a Catholic *commoner* should enjoy a privilege which was denied to a Catholic peer. In this view of the case, the Catholics are already *emancipated*. It will be a happy thing if this sudden turn in Catholic fortunes should *spare the Duke of Wellington* the invidious trouble of some *fractional* measure for *putting the question at rest*. The Irish priesthood have been accused, time out of mind, of politically exercising their power over their flocks; and hence, all the discontent of

Ireland, and the obstructions thrown in the way of government: but we have now an open and avowed interference of the priests; and we see what their power *is*; — a sufficient proof that the presence of that power cannot be traced in minor bye-gone events. By this power (as may be seen in the events of the week) all the ordinary relations of society can be changed; why then should it be wantonly provoked? If Ireland should rise in rebellion, the priests will find the level of their influence; *and so will the government of the Lord Lieutenancy*. Ministers have had *warnings* sufficient; it is perhaps well for them that an accidental *diversion* of the national mind from its bent course, has changed the aspect of the future. We cannot help noticing, without some slight degree of ridicule and contempt, the advice which has always been given to the Catholics by the adherents of the minister of the day. No matter who he is; whether Mr. Pitt or Lord Liverpool—Mr. Canning or the Duke of Wellington—whether one speaking for emancipation, or one voting against it—the gist of the advice is ever—“*good manners and delay* ;” —“Wait patiently and behave yourselves quietly.”—“You Catholic Association, disperse yourselves, and let me hear no more of you; O’Connell, go you to your briefs; and Sheil, to the cold bath. Priests, let politics alone; mind the sick and infirm, and compose sermons, recommending small beer and silence to your flocks. Peers and orators all, rein in your energies, and turn your hands to something else,” &c. &c. This is the sagacious mode ever recommended to the Irish Catholics, as a *trial* that could *do no harm*; time, and the disuse of all agitation, were to work them out of their political *purgatory*; and when “*experience*” shall have proved how *worthy* they are, and that their sincerity can be no longer doubted—the noble

Duke will “*reconsider the subject.*” The effect which such sapient counsel would have on the minds of reflecting men, might have been foreseen. We much question whether the Duke himself can now *sleep on it*. A state of things has developed itself in the sister country, which is no longer remediable by the old quack applications. Something of an alterative must now be administered;—whether in the shape of conciliation or coercion, will soon be learnt.

June, 1828.

In a speech of Mr. O’Connell, on occasion of the dinner given to celebrate his election, as member for Clare, he made the following observations.

Mr. O’Connell, M.P., rose amid loud and enthusiastic cheers, which continued several minutes.—“ I cannot begin without telling you one thing that you never heard before — you never heard a Roman Catholic Member of Parliament. (*Loud cheers.*) Yes, there is novelty in that, at least; and now I can tell you what you never heard before — you never heard of any county in which there was a contested election but Clare, in which the resemblance to contest and controversy was totally avoided—where there was not even the appearance of conflict—where not one angry expression was heard, and not the slightest observation used hurtful to the adverse candidate or his voters. . . . Catholic and Protestant 40s. freeholders both supported me, and I had a greater proportion of Protestant than Catholic supporters.—It was accordingly right that those who were approaching the threshold of freedom should conduct themselves in the manner the Clare freeholders have done at the late election. But by whom was this election principally conducted? The very men who are

the bugbears of poor John Bull—the Popish priests. Did they interfere at the election for criminal and unworthy purposes? Oh, no! Did the persons they supported conduct themselves unworthy of the sacred ministry under which they were led on? It was not to sell themselves, or that they might be retailed to the best bidders they came forward; but, with the spirit of martyrs, they went to the hustings to discharge their duty to God and to their country, with boldness, manliness, and firmness, and regardless of the consequences. Let it be told all over England, that an experiment had been made in a Catholic county in Ireland, to turn out a Member of Parliament, because he, being a Protestant, voted for us, who differed from him in religion, and whose religion he declared to be idolatrous; yet he, a Protestant, voted against his fellow Protestants; it shewed that it was his interest obliged him to vote for one, and that his principles did not compel him to vote for both....

....I now tell you, that instead of our urging on the spirit of the people, (as we have been accused) we are actually a drag, and the only one, upon the political wheel which is rolling on its gigantic career, and bears along (if not impeded and prevented) results as important as they may be deplorable.

Recollect, I am speaking that which is part of Irish history, and that this is a great day for Ireland. We are beginning a new era. There is, you know, a great military disposition amongst the Irish people, and it not unfrequently distinguishes itself in the most ridiculous and criminal way, by party feuds. There is a party called the "Two Years Old," and another the "Three Years Old." There is one party called the "Black-hens," and in opposition to them, the "Magpies." (*Laughter.*)

Ridiculous as the names of these factions may appear, twenty lives have been lost within the last four years, in quarrels between them. I addressed them last Sunday week. I used every topic, which reason or religion could give to my aid.—I addressed myself to their feelings and their interests. One and all they promised to listen to my voice, and that of the Catholic Association; they told me they should meet the next Sunday, arm in arm together, like friends and brothers. I called upon their wives and their mothers, that they would keep them to this promise, and cordially they consented to do so. I left them with this promise. Within a week and a day from this, I again met them, and their priest came forward at their head to meet me, and he said “I am, Sir, bail before Heaven, and to you, that there shall be no more quarrelling amongst those men—like friends, linked arm in arm, they now go before you.” The men themselves said, “Sir, we are all Irishmen, we know it would be wrong to take an oath without sufficient cause, but you may rely upon us that our differences are put an end to for ever.” (*Cheers.*) I told them, I should send down to them four of the medals of the Order of Liberators, for the leaders of the “Magpies and Black-hens.” When I came to Drumker, I found there the Cummings and the Mahers; these also I reconciled, and they would take but one medal for each of the parties. I now ask, have I not, in my political struggles—I, a Member of the Catholic Association, done more in putting an end to outrage and to crime, before God, to injury and abuse to man, than the Imperial Parliament itself has been able to effect? What I now say, I wish to reach England, and I ask what is to be done with Ireland? What is to be done with the Catholics? One of two things. They must

either crush us, or there is no going on as we are. There is nothing so dangerous as going on as we are.....

As for myself, I do, I confess, expect very little fair play from them. I only wish the Catholic people of Ireland to be prepared for this event, for never shall a rebellion be attempted while I have life. When those who have the power to grant peace and tranquillity to the country, are asked to emancipate the Catholics of Ireland, they are not asked to put down Protestantism—we never asked, never sought, never would accept of emancipation, if it were the means of putting down Protestants. We would not debase the dissenters—no, we would rather continue slaves as we are, than injure a fellow Christian. Yes, Sir, this is one of the tenets of our calumniated Church. It is one of the tenets, too, which has, if possible, made me cling with still greater affection to it—that the greatest possible good was not to be reached even by the smallest crime. We would not then accept of emancipation, except we were to be upon the same ground of equality with our Protestant brethren. We wish for no ascendancy, and if there were in this country a Catholic ascendancy, I would as anxiously labour to put it down as I would any other ascendancy. What has been my object, but to establish the security of the throne, and the respect and admiration of my sovereign?....

Let Wellington and Peel but do justice to Ireland, and the Catholic people of Ireland will be found to collect around the throne—they will form for their sovereign troops far better than the armies of the Holy Alliance.—But let justice be done, and all will be found to rally round the throne—its best security and safest protection.....

If they refuse to conciliate us, the other alternative is to crush us. But can England afford to crush us? They

cannot crush the people of Ireland. Will they then conciliate her? We are ready and prepared to afford them every assistance. Do they want information?—I am able to give it to them. Did any man think that the Lethbridges and Evanses would repeat their dull fables, if they had one to oppose them able to contradict them? No—good temper, good sense, and good feeling, would prevail in the debate. I might tell, but I cannot adequately describe, the scene which for the last three days I have witnessed. When I looked at my county, and the people with whom it was filled, my heart overflowed, and my eyes were filled with tears, as I thought upon the lovely land that met my sight, and had to consider that the people were like slaves in their native land, and that it might not be free for their children. I saw, in the month of July, rivers dashing down from the mountains, sufficient to turn all the machinery of England—water power in profusion to save her from the steam machinery, which, though it makes money abundant, renders man weak and miserable—there I looked upon the healthful power which nature supplies, cheering by the merry rattle of its waters through the machinery, giving joy by its sound, and adding to the hilarity of the workmen. I traced those rivers to their mouths, and I found them opening into the wide and expansive ocean, with no sand banks to impede their course, but widening into capacious harbours, secure from every storm, and where the navies of the world might ride in safety. There the commerce of the world might be transhipped. It might be made the sacred deposit for the united storage of the two great nations of the earth. I know not whether I am more loyal, who would contend to render Ireland thus, or those who would raise the blood-stained standard of Orange Ascendancy. But, humble as

I am, I shall still contend for "happy homes and altars free." My talisman is not the sword; but my watchword—*Liberty!*"

July, 1828.

On another occasion Mr. O'Connell said:—"It was not for myself, God forbid it should, that I contended at the Clare election for the County Clare—no, it was for Ireland and for Liberty. It was that the noblest and the bravest people should not be fettered with the chain of slavery—it was that the finest country in the world should put forth her moral energies, and, shewing herself too big for the chains that were cast around her, break through them by the mere moral effect of her own internal elevation. Our governors do not know this country. I did not know it myself, until I mixed personally and politically with the people—and, so help me God! my mind was never so overcome with admiration, as in witnessing the heroism and magnanimity which the people of this country were able to exhibit:—never did fiction or "fabled story" invent a tale—never did poetry ornament or emblazon an achievement—never did history recount more noble and heroic chivalry than my countrymen have exhibited. For the cause to which he was pledged, the individual who is but an atom in the scale of existence was ready to sacrifice all; for that he was ready to sacrifice himself—the wife whom he loved, and the children who were the consolation of his sorrows and his cares; for that cause he was ready to offer himself a willing victim upon the altar of his country. Such a people cannot, must not, shall not, be enslaved. What is it we seek? Is it revolution—is it convulsion?—No, it is not. We seek to make the throne more secure, by changing it from what it is like at present, a cone resting upon its summit, and turn

ing it on its base, which shall be as broad as the universal empire. What—do we seek to pull down the aristocracy of the country?—Why should we seek to deprive the aristocracy of the station which they fill?—and oh, how well some of them do fill it!—As to those who do not follow the illustrious example now before us, we should not lower them, but seek, my lord, to raise them to the elevation of the station which you hold. Do we desire to lessen the privileges of the House of Commons, or to curtail the proper representation of the people in Parliament: it is no vanity in me to say, that the people do not err in the representatives they choose; but it is not for me to say this, who happen to be the object of the choice of one county in Ireland—a county unstained by crime, and untarnished by violence—one that has suffered much from absentee landlords, and still more from the cruel, emaciating and grinding spirit of biblical persecution. It is not for me to speak of the people who have made me the object of their choice; but, putting my case altogether out of the question, look to those who have been the object of the people's choice; and from the Villiers Stuart of Waterford, to the Alexander Dawson, of Louth, I would ask, are there not the very best men to be found in Parliament?....I am, I own, fervently attached to the principle of universal suffrage—I think that every man unstained by crime—that every man who pays taxes, and personally contributes to the support of the state, has a right to have a voice in the appointment of him, who is to be the protector of his person and his property. This was the ancient Catholic constitution, and to the electors of Clare I have pledged myself to maintain this principle.... We now have embodied the spirit of that agitation which has been continued for eight and twenty years. We want to sub-

vert nothing. We seek but to follow the glorious example which Ireland has already set. This country once saw a glorious change, in which not one particle of property was disturbed, in which no man suffered in his person or his fortune, and not one single drop of blood was spilt, and in which, sacred God! this country became, from a pitiful, pelting province, a free and independant nation, with a national legislature of its own. For this, we want agitation, and to accomplish this shall be the business of my life. (*Loud cheers.*) Is there one amongst us who despairs of such a consummation; if there be, let him listen to me for one moment. I recollect the period when it was with the greatest difficulty that eight or ten of us could be got together. We were sneered at by some, scorned by others, and it was not at all the fashion to belong to us. Now we have overcome the coldness of opponents, the laugh of scorn, the taunt of ridicule, and the perpetual calunny that has made us insensible to abuse, and we now find our cause in the present situation it holds in the eyes of the empire; and after this, will any man dare to tell me that I shall despair of Ireland. Ireland ought to be connected with Britain by the golden link and tie of having one sovereign; but she ought to be independent, and have an independent legislature; she ought to have her parliament, the members of which should be solely selected by the people; and I now think that we have arrived at the 'vantage ground, to enable her to take the spring, which will give her this great prize for all her labours, and, thank God, I am young enough yet to see her independence accomplished. I will not "tear the strings of the harp asunder." I feel that the harp of Erin shall yet sound boldly and strongly, and that we shall live to hear the song of her triumph resound through the green fields of old Ireland."

Mr. Sheil said — “ The Clare election was pregnant with instruction, and held out great admonitions. It was important, as a phenomenon exhibiting the intensity of national emotion, and the profound sympathy which all classes of the people experience in what is regarded as the freedom of Ireland. That event has gone by ; but it has scarcely passed when others have succeeded. I have just returned from the county of Tipperary, in which the great provincial assembly was recently held, and I have come with still deeper impressions of the awful condition in which we are placed, than I had previously entertained. There are two matters for serious reflection, afforded by the manifestation of public feeling in the south of Ireland. The state of the Catholics is not only very remarkable, but the disposition of the Protestants is becoming almost equally conspicuous. To these two topics I mean to apply myself. First, let us consider the condition of the Catholic mind in the south of Ireland. I own that I regard it with some degree of alarm. I was present at a public meeting in Thurles, where not less than ten thousand persons had assembled upon the warning of an instant, and I will not hide from you that the passions which they displayed conveyed to my mind much melancholy intimation. At the town of Borrisicleigh, which had been the arena of savage faction, and where men slew each other with scarcely a motive beyond the abstract love of fight which predominates in the character of the people, a reconciliation has just taken place. The peasantry obeyed the orders of the Association, and laid down their ancient animosities. In Clare they had been persuaded to abandon the maddening beverage for which they were supposed to have an unsurmountable predilection: this was doing much; and the sobriety of the people was accounted formidable;

but, in Tipperary, even more has been effected, and the omnipotence (for such it is) of the Association has been evinced in the system of brotherhood which has been produced amongst contending factions, who had inherited hatred, and carried their detestations in ~~the~~^{their} blood. The mandate of the Association has done more than the law, with all its terrors, could accomplish. The manner and circumstances of this reconciliation were almost as remarkable as the fact itself. They moved in a vast procession which covered miles of the country, in perfect order, marshalled, disciplined, and regimented. Their leaders were attired in gaudy green, and although they offer to the imagination figures sufficiently fantastical, yet the smile which their strange attire might at first produce, will speedily give way to the serious reflections which such accompaniments ought to create. These incidents afford incontestable proof of the extent of the national organization, and of the perfection of the popular discipline. They have almost reached the excellence of military array. It is unnecessary to suggest that an immense population thus united, thus affiliated, thus controlled—in such a state of complete subordination, affords matter for the most solemn meditation. I have spoken thus far of the condition of the Catholics, and it is enough for me to say, that a feeling of expectation has begun to manifest itself among the people. They put painful questions, and awful interrogatories. It is not our fault if this condition of things exists. The government who, by the disfranchisement, have produced the consolidation of seven millions, are responsible for present calamities, and will be answerable for evils to come. But, if the state of the Catholics be deserving attention, that of the Protestants calls also for remark. It is in vain for us to hide it from ourselves;

the Protestants are becoming every day more alienated, by our display of power. The division between Catholic and Protestant is widening. They were before parted, but they are now rent asunder: while the Catholic Association rises up from the indignant passions of one great body of the community, the Brunswick Club is springing out of the irritated pride and sectarian rancour of the Protestants of Ireland. The Catholic Association owes its political parentage to heavy wrong, operating on deeply sensitive and strongly susceptible feelings. Oppression has engendered it. The Protestant Association has its birth in the hereditary love of power, and inveterate habits of domination; and thus, two great rivals are brought into political existence, and enter the lists against each other. As yet, they have not engaged in the great struggle, they have not closed in the combat; but as they advance upon each other, and collect their might, it is easy to discern the terrible passions by which they are influenced, and the full determination with which they rush to the encounter. Meanwhile, the government stands by, and the minister folds his arms, as if he were a mere indifferent observer, and the terrific encounter only afforded him a spectacle for the amusement of his official leisure. He sits as if two gladiators were crossing their swords for his recreation. The cabinet seems to be little better than a box in an amphitheatre, from whence his Majesty's ministers may survey the business of blood. . . . This, then, is the state of things—there are three parties concerned, the Catholics, the Protestants, and the government. The Catholics advance upon one hand, the Protestants upon another, and the government, by whom both ought to be controlled, look passively on. What, then, does it behove us to do? I will tell you; and it is for that purpose that

I have risen to-day to speak. We know that our adversaries pant for a rebellion. They have frankly and openly avowed it.—‘The sooner it comes the better,’ was the ferocious yell with which they assailed their quondam leader. Now, mark me—we must not indulge them in the luxury of a massacre, nor bare the throat of Ireland to the knife. Being well aware of the objects of our adversaries, and of the excited state of the Catholic mind, we should always guard against any, the least violation of the laws. Do not attribute my advice to weakness or pusillanimity. The peasantry of the south might, by a single spark, be ignited into an explosion. We should watch them as we would a powder magazine. The enemy is well aware that our real strength lies in our tranquillity, and that they have no chance of arresting our progress to perfect liberation, excepting through a premature display of physical power, which they are now able to put down. Like skilful generals, they are anxious to bring us to an engagement, when they dread the diminution of their own forces, and apprehend the hourly augmentation of ours. We should retreat—and they will be exhausted and worn out in the pursuit. But let me drop all figurative phrases, and speak with a direct simplicity of matters that are of fearful consequences, and should be treated with that plainness that becomes what is of such vast moment. The case stands thus—by the exercise of pacific means, the whole Catholic population have been completely organised; immense power is placed in our hands, but it is of a moral kind. The Orangemen, aware of our progress, and of the expedients by which it has been effected, well know that they cannot stop us, as long as we persevere in the same course. They, therefore, use every stimulus to provoke us to aggression. We should act with a moderation propor-

tioned to their intemperance, and adhere, with undeviating fidelity, to the system on which we have hitherto acted. Thus we must inevitably succeed in their overthrow. We shall consume and waste them away. As it is, how rapidly we are every day encroaching, and making inroads upon them! Every where, Orangeism is giving way. The nurseries of Protestantism are broken up in the charter-schools; Kildare-place is on the wane; and even the Foundling hospital has ceased to be the cradle of religion, as well as the resource of love. Mr. Seymour, in his late speech at Sligo, informs us that, within a short period, 25,000 Protestants have emigrated from the north; and he piously laments the increase of Popery and of pig-sties, in the favourite district of orthodoxy. Thus we are, on all sides, pressing upon them, and nothing but our own rashness can interrupt our march to success. All your might, whatever power you have, arises from peace—be tranquil, and you must be triumphant.”

On another occasion, Mr. Sheil made the following eloquent appeal:—“What country has ever presented such a spectacle of universal organization as this? Open the pages of history (I address myself to some one of your haughty rulers, in whom recent events may have produced an abatement of disdain) and tell me, whether in the annals of mankind, an instance of national confederacy can be found, which can be brought into any comparison with the mighty union of the Irish people? I do not hesitate to say that in no page of history will there be discovered such an example of a consolidated passion, and concentrated energy, and of systematised action, as is at this moment presented to the contemplation of every political observer, by the actual state of Ireland. In other countries, large masses of the population may be found, who, under the pressure of

penalty and disqualification, have been brought into adherence, and felt a community of interest in a community of wrong. The Huguenots of France, for example, were a powerful body, but still they did not exhibit a union so perfect and complete as the great seven millions of disfranchised subjects, who, shut from the pale of the constitution, are drawn up beyond it. (*Cheers.*) I repeat it—there cannot be found in the annals of any people an instance of combination as complete, and let me add, or appalling, as the marvellous confederacy of the Catholics of Ireland.—From the palace of the proudest peer amongst us, to the lowest hovel of the meanest peasant in our marshes, one single undivided sentiment prevails. The language in which utterance is given to the national feeling is diversified, according to the condition of those who employ it; but whatever may be the difference of phrase, I will venture to assert that there is but one great political thought which occupies all ranks and classes of our body. The country is in a state of the most dangerous organization, and the greater the peril the more imperative the reasons for a change of that system from which these results are derived. I therefore draw away the veil; I throw off all disguise; I put aside all sophistication; and I bid the government contemplate our condition, and look out a little into that future, of which the past and present afford such alarming omens. Where is all this to end? The public passions must be either retrograde, or stationary, or progressive. Will they be retrograde? Will the tide which is now rushing on, but is not yet at full flood, go back—or is it not rather like that sea which ‘feels no returning ebb?’—What man knows so little of human nature, as to say that the mind of Ireland will recede of itself from the point of agitation which it has

reached? Is there any just reason so to think? Let us look a little back, and endeavour to find in what has already taken place, the means of calculating what is to come. I do not mean to traverse many years of retrospect. I refer merely to what we have all seen, and to events in which we have been ourselves the actors. During the last eight years what has happened? The Catholic Association arose. Its first beginnings were humble indeed. All classes of Catholics felt at last that it was only by a manifestation of national power, that any thing useful for Ireland could be accomplished—a remarkable event, showing how much had been done in raising the moral character of Ireland. The elections of Waterford and Louth called up the spirit of the peasantry, and the Protestant aristocracy were in an instant overthrown. The simultaneous meetings, which I had the honour of suggesting, came next, and seven millions raised up their arms together. Let me not pause upon this great incident. It speaks enough in its own behalf, and requires no comment. I hurry over other inferior circumstances, all of which, however, furnish illustration of the state of moral and political feeling which has been created amongst us, and I come to the great event which is now taking place before us. The election of Mr. O'Connell is the crowning and consummating incident. It has, more than any other, developed our resources and our power, and given a deeper insight into the mind of Ireland. What statesman can contemplate that triumph without also looking into the feelings which beat at the nation's heart. That triumph is not a mere example of ephemeral popularity; it is not the mere demonstration of evanescent favour which the populace manifests under their temporary feelings. All Ireland has started up in acclamation. I revert to what

I originally laid down, and ask whether it be possible that the public passions which have made this extraordinary way can be retrograde? I think it clear that they cannot. Will they be stationary? It is not in the nature of things. They must then be progressive; and if they are, where, in the name of all that is dear to us, are they to pause and rest? The torrent will not go back; it will not freeze and stand still; it will rush on: and I, who cannot retard or accelerate, do but point out the gulph into which the vessel is swept by its very smoothness. I do but bid you listen to the rapids which are, perhaps, not far away;—I do but warn you of that tremendous whirlpool to which we are drawing by an increasing suction, and in which, if the ship be not more wisely steered, we shall be inevitably swallowed up. Seven millions of the Irish people are united and organized. That organization is hourly on the increase. The gentry, the middle classes, the peasantry, and above all, that powerful and enthusiastic body, the Catholic priesthood (whose hearts have room for political and religious passion, because they have exiled every other) are all blended in one mass of accumulating discontent,—and animated by a sentiment which is at present, indeed, under the just controul of constitutional duty, but to whose vehemence it may at last be difficult even for those who have most contributed to excite it, to prescribe a limit. I repeat my question—where is all this to end? I said there was nothing comparable to the organization of the people. I should have said, that there was nothing to be compared to it but the infatuation of the government.”

The Rt. Rev. Dr. Coppinger to his R. C. Parishioners of Cove. MY DEAR FRIENDS.—You are already informed

by the public prints, that the House of Lords, that august branch of the British Legislature, after two nights' adjourned discussion of the Resolution presented to them by the House of Commons, and strenuously recommended to them by that honourable assembly for their dispassionate consideration, have, notwithstanding, resolved not even to examine or discuss our question.—This intelligence is certainly painful, but yet, under all the circumstances of the case, is far from discouraging. It now clearly appears, that the more this question is agitated and discussed, the more favorably has it advanced in public opinion. All the most splendid abilities and convincing eloquence of Lords and Commons are now ranged on the Catholic side; and if the Catholics of Ireland persist in the line of conduct hitherto so creditably adopted by them;—if with union, firmness, peaceable submission to the law, they continue to urge their question on constitutional grounds, the number of their friends must increase, and the number of their enemies be diminished. The peaceable and orderly demeanour which characterized our late simultaneous meetings, while it powerfully pleaded for the Catholic body, was a most mortifying disappointment to their enemies. I trust in God we shall continue in that commendable and efficacious mode of attaining the object of our wishes. Those who would rivet our chains have very opposite views, and to glut themselves in the dismal consequences of violence, or illegal proceedings, to which they would gladly provoke their Catholic fellow-countrymen, will, we fear, lose no opportunity which, in their enmity to us, they would consider likely to create confusion. My intention, in submitting this state of our case to your attentive consideration, is, in order to put you on your guard against any manifestation of turbulent dis-

pleasure, at a reformation meeting which is publicly announced to take place in Cove to-morrow. Judging from the language adopted by the speakers in every similar meeting heretofore announced, it may be expected that the most calumnious and venomous aspersions will be vomited against the Catholic Church. As for theological argument, wherever it has been advanced, the most triumphant refutation has rebutted it, in Cork, in Carlow, in Waterford, in Downpatrick, and in Dublin. When assailed by virulent publications they were as powerfully and triumphantly refuted. Dr. Doyle, Dr. M'Hale, the Rev. Mr. Kinsella, and of late the first Earl in England, the Earl of Shrewsbury, have overwhelmed these unblushing charges and imputations with the irresistible weight of truth.

To descend, therefore, again, into the arena of controversy, with petulant pretenders to ability in this way, would be at once to lower the divinity of religion, and to expose the community to the evils of rancorous division. We behold its dreadful effects in what lately took place in the town of Balinasloe, where the bayonet was recurred to when argument had failed, where blood was spilled, and where lives were in imminent danger. If, therefore, malignant individuals shall calculate upon the warm feelings of Irish Roman Catholics, when provoked by the slanderous abuse of their religion, and shall combine in their meetings of the New Reformation, as they call them, to incite the Catholic population to be their hearers, I trust that you, my friends, know your interest too well to be caught in that detestable snare. I trust you have too high a respect for yourselves, as professors of the Catholic faith, to gratify such men by swelling their congregations. I trust that if they be determined, as I presume they will,

to abuse and to vilify that ancient faith, once delivered to the Saints, you will leave them to themselves, and consign them to our common Judge, upon the great accounting day, before whom it surely cannot be very enviable to present themselves as reformers of a religion which he himself delivered: promising to be with its accredited teachers throughout the world to the end of time. A duration of 1800 years has verified his promise. May the God of heaven, who has so miraculously exhibited the power of that promise in this our native land, preserve you all from being aggregated in communion with any body of men, who shall appear before Christ as professing a better religion than he himself established. On these several grounds I feel it my duty to prohibit you, under the severest spiritual penalties, to appear at this projected meeting to-morrow. I announce this prohibition for your sakes, and in my capacity of your bishop, answerable for your souls at the great tribunal of Him who is to judge us; and I here beseech him to enlighten, to support, and to guard you, against every danger, in your progress through this world unto eternal life,—a blessing I wish you all.—(*Sunday Morning, June 22.*)

In reply to a communication from the Chairman of the Association, the same venerable prelate says: “As being the oldest, by creation, in the Catholic prelacy of Ireland, I must naturally feel myself identified with the concerns of the Irish Catholic people, and with their constitutional efforts for the furtherance of civil and religious liberty to all; essential as I conscientiously deem it, to the prosperity of the empire, to the consolidation of the state, to the stability of the throne, and to the happiness of the community. Predominant sectarian sway over fellow-

men, whatever be their creed, I abjure and reprobate, in full accordance with the Catholic Association, as do my clergy, and the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland. Let us then hope, that the misconceptions of our religious and political principles, gradually giving way to the general conviction of what they really are, will, ere long, change hostility, not alone into Christian forbearance, but into universal brotherly love."

Address to the Roman Catholics of the North.—At a Catholic meeting held in Dublin, on Saturday, 5th July, 1828:—DAVID LYNCH, Esq. in the chair,—it was moved by A. Carew O'Dwyer, Esq. and seconded by the Rev. F. J. L'Estrange:

Resolved unanimously—That the following address be printed, and forthwith circulated in the North of Ireland, as a means tending to ensure the preservation of the public safety, on the approaching 12th of July.

ADDRESS.

Fellow Countrymen.—Influenced by the most lively wishes for your welfare, and animated with feelings of affection and sympathy towards you, we address you upon a subject of very great importance, and, by virtue of our common and undivided interests, we implore you to listen to our appeal.

We have been informed that the armed Orangemen of the North, have for some time been engaged, and are now actively employed, in making extraordinary preparations to commemorate the battle of Aughrim, on the approaching 12th of July. We have been apprized by authentic accounts, that this festival of insult and oppression will be celebrated on the coming occasion with unusual pomp,

and with an exhibition of insolence and triumph likely to excite a disturbance of the peace amongst you.

Listen, then, Countrymen, to our advice! As fellow-sufferers, we call upon you to abstain on the 12th of July from every act of resistance to the insulting proceedings which are contemplated. We call upon you, neither by word nor deed, to provoke a breach of the peace, nor to expose yourselves, unarmed and defenceless as you are, to the violence of these men, who are well organised, and supplied with arms and ammunition, which they might turn to the most deadly purpose. Do not assemble in numbers on the 12th of July. Do not come into the towns; and, above all, refrain, we beseech you, that day, from the use of intoxicating liquors, which, by stimulating your passions, might render you more liable to be drawn into a disastrous conflict, if there were an attack made upon you by your enemies. Keep within your respective homes, and, if possible, avoid the roads and streets through which Orange processions may pass. Remain in the society of your wives and children on that day, and unite with them in prayer to the Almighty God, the Father of us all, that the time may soon arrive when intolerance shall not exist in the land—when the Protestant and Catholic will know no distinction between each other, and when no Irishman shall pervert religion, of which charity and love are the essence, into the source of discord and social strife.

Depend upon the law for protection—if you be injured, trust not to violence for ~~an~~^{an} address. The glorious cause in which we are all embarked, has made a mighty progress in the public opinion. Each year brings to us an accession of friends, and exhibits the conversion to our side of many who, at one time, were hostile to our principles. Do not then tarnish our great and virtuous cause by any act unsanctioned by the laws of the land.

Fellow Countrymen! One of the highest authorities, Lord Plunkett, has pronounced Orange processions to be contrary to the law, and every magistrate is bound to disperse them wherever they appear. Of course the magistrates of the North will do their duty, and will enforce the dictates of the law, by suppressing all incitements to disturbance. The Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Sir Anthony Hart, by whom all magistrates are commissioned, is a pure and upright judge, and upon him you may depend for equal and impartial justice. In every case where you entertain a reasonable apprehension that the public tranquillity is likely to be disturbed, you should apply to a magistrate of your district—tender an affidavit of the fact, and the magistrate is bound to prevent, by the adoption of vigorous measures, such anticipated violation of the peace.

We beseech you, then, to obey implicitly the advice of your virtuous and affectionate priesthood, and to be guided by their example. They will tell you, as we do, that the time is fast approaching when freedom will smile upon our country; and that obedience to the laws, and reliance upon them for redress of injury, are the best means of accelerating the completion of our national happiness.

In conclusion, we conjure you to avoid all secret associations and illegal confederacies. The fact of secrecy implies illegality, and whatever is illegal must be bad, and subversive of good order. If a cause be good, it need not fear publicity—if it be good, it must triumph, in proportion as it is generally known.

Farewell! We rely upon you to attend to this sincere admonition. You know we are your friends, and that our interests are identified with your own; we give you that advice, which we are convinced is most calculated to make our lovely country what she ought to be, and what

she will yet be, with the blessing of heaven—prosperous, tranquil and contented.

DAVID LYNCH, Chairman.

BART. CORBALLIS, Sec.

“ *Carlow, August 11, 1828.*

“ DEAR SIR.—On my return here, after an absence of several days, I was honoured, on Saturday last, by the receipt of your very kind letter, inclosing a resolution of thanks to me, passed at a meeting of the Catholic Association, on Saturday, the 2d of this month.

“ I wish I had merited this mark of public favour, so liberally conferred on me, by so large and respectable a body of my fellow-countrymen. The thanks of a whole people, or of those who in any way represent them, is a reward commensurate to the greatest services; and, to an Irishman, thoroughly devoted to his country, perhaps the thanks of the Catholic Association should be more estimable than those of any other body in the world; but for me, who am conscious of my own infirmity and inutility, and whose pursuits are feeble and constrained, when they diverge into politics, the thanks of my own fellow-sufferers serve only to remind me of the calamities which press upon our dear country. They compel me to ask,—why have we a Catholic Association, not, indeed, usurping empire, yet ruling without laws to guide it, without precedents to regulate it, without power or authority to enforce its injunctions? and why am I compelled often to quit the sanctuary, and participate in the proceedings of those who are an anomaly in the state? God is my witness, how much I deplore this state of things, even while I concur in its maintenance, and contribute, however

feebly, to its support. But NECESSITY is our CHARTER; and we must continue till it cease. Injustice prevails, and is prolonged against us; and we are bound by that law which is written in our hearts, to struggle—to agitate—to strive against its pressure. In doing this, if obliged to press upon the limits of the laws, let us not transgress them; let us not be elated by success, nor depressed by defeat. A people such as ours, is made drunk by a sudden and unforeseen advantage; they are also liable to despond, when under failure or defeat.—But whether they recede or advance, union will preserve their struggle, moderation will mature it, and perseverance will crown it with success. Our duty is, to sustain the hopes of the people, to combine their energies, and direct them to one single and attainable point. Let us not aim at what is above our reach, or beyond our competency, or occupy ourselves about business which is not properly our own. Let us burst the penal code, and enter into the enjoyment of existing privileges and rights. Then will the Catholic Association cease; then can I, and those of my calling, return to the work of the ministry, and to that alone; then you, sir, and your fellow-labourers, merged into the great mass of the nation, with the glorious principles of 1688 as a beacon before you, may deliberate about Irish interests, and endeavour, not as Catholics, but as British subjects, to promote them.

“ This is the only result for which I have hitherto laboured, or will labour hereafter. I am grateful, exceedingly grateful, to the Catholic Association; and did I cease to support it, to the utmost of my power, while those laws which it seeks to have repealed have destroyed more lives by their operation in Ireland, even during the last eight

years, than have fallen in Greece under the Turkish scimitar, I should be a rebel to my conscience, and the accomplice of those who afflict the oppressed.

“ I have the honour to be, dear sir, your most obliged and obedient servant,

“ *To John Chester, Esq.*”

“ J. DOYLE.”

August 12.

The anniversary of “ the relief of Derry ” was celebrated at Derry, on the 12th instant. A pillar had been lately erected in that town, on the top of which was placed a statue of Walker, who signalled himself at the siege of Derry. The statue was uncovered for the first time that day. A considerable number of the Orange peasantry assembled, and walked in procession. In the evening, upwards of two hundred gentlemen, subscribers to the Testimonial, dined together in the Corporation Hall, the Right Honourable Sir George F. Hill, Bart., M.P., in the chair. At the President’s table were Mr. Dawson, M.P., Sir Hugh Stuart, Bart., Sir R. Ferguson, Bart., the High Sheriff of the county, Mr. Barre Berresford, Mr. Connelly Gage, and others of the leading interests of the county of Londonderry, and the neighbouring counties.

The health of GEORGE ROBERT DAWSON, Esq. M.P. was given and received with loud cheers. The honourable gentleman returned thanks in the following terms:—

“ Sir George Hill, and gentlemen—It may seem affectation in a man who has so often had the honour of addressing you on similar occasions, to say that he rises with diffidence and pain to return you thanks for such a gratifying proof of your regard and approbation as you have just bestowed upon me; but the eulogiums which have been lavished upon me by the kindness of my friend,

(*cheers*) and the consciousness of my own unworthiness, must give rise to those feelings in my mind. I have, however, a great public duty to perform; and in appearing before you on the present occasion, I have no other wish than to express my sentiments with that openness and sincerity which I have always used, and which I hope will be the best passport to your favour, as it ever shall be to me the best reward.—Gentlemen, in gratifying my own wishes, and in obeying the summons which you sent to me to become a steward of this meeting, I shall briefly state the motives which have induced me to be present, and describe the character which, in my opinion, ought to be given to the celebration of this day. After the lapse of near a century and a half, it has pleased the inhabitants of this enlightened and wealthy city to erect a splendid testimonial in commemoration of the valour, the fortitude, the unparalleled patience, under sufferings of every description, and success of their forefathers in the defence of their city against a foreign foe and a domestic enemy, in support of their religion, their property, and their liberties. If there were any topics calculated to rouse the feelings of the heart; if any impulse were wanting to animate the emotions of a manly breast, where can we find a more noble incentive for any true patriot, than in claiming his sympathy for men who risked their lives, and encountered all the horrors of a lingering death amidst plague, pestilence, and famine, in support of their religion, their country, and their liberty. (*loud cheers.*) What words are more heart-stirring, or penetrate more deeply into the human breast, than the triumphal song in celebration of the warriors who have defended our altars, our homes, and our country (*cheers*); what theme can be so ennobling, both as a mark of gratitude to the illustrious dead, and as

an example to those who live, as the record of daring exploits and successful valour; and where could a poet of the warmest imagination find a more glowing picture of the brave, the patriot, the invincible soldier, than in the description of those scenes of carnage, of pestilence, and famine, which aggravated in an unspeakable degree the approach of death, and which history has recorded to have occurred within these very walls? (*cheers.*) To be dead to such emotions is to confess that we deserve not to have illustrious ancestors; is to refuse our tribute of admiration to the valour of our forefathers; is to teach our own children that virtue and merit are unworthy of imitation. It has been said by Dr. Johnson, who well knew the character of the human heart, that he did not envy the man whose piety did not grow warm amid the ruins of Iona, and whose patriotism did not glow on the plains of Marathon. Sir, I agree in this noble sentiment; my heart thrills with responsive concurrence in this natural effusion of a pious and a generous spirit. I am sure that every man in this room is animated with the same feeling; and it is in obedience to this irresistible appeal that I am present at this festival to commemorate the valour of the defenders of this city. (*cheers.*) But, gentlemen, I cannot say that my feelings are of an unmixed nature; I do not feel that single and overwhelming impulse of enthusiasm which ought to prevail in the attainment of a great national victory; and I trust when I have explained the nature of the alloy, which in the contemplation of these occurrences imparts a taste of bitterness to the cup of enjoyment, that there will not be found an Irish heart which will impute an improper motive to these melancholy reflections. Gentlemen, I have said that we are called upon to celebrate the valour and success of our forefathers in the defence of

their city against a foreign foe and a domestic enemy. What a multitude of recollections does such an unnatural combination present; what a painful retrospection for every true lover of his country—a foreign foe and a domestic enemy! (*cheers.*) In such an union are combined the horrors of a foreign invasion and a civil war, the two greatest curses which can afflict a country, and where victory itself is robbed of half its glory. Would that the deeds which we now commemorate, were confined to the songs of triumph over a foreign enemy, with what unmixed pleasure should we lift the cup to our lips, and raise the shout of triumph in commemoration of our noble defenders! Would to God that we were called upon alone to record the defeat, the disgrace, and rout of the execrable De Rosen and his French squadrons; but what person bearing the name of Irishman will say, no matter whether a follower of King William or a supporter of King James—but what man bearing the common name of Irishman, will say, that he peruses the narration of those scenes where the glory and the misery of his country are blended together, without mixed feelings of triumph and disappointment? Let us give our utmost meed of praise to the valour, the fortitude, and skill of Walker; (*cheers*) but what man, in the exultation arising from the display of national virtue, can refuse the same praise to his gallant adversary Sarsfield? (*loud hisses.*) If I thought any gentleman could intend to put me down by clamour, no person should ever see me at a meeting of this kind again. It is right that at a meeting such as this I should express my opinions openly and fearlessly, and I shall do so in despite of every attempt to interrupt me. I am here, Sir, as a servant of the crown, and no one can blame me for expressing the honest conviction of my mind. I say, Sir,

that no Irishman can blame me for bestowing upon the adversary of Walker that praise to which his valour so justly entitled him. (*cries of no, no, no.*) If it be the opinion of the person that we are to withhold our meed of approbation from Sarsfield, what a pitiful cringing creature must he be. (*loud hisses.*) Both were Irishmen, both were brave, both skilful, and both have conferred immortal honour on the character of the Irish soldier; but their prowess was proved in the shedding of each other's blood; and though both were heroes whose personal qualities were calculated to shed a lustre on our national annals, the misfortunes of the times have compelled our historians to paint them according to the bias of their political feelings, either as martyrs or as traitors. In the struggle between King William and James the Second, the citizens of Derry were the first to show their attachment to the principles of liberty, and to set the example of a devoted sacrifice in defence of the freedom of conscience, and the support of the Constitution against a tyrannical and cruel king. But let it be recollected, amidst all the triumphant feelings of those glorious days, that the enemies with whom our ancestors had to contend, were natives of the same soil, (*no, no!*) that they adhered to the religion of their forefathers—that they fought in defence of a king to whom they had sworn allegiance, (*hisses*) from whom that allegiance had never been withdrawn, and under whose sway they were content to live. Happily, in the struggle, the cause of justice and of liberty was triumphant. The whole kingdom has felt the benefit of that glorious trial, and the descendants of men who contributed so largely to the salvation of the empire, have a right to feel a just pride in the exploits of their ancestors, and to commemorate, with becoming gratitude, their

deliverance from danger. As one of the descendants of the warriors of that day, not indeed of those who endured the siege in the city of Derry, but of those who volunteered their services to King William, I attend this anniversary. I attend here to mark my approval of the principles of the Revolution of 1688; and since it has pleased the descendants of those brave men, even at this late period, to raise up a trophy in commemoration of their exploits, I most willingly contribute the aid both of my purse and my presence, to establish what I hope will be a never-fading memorial of our respect and gratitude. But, gentlemen, I wish it to be particularly understood, that I do not attend here to mark any triumph over my Roman Catholic brethren; I wish to blot out for ever the recollection that the triumph of those days was achieved over natives of the same soil. I cling only to the blessings which we have gained, namely, the enjoyment of a free constitution; and I will not diminish the value of such a legacy, by a heart-burning reference to a national strife, and by tearing open afresh the wounds of civil warfare. Having made these declarations, and thanking you sincerely for the honour which you have done me, I might now close my task; but it is impossible not to see that, under the present very peculiar circumstances of the country, something more is expected from a man who has the honour of being your representative in Parliament, and who is no inactive spectator of the passing events, than the mere formal ceremony of making a complimentary speech. I shall, therefore, take this opportunity of making a few observations upon the internal condition of this country, begging of you at the same time to bear in mind, that my remarks are made without reference to the opinions of any other individual, that they spring from

my own observation of the events of the day, and that they are totally uninfluenced by party connections, or official station. It is a source of the most gratifying pleasure to me to be able to state most unequivocally, that I see a marked improvement in the condition of the people; it is visible in every class; it is corroborated by a reference to those tests in which there can be no deceit. If we were to believe the rumours of the day, if we were to be guided by the reports of the public newspapers, we might fancy ourselves in a state of insurrection, and in a country where there was no security for life or property, from whence industry had fled, where commerce was extinct, and where poverty and starvation had almost completed their work of degradation and destruction. It is astonishing to see with what avidity the public mind is ready to receive even the most incredible fabrications with respect to Ireland, and how little the real condition of this country is understood. But what are the facts? The English newspapers teem with reports that Ireland is in a state of insurrection, because a couple of regiments have received orders to march from England, to replace other regiments that are about to leave this country—they land at Belfast, and the whole of the north of Ireland is supposed to be in a state of alarm; but what is the fact? I will venture to assert, that so perfect is the state of tranquillity in this province, there is hardly to be found a single family which would think it necessary to fasten the latch of their door. But let us refer to more convincing evidence than mere assertion. The assizes are just finished; there, at least, are to be found the tests of crime and outrage, if they exist in the country; but when, within the memory of man, have the gaols been emptied with so few evidences of the demoralization of society? When can we

recollect so few instances of sanguinary outrage, of midnight robbery, or party violence? I heard the judges declare their perfect astonishment at the tranquillity of the country; and we heard their congratulations in this city, that they found no crimes on the circuit, but such as must exist in every mixed state of society.* Is trade extinct? Has commerce fled, and is starvation staring us in the face? Look at the quays of Belfast and Derry; look at the numerous steam-vessels departing every day for Glasgow, Liverpool, and London, and can any man say trade is extinct? Look at our fairs and markets, and

* MONAGHAN. Baron McClelland—"There was no case, with the exception of one, which might not occur in the most peaceable country. FERMANAGH. Judge Vandeleur—"He felt great satisfaction in being enabled to congratulate the Grand Jury on the tranquil state of the county. It was gratifying to see no charge of an insurrectionary nature." CAVAN. Judge Torrens—"I am happy to inform you, that your calendar is unusually light."

These are what are called Orange Counties, and notwithstanding the excitements which have been applied to the passions of the lower Orangemen, it is creditable to them, or perhaps, we should rather say, to the magistracy, that no breaches of the peace have occurred in these places. Now we shall turn to the south of Ireland, and we shall begin with Clare, the scene of the election, or as the London journalists will have it, the focus of the revolution.

CLARE. The Chief Baron—"I have to congratulate you, that the state of the civil and criminal calendar will not detain you long, for you may discharge the latter in the course of the day." LIMERICK. Baron Pennefather—"He congratulated the country on the light state of the calendar, and contrasted it with the heavy duties they had to perform in former years." Now, with regard to the Home Counties. CARLOW. Lord Plunkett "congratulated the county on the lightness of the calendar. KILDARE. The Lord Chief Justice complimented the county on its tranquillity. QUEEN'S COUNTY. The Chief Justice felt no necessity to charge the Grand Jury, from the tranquil state of the county. WICKLOW. *There was one man in the gaol of Wicklow.* We are not informed whether he was acquitted or not.

let us ask ourselves if industry has fled; more animated scenes of business and activity cannot be found, and no complaint is heard, save the never-failing one of the lowness of prices. Where are to be found the proofs of general poverty and starvation? Food is so cheap, that it is within the reach of every individual of even the least industry; potatoes vary, from fourpence to sixpence a bushel, a price which will enable a man to maintain himself for little more than a halfpenny a day; and provisions of all kinds are so abundant, that the markets of Liverpool, Glasgow, and Bristol, are actually overloaded with Irish produce. Such is the condition of this part of Ireland; I speak only of this province, with which I am best acquainted, and I will defy any man to contradict the statement which I have made. It may be said that I have exaggerated the picture of our prosperity, and that such a state of things is incompatible with a general confession of the distracted state of Ireland. But the elements of prosperity are to be found in the never-failing resources of a rich soil, a hardy and industrious people, and a neighbouring market, ready to receive all our produce. But, with such advantages, and with such resources, there is one ingredient which poisons all our blessings, and which, it is vain to deny it, meets us in every station, in every society, and in every undertaking—I mean the state of our religious and political dissensions, or, in other words, the Catholic Question. I have not staid here for a trifling object, such as to drink the 'Glorious Memory,' or cheer the 'Prentice Boys. It is my duty, as I am here, to state to the Meeting my opinions with respect to that great question; and I beg the attention of this company to the description of the condition to which, in my opinion, this subject has reduced the

country. Instead of an exclusive devotion to the business of life, and an industrious pursuit of professional occupations, the only certain road to wealth and eminence, this question has made every man, from the peer to the peasant, a politician ; it is the absorbing topic of every man's discourse, and it is, in consequence, the fruitful parent of exaggerated fears, of unmeasured pretensions, of personal hatred, of religious fury, of political strife, of calumny, of abuse and persecution, such as is not to be found in any other part of the civilized world. No matter what your pursuits—no matter what your disposition may be, the subject pursues you in every part of the country. It is the prevailing topic of your breakfast table—of your dinner table—of your supper table ; it is the subject of debate among men—it is the cause of alarm among women ; it meets you at the Castle of Dublin—it meets you at the house of the country gentleman ; it creeps into our Courts of Justice ; it is to be found at the Grand Jury : it is to be found at the Petty Sessions ; it is to be seen in the vestry room ; it is to be seen at the markets and fairs ; it is to be found even at our places of amusement—it meets you wherever you go. Would that the evil ended here—but we may see what the mischief of such a state of things must be in the convulsed state of society, and the annihilation of all those ties upon which the well being of society depends. The state of Ireland is an anomaly in the history of civilized nations—it has no parallel in ancient or modern history ; and being contrary to the character of all civil institutions, it must terminate in general anarchy and confusion. It is true that we have a Government to whom an outward obedience is shown, which is responsible to Parliament, and answerable to God for the manner of administering its functions ;

but it is equally true, that an immense majority of the people look up, not to the legitimate Government, but to an irresponsible and a self-constituted Association, for the administration of the affairs of the country. The peace of Ireland depends, not upon the Government of the King, but upon the dictation of the Catholic Association. (*Cries of more's the shame ; why not put it down ?*) It has defied the Government, and trampled upon the law of the land—and it is beyond contradiction that the same power which banished a Cabinet Minister from the representation of his county, because he was a Minister of the King, can maintain or disturb the peace of the country just as it suits their caprice or ambition. (*Hear.*) The same danger impends over every institution established by law. The Church enjoys its dignity, and the clergy enjoy their revenues by the law of the land ; but we know not how soon it shall please the Catholic Association to issue its anathemas against the payment of tithes ; and what man is hardy enough to say, that the Catholic people will disobey its mandates. It depends upon the Catholic Association, no man can deny it, whether the clergy are to receive their incomes or not. (*Uproar.*) The condition of the landlords is not more consoling ; already they have been robbed of their influence over their tenantry—already they are become but mere ciphers upon their estates ; nay, in many places they are worse than ciphers, they have been forced to become the tools of their domineering masters, the Catholic Priesthood, and it depends upon a single breath, a single resolution of the Catholic Association, whether the landlords are to be robbed of their rents or not. So perfect a system of organization was never yet achieved by any body not possessing the legitimate powers of Government ; it is powerful, it is arro-

gant, it derides, and it has triumphed over the enactments of the Legislature, and is filling its coffers from the voluntary contributions of the people." (*Uproar, cries of no, no, they are not voluntary.*)

The Chairman here interfered and said, you are bound to hear every observation that falls from a speaker. When the next gentleman rises to speak to the succeeding toast, he will, on his legs, have an opportunity of controverting the statements of my honbl. friend. But, surely, in an assemblage like the present, common courtesy demands that every gentleman should be heard to the end.

Mr. DAWSON resumed and said,—“As far as I know this country, I did not think I should have required the interference of my friend, Sir George Hill, to procure me a hearing of what my views were of the present state of the country. What I say is, that the Catholic Association, by securing the voluntary contributions of the people, consolidates to itself a power from which it may supply the sinews of war, or undermine by endless litigation and persecution, the established institutions of the country. Such is the power of this new phenomenon; and I will ask any man, has it been slow to exercise its influence? In every place where the Catholic population predominates, it is all-powerful and irresistible—it has subdued two-thirds of Ireland by its denunciations, more completely than Oliver Cromwell or King William ever subdued the country by the sword. The aristocracy, the clergy, the gentry, are all prostrate before it. In those devoted regions, a perfect abandonment of all the dignity and influence belonging to station and rank, seems to have taken place; or if a struggle be made, as in Clare, it is only to insure the triumph of this daring autocrat. In those parts of Ireland where the Protestant and Catholic popu-

lation is pretty equally divided, the same influence is felt, if not in so aggravated a degree, at least so mischievously, that comfort and security are alike uncertain. Amongst the two classes we see distrust and suspicion, a perfect alienation from each other in sentiment and habit, and an ill-suppressed desire to measure each other's strength by open warfare. The institutions of society are reviled, the predominance of authority is lost, the confidence of the people in the impartiality of the courts of justice is impaired, the magistracy is condemned or supported according as it is supposed to lean to the Orangemen or the Roman Catholic, and even trade and barter are regulated by the same unhappy distinctions of religious feeling. Such, gentlemen, is the picture of this country, a country possessing every material by the bounty of God, and the intelligence of its natives, to become great, powerful, and wealthy, but in which every hope is blasted, and every exertion frustrated, by the unhappy dissensions of its inhabitants. And now, gentlemen, it is time to ask ourselves the question, what must be the result of such a disordered state of things, and such a complete overthrow of all the relations of society? Some gentlemen will say rebellion—and the sooner it comes, the sooner we shall be able to crush it. (*Loud cheers, which lasted for several minutes.*) Now, I entertain a very different opinion—it is not the interest, and I firmly believe it is not the wish, of the Roman Catholic leaders to drive the people into rebellion. (*Loud hisses.*) We have the best security for the purity of their intentions (*hisses*) in that respect, in the stake which they hold in the country, and in the moral conviction that they would be the first victims of a rebellion. (*Loud cries from several voices, no, no, we should be the first.*) If a rebellion should take place, it will not

be from the orders or example of the Roman Catholic leaders—but from the readiness of the two contending parties to come into conflict with each other, and from the total impossibility of checking the ebullition of popular phrenzy, if the two parties be goaded and exasperated against each other by inflammatory speeches, or exaggerated misrepresentations. But the result will be a state of society far worse than rebellion—it will be a revolution—a revolution not effected by the sword, but by undermining the institutions of the country, and involving every establishment, civil, political, and religious. There never was a time when the whole Catholic body (and it signifies very little whether their number be two millions or six millions)—there never was a time when the whole body was so completely roused and engrossed by political passions as the present. They have found out the value of union; they have put in practice the secret of combination; they feel a confidence in the force of numbers; they have laid prostrate the pomp and power of wealth; they have contended against the influence of authority, and the decrees of the legislature, and they have enjoyed an easy triumph over both. At present there is an union of the clergy, the laity, and the people. The clergy and the laity are the contrivers, but the people are the tools by which this extraordinary power has been gained; but soon they will find their own force, and some audacious democrat will start up, who will spurn all restraints, civil, political, and spiritual, and who will consign the whole power of Ireland to an absolute and senseless mob. Now, gentlemen, with such a state of things staring us in the face, (and I do not think that I have overcharged the picture,) there comes the last question, what is to be done? The country confessedly contains great advantages; it has

made a wonderful progress, notwithstanding these drawbacks; it has confessedly the elements of wealth and prosperity within itself, but all is checked and counter-balanced by these unhappy discussions, and the invariable conclusion of every speculation on the state of Ireland is, what is to be done? Can we go back to the penal laws? God forbid that such an experiment should be made; it is revolting to common sense—it is revolting to the dignity of man. Can we persevere in our present system? The statement which I have made, and the firm impression made upon my mind by an anxious attention to passing events is, that we cannot remain in our present situation; something must be done; there is but one alternative, either to crush the Catholic Association—(*Loud cheers, which lasted for several minutes,*)—there is but one alternative—either to crush the Catholic Association, or to look at the question with an intention to settle it. Let us exercise all our ingenuity—let us argue with all our subtilty—there is no other alternative; and with such a conviction on my mind, I feel myself called upon to exhort my countrymen—men whom I have the honour of representing—to abstain from irritating harangues, to pause, and to weigh well the dangers of the country—to dismiss all personal bitterness from the contemplation of a whole nation's welfare, and to devise some means, with satisfaction to all parties, for restoring the predominance of established authority, and giving security to the recognized, the legal, the constitutional institutions of society. I speak here as a member of Parliament, as a member of the Government, and as a citizen of the world. Is it possible that I can look with apathy upon the degraded state of my Catholic countrymen? (*Loud hisses.*)—I cannot express too strongly the contempt I feel for the per-

sons who thus attempt to put me down. If the representation of the county depended upon the votes of those who interrupted me, I would not condescend to ask them, though their suffrages would secure my return. I must know, mixing as I do in the world, and holding the high situation I do, how the interests of Great Britain are wrapped up in the safety of Ireland. There is but one topic more before I conclude an address already too long. A threat has been held out that the North of Ireland, and this county in particular, is to be visited by some itinerant demagogues, to stir up the elements of discord. Let them undertake this task at their own peril. There never was a time when the Protestant proprietary were more determined to rise as one man to resist such an invasion. The attempt will be hopeless, utterly hopeless; but let them pause well on the consequences. They will meet here a sturdy, a bold, a determined, and, if driven to retaliation, a fierce yeomanry—they will be answerable to God and man for the floods of blood that will flow from such an attempt; no power can control it; but upon them be the responsibility. Let their deluded victims also reflect upon the fate which will attend them. If once the kindly tie which binds them to the landlord be broken, the result will be, not a quiet submission of the landlords, but a transfer of their lands to Protestant tenants; thousands are to be found in this county who want such lands, and the force of numbers will no longer protect them, as it has hitherto done their deluded brethren in the south. I speak these words in kindness and advice to them. With respect to myself, I shall be found at my post, and ready to make every sacrifice in defence of the rights of my country, the character of its gentry, and the support of the constitution." The hon. gentleman then resumed his seat.

This speech appeared to cause a great sensation in the room. A reverend gentleman wished to question Mr. Dawson concerning his new principles, but the chairman would not permit the order of the meeting to be disturbed. It was alluded to in the course of the evening, in rude and angry language, by several of the speakers, who expressed generally sentiments of the most hostile nature against their Catholic countrymen.

Extract of a Letter, dated Thurles, September 1.

“The scene which took place in this town yesterday, puts all description at defiance. Picture to yourself a dense mass, comprising about 40,000 persons, filling our entire town, of which nearly half were from the distant and neighbouring parishes, and composed of the *ci-devant* belligerent factions, their friends, allies, and relatives, all marching in one grand procession, one half mounted, the rest on foot, preceded by their respective rustic musical bands, and coming to lay upon the altar of their country, in the face of the world, their quarrels and strifes; and to cement, by a glorious union of heart and hand, that happy reconciliation, for the introduction and establishment of which alone, the hero of the Clare election should be immortalized, and for the consummation of which, Irish feeling has entitled itself to a well-deserved reciprocal tribute, in the removal of those flagitious laws, to the existence of which is traceable all the unfortunate discord and lawless insurrection, that have been generated and fomented by the prolonged political mismanagement of as fine, generous, brave, and magnanimous a people, as ever nation could rejoice in. Good God! what reflections do not these facts call up! By what preposterous de-

moniacal infatuity is such a noble people outlawed upon its own soil, and consigned to the fatal consequences of premeditated misrule, and the anomalous delegation of authority, so basely abused, to the paltry minions of a heartless, pusillanimous faction? Why is not such a people judged by the conduct that it can prove itself capable of evincing, if (as in the present instance) but a glimmering of hope appears in the perspective?

“I have the strongest guarantee for the assertion, when I pronounce that disposition unsophisticated, that I was witness to the illustration of, in the zeal of every individual in that vast multitude, to diffuse and generalise the spirit of kindly feeling, union, and brotherhood. The incidents and anecdotes of the day, which would be too far beyond the limits of my purpose to detail here, would put down all scepticism upon the subject, and convince any man who was not unwilling to believe it, that the congregation of such numbers of people was exclusively directed to the noble and sacred object of establishing peace and unity, and of annihilating for the future, by an obvious recurrence to the past, all those intestine feuds which the Catholic Association has at length taught them to discover, were calculated only to bring home to them disgrace and misery, and blight every prospect of happiness at their peaceful firesides.

“To see them in their rudeness—to witness the singular propriety and decorum they observed—and, above all, the remarkable forbearance and self-denial studiously practised in such an assembly of ‘mere Irish’ (for they refreshed themselves only with a single pint of beer and a little bread) one could hardly, even shrouded in his prejudices, withhold from them the homage of candour, in an

unqualified admission of their sincerity and admiration of their views. They would win even Peel himself, if he be at all possessed of a soul.

“They called themselves ‘pacificators,’ and they incontestibly proved that it was not a misnomer.—They are so in reality. The ‘schoolmaster’ has been amongst them, and they can now use a *big* word, and understand its meaning too, for pacification was the reigning ruling principle.”

Tipperary, September 18.

About 4,000 men, belonging to some of those parties which have hitherto disturbed and disgraced this county, peaceably assembled in Golden, on Sunday last, for the purpose of being reconciled to each other.—Major Carter, at the head of a large party of police, commenced reading the Riot Act, when the Earl of Llandaff appeared, and requested that the Major would withdraw the police, which, being complied with, his lordship placed himself in the centre of the people, by whom he was received with the greatest enthusiasm, and addressed them on the necessity of conducting themselves temperately;—they told his lordship that they met to be friends, and to follow in future the advice of Mr. O’Connell (whose portrait they bore on a flag) never to quarrel again. His lordship approved of their good intentions—admonished them to refrain from the use of spirituous liquors, and to return quietly to their respective homes, adding, that they would always find in him a friend and protector. The immense multitude then heartily cheered the noble and popular Earl, and soon after separated in peace.

“ Cortolvin-Hills, Monaghan, Sept. 23, 1828.

“ SIR,—I inclose £25, Catholic Rent, and I request the honour of being admitted a member of the Catholic Association. I need not, I am sure, remind my Catholic countrymen, that I have long been a zealous and an ardent advocate of their just rights. Hitherto, it is true, I have not been in the habit of attending the Association; it was because I knew the battle of Irish freedom must be won in England—and I conceived that I could present myself with more effect to that generous, manly, but sometimes mistaken people, as one unconnected with Catholic proceedings, and be a better evidence, divested of the character of a partisan: but now, when I find an infatuated few congregate themselves into political clubs, and miscall themselves ‘the Protestants of Ireland;’ when I find them anticipating torrents of blood (to be shed to preserve an invidious monopoly), telling the King’s Representative ‘he should be made to know their power; and that 400,000 men were organized, and ready to spring into the field;’ when I perceive that such proceedings were calculated (if not intended) to dictate to the authorities, to supersede the equitable administration of the laws—to arrest the progress of liberality and intelligence, and bring the unhappy party divisions of this country to an appalling crisis; I think the best evidence I can give England of my deep abhorrence of such dangerous measures is, openly, distinctly, and unequivocally to identify myself with your Association; the objects of which are just and natural, the proceedings of which are open, and founded, not upon the principles of the ascendancy or domination of any one class over another, but upon that principle which at once combines the perfection of legislative wisdom with Christian charity—equal rights and privileges

to all. I therefore feel I am called upon, as a Protestant, to enrol my name, at this juncture, among the active and energetic friends of civil and religious liberty. I call upon every honest Protestant to do the same, and to protest against the name of Protestant being usurped and profaned by those who, whatever may be the private virtues of some of them, neither represent the sentiments, the rank, the property, nor the intelligence of the Protestants of Ireland. Permit me, sir, to take this opportunity of expressing my sincere conviction of the utility and justice of the steps the Catholics have lately taken, to purify the representation of this country. A great law authority has lately said, 'he had been averse, when in the Irish Parliament, to the Union, because he dreaded Irish questions would be neglected, in the United Parliament; that he found his error by the readiness with which all Irish questions were attended to.' I am at issue with this learned authority. The affairs of Ireland are not attended to in the imperial legislature—measures relating to this country are usually introduced late—after the Irish members are departed,—are generally passed without discussion, or discussed without ability. Some excellent, able, and patriotic members for Ireland, there undoubtedly are; I have the happiness of knowing some of them. But, neglected and ill-treated as Ireland has been, it requires representatives of no ordinary qualifications to regenerate her fallen fortunes; men peculiarly gifted by nature, and prepared by cultivation, for the arduous task of bringing the affairs of Ireland, as they ought to be, before the British House, are now required: one such representative you have—Mr. O'Connell. I have not had the honour of personal intimacy with that gentleman—I know him only as a public man—neither do I always

agree with him in isolated expressions, or particular measures. But he possesses so high an order of mind—has acquired, by habit and cultivation, so just and intimate a knowledge of Irish affairs—and an eloquence so commanding, so varied, and so calculated to impart the knowledge he has acquired; his general principles of public policy are so wise and just, and withal he has an integrity of purpose so unquestionable, that he seems as if proved and prepared—as one destined to be the great instrument of regenerating our unhappy country. Mr. Grattan got £50,000 from his country (and he merited it) for an act which only gave political freedom to a small portion of the people. Mr. O'Connell aspires to make the nation free. I believe, in law, he is entitled to exercise the full privileges of a representative in Parliament, as member for Clare. It remains to be seen whether the tribunal which exercises the power of constructing the law, will misconstrue it, in order to exclude him. If not, he will be the representative of Ireland. But, whenever he can exercise the privileges of a member of Parliament, and that period cannot now be long delayed, I trust, I shall find the munificence of a grateful people enabling Mr. O'Connell to devote the great powers, now divided with his professional duty, solely to the benefit of his native land.—I have the honour to be, sir, your very sincere servant,

“ *To Edward Dwyer, Esq.*

ROSSMORE.”

This letter was received by the Association, at a meeting of which it was read, with the most enthusiastic cheers.

September 25th.

In a speech delivered at the Association, Mr. Sheil said: “I rise in obedience to a strong sense of political duty, to

call upon the Association to adopt immediate measures, if not for the controul, at least for the regulation, of the extraordinary excitement, which has recently manifested itself in the south of Ireland. I am well aware, that I have been considered as an alarmist. My fears, however, spring not from any danger of my own; but I confess, that if courage consists in seeing my country covered with the blood of its people, with indifference, I do not possess that kind of intrepidity. It does appear to me, that men are not sufficiently aware of the results which may ensue from the unparalleled excitation, (for it is without example) to which the passions of both Catholics and Protestants have been raised. It is recorded, that in a great combat, so fierce was the fury of the contending armies, that they were not conscious of the earthquake by which the field of battle was shaken. In this terrific contest, in this shock of faction, we do not perceive that the country is rocking beneath our feet. I do here repeat, that the government, (for with them all the blame must ultimately rest) by allowing the Catholic question to convulse the country, and not at once interposing for its adjustment—by their strange procrastination, and almost imbecile indecision—by their fantastical irresolution, and unaccountable infirmity of purpose, have caused the mind of Ireland to be infuriated to such a point, that we are almost at the mercy of accident, and that any unfortunate contingency might throw the country into a convulsion. The oldest man who hears me, does not remember a parallel of national passion. Before the rebellion, the people were not organized and determined as they are now. The reason is this, that at present, it is not needful that conspirators should go forth amongst them, and swear them into resolution: their own emotions have thrown them into an

almost self-created confederacy, the sense of injury has pressed them into combination. It is not the conspiracy of a few, but the union of all; it is not the machination of individuals, but the organization of a whole people.—What is to be done by the Catholics, or rather by the Association, in which the Catholic power is concentrated and condensed? Turn your eyes to the south of Ireland. Do you see nothing there? For my own part, I behold not only most extraordinary objects, which are visible to every eye, but I see great results, rising like phantoms, from the events which are actually passing, and of which the transition from prognostication to reality is not difficult. What is taking place? [Here Mr. Sheil described the meetings of the peasantry, of which an account has been given above.] Now, Sir, I am at a loss to see any benefit to be derived from these meetings, beyond the bare evidence which they afford, of the colossal power of the people, which bestrides the aristocracy; and of that amazing strength perhaps there has been given proof enough. I had rather show the government the giant in repose, than exhibit the mighty stirring of his limbs. It is excellent to have this giant strength, but it is rash to use it after this gigantic fashion. The people are reconciled; the government must see pretty clearly what they would do, at a signal. (God forbid it ever should be given!) Enough has been done—and I own that I see many objections to these assemblies. First, they are not of our calling. We may have prepared the public mind, and rendered it susceptible of the feelings from which these meetings derive their origin; but we have not called them. I do not desire to see any assemblies of Roman Catholics, excepting such as shall be under the immediate directions and controul of that government which we have established.

We have hitherto exercised a useful controul over the passions of the people, and have taken care to present to them none but legal and constitutional objects of political pursuit. But let us have a care. Let no spirits be permitted to rise, except such as we shall evoke. Let us be so wise in our magic, that no power shall ascend except at our bidding ; and let us beware, lest some spirit may appear, who shall disobey the spell—who may trespass on the boundaries we have traced—who shall destroy the circle, and hurry the enchanters away. Mark me, then. We have not called the strange meetings which have recently appeared ; and let us in time, and while the dispositions of the people are still under our dominion, let us forbid their recurrence.....We are assailed as the disturbers of the public mind, and as the authors of national confusion. It is alleged, that we play in wantonness with the popular passions, and thrive upon the disturbances of the country. Of this calumny, let us afford, in the measures of this day, a triumphant refutation. Let us shew ourselves the guardians of the nation's peace, and the sentinels of its tranquillity. Let us prove to the government our profound solicitude for the pacification of Ireland, and how willingly we should co-operate, if they would give us leave, in lulling its turbulence into peace. Let us also hold out the people themselves a great and most useful lesson. Let us teach them that the only true road to liberty, is through the exercise of those prerogatives and powers, which are not only compatible with, but are given by the constitution. Let us tell them that they will, that they must, at length overthrow all obstacles, by acting upon a system of peace and bloodless union. We should speak to them thus : ' Become masters of the representation of Ireland ; consummate the great work of Waterford, and

Louth, and Monaghan, and Clare. Annihilate the power of the Orange faction, and set the aristocracy at nought ; fight them at the hustings, for that is a field in which victory is secure.' ”

Mr. Sheil concluded by moving a series of resolutions, among which were the following: “ That while the Association congratulated the people upon the cessation of party feuds and animosities, they implored them to discontinue their meetings ; humbly requesting the different parish priests of the county of Tipperary, to second the views of the Association in this respect, and requesting Mr. O’Connell to use his interference, by an address to the parties concerned.”

How far this was effected, will be seen in the two documents that follow.

October 1st.

O’CONNELL’S ADDRESS TO THE PEASANTRY OF
TIPPERARY.

“....Rely on the Catholic Association ; we will not sleep at our posts—we desire to obtain liberty for the Irish people ; but we desire to do it by raising the moral and religious character of that people. Let me strongly advise you to be regular and constant in your various dutieswe disclaim the assistance of the idle, the profligate, the vicious. Religious and moral men are those alone who can regenerate Ireland. The greatest enemy we can have, is the man who commits any crime against his fellow-man, or any offence in the sight of his God. The greatest enemy of the liberty of Ireland, is the man who violates the law in any respect, or breaks the peace, or commits any outrage whatsoever.

“ My friends, my beloved brothers, cultivate your moral and religious duties. Avoid every kind of crime ; avoid

as you would a pestilence, all secret societies, all illegal oaths; seize upon any man who proposes to you any oath or engagement of a party of a political nature. I denounce every such man to you as a 'blood-hound' in disguise. Treat him as such, and drag him before a magistrate for conviction and punishment.

"Rely on it, also, that I will not lose sight of the great work of the pacification of the county of Tipperary. I am proud of having begun that great and glorious work. We, my friends, and brothers, will not leave that work unfinished. You will, I am sure, desist from those large and unnecessary meetings, and I promise you to mature a most useful plan. That plan, when matured, I will submit to the Catholic Association of Ireland—and if it meets the approbation of that learned, intelligent, and most patriotic body, I am sure you will adopt it, and that it will spread all over the land.

"The outline of that plan will be to divide the people for all political, moral, and religious purposes, into numbers, not exceeding one hundred and twenty. That those one hundred and twenty should elect among themselves a person to take charge of the whole, under the name of a 'Pacifator.'—No man to be a 'Pacifator,' but a man regular in his religious duties, and, at least, a monthly communicant. The 'Pacifator' to have power to nominate two persons to be called 'Regulators,' under him, and the three to be responsible that no crime, or outrage, or violation of the law should be committed by any of the one hundred and twenty. On the contrary, that they should assist in the preservation of the peace, in the prevention of all crimes, in the suppression of all illegal societies, in the collection of the Catholic Rent, and in all other useful, legal, and honest purposes.

“ It would be part of my plan, that the name and residence of each ‘ Pacificator’ should be transmitted to every neighbouring magistrate and police station, be advertised in the newspapers, and enrolled in the books of the Catholic Association.”

“ *October 8th.*

“ ADDRESS TO THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION OF
IRELAND.

“ Three thousand of your countrymen—that portion of the mechanics, working classes and inhabitants of Clonmel, who, on Sunday, the 28th instant, were prepared with flags, music, dresses, and decorations, to proceed to Clogheen, to join the immense body of their countrymen there assembled, for the purpose of sacrificing their feuds and differences on the altar of our common country; approach your enlightened body, with the expression of our confidence, admiration, and gratitude.

“ We yield not to any class of his Majesty’s subjects in attachment to the throne, and obedience to the laws. We belong not to any faction—we wish not to exhibit any party colour to injure the feelings of any portion of the community. The green badge which we intended to wear, we believe would be worn by Irishmen of every creed, in any other country, and is considered as the national colour of our emerald isle, as the rose is of England.

“ Sensible of the great benefits which our beloved country would derive from the establishment of internal peace, we hailed its general announcement with joy— beheld its celebration here with the liveliest emotion—and we were therefore anxious to be witnesses of the last bond of union at Clogheen; our venerated clergy, how-

ever, perceived and admonished us of danger. Your mandate of prohibition was received. We reverence our clergy—we respect you—we refrain from joining the meeting; and thus render the tribute of our submission to your guidance, and of obedience to your advice; and trust that, when your wishes are sufficiently manifested in this country, that our fellow-countrymen will follow our example.”

October 25.

FROM A SPEECH OF MR. SHEIL, AT THE PROVINCIAL
MEETING OF MUNSTER.

“ The Irish ascendancy do not elect the Irish members. They are returned by the Catholic body, and, at this day, the Association commands far more votes than the whole of the Irish proprietors. We are masters of the representation. This is the pivot of the case. We have wrenched their influence from the gentry; and the Protestant who draws rent from thousands of acres, is almost as much destitute of power at an election, as the peasant without a rood. Is not the country agitated by the most dreadful passions? Does not a tremendous organization extend over the island? Have not all the natural bonds by which men are tied together, been broken and burst asunder? Are not all the relations of society, which exist elsewhere, gone? Has not property lost its influence—has not rank been stripped of the respect which should belong to it? Do Waterford, and Louth, and Clare, supply no reminiscences and no warnings? So much for Catholic indignation, while we are at peace—and when England shall be involved in war—I pause—it is not necessary that I should discuss that branch of the division, or that point of the cloud which, charged with thunder, is hanging over our

heads. One act of legislative wisdom can break and disperse it. I have done—I have treated the question as one of mere expediency, and put the great Captain to his election. One of the two parties is to be offended, according to his view. Conciliate both, if you can—if you cannot, which is it wisest to please? Let him choose—let him elect between a nation and a faction; between thousands and millions; a powerless aristocracy, and an almost irresistible people. Does he want votes in Parliament? We have them. Does he want soldiers? The Orangemen will give him the blood of the Catholic—the Catholic will give him his own. (*Cheers.*) I do not think he will long continue to hesitate. Events have become our advocates. The Russian trumpet is pealing in our favour—a voice is heard from Constantinople, which cries, ‘set Ireland free!’ and inscribed on the white flag that streams from the navies of France, as, laden with gallant men, they are wafted to the Morea, it is easy to discern, through the telescope of the mind—EMANCIPATION.” (*Loud and continued cheering.*)

APPENDIX.—No. VII.

LETTER OF DR. DOYLE, TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON, K.G., &c. &c. &c.

“MY LORD DUKE,—It ought not to be a matter of surprise to any one, that the writer of this letter should address your Grace. Your late speech on the Catholic question has led some to think, and confirmed others in the opinion, that you are anxious to settle that question finally. I have been at different times engaged in the

consideration or discussion of the Catholic claims. I have bestowed on them all the attention and study of which I am capable, and should I now be so fortunate as to render the slightest assistance to your Grace by the further application of that study and attention, I should both gratify my own wishes, and contribute something to the public good. It is true that your Grace is supposed by many to have entered fully into the views of those who have doomed the Catholics to perpetual exclusion, notwithstanding that you have thought proper, as head of the government, to abstain from harsh language towards so large a body of the King's subjects, and even to let in a glimmering, resembling the light of hope, upon the gloom which envelopes them. There are others who think that your Grace, like all the statesmen who have gone before you, would be regulated in your policy more by necessity than by preconceived opinions; and that whilst, in compliance, perhaps, with your own sense of duty, or if not, with the wishes of those on whose support you depend, you would willingly postpone the Catholic question to an indefinite period, yet that you are disposed to watch the course of events, and even to enter into an alliance with your Catholic countrymen, should your foreign allies cease to be your friends. Fear is the beginning of wisdom; and though the Irish were not to be feared, the state of England, and of her foreign relations, may produce a salutary dread, even in your mind; and out of that fear may spring those wise and healing measures which it is our most anxious desire you should adopt. Having before us, the state of Europe, and not of Europe only—knowing, as we do, the difficulties which beset us at home, we may, though not endowed with more than ordinary foresight, discover that, at no very distant period, your Grace may be

seriously and sincerely disposed to settle finally and amicably the claims of the Catholics. My object, therefore, is to offer before-hand my feeble assistance to your Grace, so that if the time should arrive 'when something may be done,' you may avail yourself of it; but should that time not arrive—should peace be re-established on the continent, should our trade and manufactures flourish—should our income exceed our expenditure, and England enjoy as heretofore, both peace and plenty, then the reflections which I am now about submitting to your Grace, may lie, with the parchment of our petitions, buried in oblivion.

“I will proceed, however, on the supposition, that men in power are upright and sincere; and with a most anxious wish on my part to assist in pointing out the way to avoid those difficulties which appear to impede the progress of our claims to a satisfactory adjustment.

“From a perusal of the late debate in the House of Lords, I infer that the opposition to the Catholic question, on constitutional grounds, was and is confined to a very small number, a number, perhaps, not exceeding the minority who voted against the repeal of the Test and Corporation Laws, and that the majority opposed to the Marquis of Lansdowne's motion consisted principally of noble lords who are only anxious to have competent securities provided against the danger apprehended to the Church and State, from the admission of Catholics to the privileges of the constitution. The position of the question is thus altered; and if circumstances urged the settlement of it, that settlement could not be long retarded. It is difficult to suppose in a case where great interests are concerned, and those engaged in conducting them have only to settle details, that an agreement may not quickly be come to, if the parties so engaged are ani-

mated by a spirit of peace and concord, if they proceed with good faith and a sincere desire, by mutual allowance and concession to hasten—not obstruct, the consummation of their labours. In political questions, as in war, the end proposed is security and peace; and whilst the parties combat in the field, or employ all their resources in preparing for action, they secretly make overtures of peace to each other, and often sign the preliminaries with arms in their hands. 'Tis so at present with the Catholics, and those who are opposed to them: they have contended, and will still contend; but they are, on both sides, wearied of the combat, and anxious, many of them, to bring it to an honourable and safe conclusion. Let wisdom, then, supersede violence, and amicable discussion take the place of force. To you, my Lord Duke, it belongs to proclaim a cessation, not in any ambiguous language, which only serves to excite to new exertion, but in terms plain, distinct, and intelligible. You cannot say to the sea of our troubles, 'be still,' nor to the tempest which rages in Ireland, 'do not blow.' We are a nation grown up to manhood, and the only force which can subdue us, without ruin to the State, is the force of equity. But, though strong, and daily waxing stronger by exertion, we desire most earnestly to conclude our struggles. Our cause is just; those great principles which have informed Europe, are operating in our favour; we are supported by the voice of wisdom herself, and by the sympathies of the entire world; we are not doubtful of the issue of the contest in which we are engaged; for if young, we are vigorous—if poor, we are frugal—though dispersed, we are united; there is no luxury, nor corruption, nor wasting principle, within us; and, such is our devotion to the cause in which we are engaged, that, let it require a sacrifice of 10 per cent.

or 20, upon our time, our labour, or our income, we are prepared, from the peer to the peasant, to offer it up on the altar of our common wrongs. But, with all the confidence which this knowledge of ourselves and of our situation inspires, we are prepared to desist from our pursuits if your Grace only invites us to do so, in a manner suited to your own dignity, and to the justice and importance of our cause. We are willing even to precede your Grace, and to assist you by our most zealous co-operation, to remove whatever obstacles are opposed to the adjustment of our claims. You are reported to have said, 'let our agitations cease, and, perhaps, something may be done.' Even in those expressions, vague and indefinite as they are, we would fain discover a disposition to peace; and though they will not cause us to desist from exertion, but rather prompt us to increase it, they induce me to offer to your Grace the following reflections on the subject of those securities, on which the adjustment of our question is now admitted to depend.

"The nature and object of 'Security' is to provide against danger, either existing or apprehended.—The principle of the securities required of us is, 'to provide against the danger to which the Constitution in Church and State may be exposed, if Catholics be placed on the same footing in the State as their Protestant fellow-subjects.' The danger to be guarded against is supposed to arise from the encroachments of the See of Rome, or from the influence which the Irish Catholic Clergy are supposed to possess over the laity of their communion.

"In providing security against the apprehended danger, it is required on the part of the Catholics, and conceded by those opposed to them—1st, That the former are to enjoy the free profession and exercise of their religion in

all its integrity—2d, It is required and conceded in like manner, that the relations of the Catholic Church in Ireland with the holy see, is a subject distinct from the influence of the Irish Priesthood over the Irish Catholic laity—3d, The danger apprehended from Papal influence, and that supposed to arise from the influence of the Irish Priesthood over their flocks being distinct, the securities to be applied to them should also be distinct.

“ Thus, in the re-establishment of the Gallican Church, under Buonaparte, the future relations of that Church with the See of Rome were determined by a *Concordat*, whilst the co-operation of the French Clergy with the Government was provided for, and secured by, the ‘*Lois organiques*.’

“ This *Concordat* and these *organic laws* are referred to, not as precedents to be followed, but as illustrations of the distinctness to be observed in treating of the relations of the Catholic Church in Ireland, and of the influence of the Catholic Clergy over the Irish People!—these are, in reality, two subjects not only distinct but different—nay, so different, that the influence of the Pope over the Irish Clergy, and that of this Clergy over the Catholic people of Ireland, might increase or decrease in an inverse ratio; and hence it is that, supposing danger to be apprehended from both these sources, the securities to be provided should not only be distinct but different.

“ Let the latter of these subjects be first examined.

“ The influence of the Catholic Clergy over the laity of their communion, arises partly from the nature of the Christian religion, and the ministerial duties which the Clergy in every Christian Church, but especially in the Catholic, are called on to perform, and it arises in part from the state of society produced by the past and present system of government pursued in Ireland.

“ This influence, so far as it arises from the first of these causes, cannot be removed, if, as has been conceded, the Catholics are to enjoy the free profession and exercise of their religion in all its integrity; nor is it desirable either to remove or diminish it, as it tends, of its own nature, to preserve order, to inculcate submission to the law, and obedience to every constituted authority. But on the other hand, the clerical influence arising from the state of the law and the system of the Government is liable to great abuse, and may be justly considered dangerous.

“ How is this danger to be remedied, and what security can be devised to provide against it? It appears to me, that if the cause which produces this influence were removed, the influence itself would cease, so far as it arises from that cause; and if the laws were made equal, and the Government administered impartially, that such clerical influence as is liable to abuse would disappear altogether. At all events, this mode of providing security should be first tried; for if novel or suspected measures were resorted to, new evils might be created, the salutary influence itself of the Clergy might be impaired, even religion might become less sacred in the eyes of the people, than which no greater evil could happen in Ireland.

“ If, after this mode of proceeding were adopted, the Catholic Clergy were found to exercise an improper influence, to excite apprehension, the Government, supported by the good sense of the people, and assisted by the Catholic Bishops, could make and enforce such regulations as would effectually confine the Priesthood to the discharge of their own professional duties. As this influence now exists, it is likely to increase and become still more liable to abuse.—It may be found, in some time, regardless of all restraint, or employed in the subversion of that which

it would be its duty to preserve; but if the laws were equalized, and the Government impartial, it would be powerful only for good; or if it diverged into any undue course, it could be restrained by measures which, if now adopted, would be liable to suspicion, and therefore should fail of their purpose.

“As to the intention, perhaps generally entertained, of neutralizing this influence by the employment of gifts or pensions, in purchasing the Irish Catholic priesthood from among the people, to whom by blood and profession they belong, that is impossible. Whether a legal provision could hereafter be made for them on such terms as would be satisfactory to all parties, is to me extremely doubtful; but I know that, if it were attempted, the attempt should be made only when Ireland is pacified, and a new mind and temper infused into the people:—even then, the arrangements should proceed on the principle of affording relief to the laity, rather than of providing comforts for the clergy.

“A provision, as now spoken of, is confessedly intended to attach the clergy to the state, by detaching them from the people, and the people from them. The consequences of it, as calculated, are ‘to diminish the strength and purity of the Catholic religion, and thereby promote the security of the Established Church.’ With such impressions abroad, no arrangement of the kind can be made—indeed, no such arrangement ought to be made. The Catholic clergy never will partake of any provision, of whatsoever description, which will render them liable to even a suspicion of being detached from the people, and the Established Church can never find her security in the moral degradation of any priesthood. Let the question which excites all the passions, which generates every where

distrust, jealousy, and contention, be settled; and then, such an arrangement as that now mentioned, may be calmly considered, and, if found practicable, equitably adjusted. There is no necessity for its hasty adoption, and in the present circumstances of the country, and of the opinions prevailing with different parties, it cannot form any part of the designed securities.

“Having thus briefly, but with perfect candour, placed before your Grace my ideas as to one species of danger, against which security is to be provided, and having pointed out that security, which is, in my opinion, effectual, and placed within our reach: I shall now discuss the other apprehended danger, point out the security suited to its nature, and which, like the former, is of easy application, and by no means inaccessible to your Grace.

“In considering the means whereby to guard against the encroachment of the see of Rome, it is necessary to have precise ideas of the dangers to be apprehended from it, as there can be no necessity of guarding against that see more than against any other, unless it be in the power of the Pope to do some injury to the British state or government, or interfere with the legal rights or privileges of its subjects.

“One class of the encroachments of the see of Rome, against which our ancestors were often called upon to guard, was the collation to ecclesiastical benefices, whether the subjects were natives or strangers—a second class, nearly connected with this, were the legal privileges claimed by the clergy, for both their persons and property, as exempt from the civil jurisdiction; of which privileges the Pope was the official and legally recognised guardian.

“The statute of Elizabeth, abolishing the papal supremacy, power, and jurisdiction within this realm, and

establishing in its place that of the sovereign, has put an end to these two classes of encroachment, and to all the matters of provision and appeal growing out of them.

“The next danger or encroachment proceeding from the see of Rome, consisted in the ancient and often-exercised pretension of the Popes to depose the Sovereign of these realms, and to absolve his subjects from their oaths of allegiance to his Majesty. This danger is removed, or sufficiently guarded against, by the univeral and uniform opinion of Catholics and Protestants in this country, if not throughout Christendom, that the Pope has no such power of deposing sovereigns, or of absolving subjects from their oaths of allegiance. This danger is still further removed by the disclaimer of the above-mentioned papal pretension being embodied in the oath of allegiance as taken by Catholics.

“As every species of apprehended danger or encroachment of the see of Rome might justly be reduced to one or other of the above heads, and as the papal supremacy and jurisdiction within these realms are abolished by law, and as the oaths taken by Catholics and Protestants include a direct and express disclaimer of the doctrine of the deposing and dispensing power of the Pope, it would seem to follow that all the securities which could be desired for the safety and protection of our constitution and government against the encroachments of the see of Rome, are already in our possession—and that whilst we profess, and perhaps think, many of us, that we are seeking securities against papal encroachments, we are only apprehensive of our own Irish Catholic subjects, and endeavouring, at the suggestion of our own fears, to provide against the growth of the Catholic religion in Ireland. This is a reflection worthy of serious consideration; for if this be

the case, all the efforts to settle the Catholic question, whilst it continues on its present basis, must prove abortive. They cannot succeed; for if the proposed settlement proceed on the admitted principle that 'the Catholics are to be permitted the free profession and exercise of their religion, in all its integrity,' and that its existence in this shape is at the same time sought to be weakened or counteracted, under the pretence of guarding against papal encroachment, good faith is wanted, and the parties treating can never arrive at a satisfactory adjustment.

"I would, therefore, presume to submit to your Grace, that if the existence of the Catholic religion in Ireland be an object of apprehension, or a danger to be guarded against, it ought to be met fairly, and considered upon its own merits; or let the proselytizing societies be reinforced; or a second crusade organized and employed against it; but let not the danger supposed to arise from it be confounded with the encroachments or apprehended dangers from the see of Rome, with which, in reality, it has no connection.

"I know this religion is hated gratuitously by some, and your Grace has, on a late occasion, witnessed the excess and folly into which a person of high station has been betrayed, in yielding to the zeal which animated him against it. You have heard another, of a widely different character and mind, endeavouring to conciliate prejudice by indulging in remarks upon this religion totally unworthy of his talents and his wisdom. You have heard it said 'that the Irish once had a Christianity pure and undefiled, but which afterwards Norman English overlaid with superstition.' It should have been said, 'that previous to the arrival of the English, and for centuries before their coming, the Irish Church was perfectly independent, though

in occasional communication and uninterrupted communion with the see of Rome; but the lumber of the decretals, the tithes, and all that was odious and burdensome in papal power and clerical dominion, were of Norman-English importation; and as to superstition, that 'it is an excrescence of our rude nature rather than of religion, but an excrescence from which no church or nation ever was exempt.' To men labouring under superstition may be applied the saying of the poet:—

*Nemo nam sine vitii nascitur
Optimus est qui minimis urgetur.*

What one man calls religion, another calls ceremony; whilst a third designates it 'superstition.' Where the extreme begins, or the mean ends, whether in belief or practice, a wise man will not pretend to determine; and he who looks at human nature, passing through ages like sand through a time glass, may abound in his own sense, but will not pretend to fix a standard to which mankind must conform under the penalty of losing their reputation. One thing, however, is certain; additions made to the essential practices of true religion, and which may be designated 'superstitious,' are not so noxious in themselves as that casuistry which would trifle with the name of God, and call him to witness what is true only by implication, or in a sense inconsistent with the words we utter.

“ But to return to the subject under consideration.

“ That the state of the Catholic Church in Ireland, or rather the attitude and movements of those who belong to it, excite strong apprehensions, is evident; but in my poor opinion, a thorough knowledge of our position, good faith, and conciliatory disposition, such as ought to exist between the inhabitants of the same country, and the subjects of the same king, are alone necessary to remove

those apprehensions, and bring all our unhappy differences to a satisfactory adjustment.

“It may appear to your Grace, as it does to many others, that the Catholic Church in Ireland ought to be paralyzed, by inducing the Pope to co-operate in placing the appointment of her bishops in the hands of the King, whilst the arrangement entered into for that purpose would be designated ‘a security against papal power or encroachment.’ But this would be a proceeding inconsistent with good faith, equity, or any of those principles whereby freemen should be governed, or their hearts united in affection to the throne, leaving out of view the anomaly of a Protestant government, calling in the aid of the Pope to assist them in pulling down the liberties, whether civil or religious, of their own subjects. I would say to those who would cherish such views, “Be generous to the Irish—spare the Constitution—do not indulge your jealousy of us to the enslavement of our priesthood—the King does not require the patronage of our Church—he cannot understand her interests, nor be a Protestant and be anxious to promote them. Leave us a free people—let us exert all our energies, and if you confide in our oaths, which have never been violated, or in our honour, which has never been tarnished, you will not have hereafter to repent of your own generosity, or to complain of our ingratitude. You may, by imposing bonds upon us, remove the alarm felt by some timid churchmen; but you will give a death-blow to freedom in Ireland, and inflict upon our common Christianity the deepest wound. The Catholics of Ireland excite apprehension! They do, and justly; for they are numerous, powerful, and discontented; but let them be admitted fully and freely to all the blessings of the Constitution, and if their hearts be of flesh, if

they have children and love them, if they have property and value it, if they have law and privilege and prize them, if they have a country and almost adore it, they will be among the best, the most loyal, the most devoted subjects in the realm. The Pope to them would be almost unknown or unthought of; but their country, their laws, their religion, and the government which promoted their interests and watched over their welfare, would engross all their respect and all their affection.'

“It is thus, may it please your Grace, that the danger from the growth of the Catholic religion in Ireland, which danger, fear, or fanaticism alone has created, should be provided against, and not by measures founded upon false pretences—measures having for their object to weaken or disturb our Church, whilst it was virtually or expressly stipulated that she should be left free to struggle against all the difficulties with which, in her humble state, she must always and necessarily be encompassed. But then, it may be asked, is nothing to be done to secure the Constitution in Church and State against the danger to arise from papal encroachment? Yes; these encroachments are to be even still more effectually shut out than they are at present, by closing up the only channel through which by possibility, they might operate. The state is already perfectly secure against them; but I would be anxious to see the Catholics of Ireland equally secure. At present, and for the whole of the last century, they have not been molested; but they are liable to inconvenience, and even to be vexed and troubled by the Pope, whilst he holds in his hands, as he now does, the unqualified right of appointing bishops to the Catholic Church in Ireland. My object would be to have the right of electing those bishops vested in those who have the most

direct and immediate interest in their appointment; and by an arrangement which would effectually exclude all foreign influence or encroachment—providing at once for the interest of the Irish Catholics, and satisfying those Protestants who are still so weak-minded or misinformed as to entertain apprehension of the Papal power.

“How a measure of this kind could be effected, appears to most people a question difficult of solution. It is difficult, without doubt, but the difficulty arises, not from the nature of the thing itself, but from the state of distrust and alienation in which the Catholics are kept by the government. Were the government to act frankly and cordially with the Catholic clergy and people, and availed themselves of the support to be thus obtained, propose to the Pope an arrangement, having for its object to render the Catholic Church in Ireland more national, and the appointment of its prelates entirely domestic, there is little doubt but such a proposal, properly urged, would be acceded to.

“An arrangement of this sort, by which the Pope would agree to vest in some one of the Irish Catholic prelates such power in matters of conscience and ecclesiastical discipline as is now exercised by some congregations of Cardinals in Rome, or such as has often been committed to legates of the holy see, and which would also authorise some persons or body of persons to elect native clergymen to the office of Bishop, so often as such office became vacant in the Catholic Church in Ireland—reserving to himself the same right only of rejection, as is reserved to him with regard to the Bishops-elect of France, Belgium, or Germany—such an arrangement as this, simple and precise as it might be, would answer every purpose which could be reasonably desired. The question then above

proposed, which appears to many so difficult and intricate, is in fact simple and easy of solution. By the arrangement, the outline of which has just been sketched, the right of electing the Catholic Bishops in Ireland would be transferred from foreigners to some body of electors, natives of the country, subjects of the King, to men bound by their allegiance, by their oaths, their interests, and their duty. The intercourse with Rome would be diminished, and almost cease, if the extensive powers, relating to cases of conscience and matters of discipline, before alluded to, were vested in some Irish Bishop or Bishops, selected by the Pope, and approved of by the government. Any remaining correspondence on spiritual or ecclesiastical matters, might be made to pass through the hands or office of such Bishop or Bishops, and be subjected to such rules and regulations as would be agreed upon, and specified in the arrangement with the See of Rome.

“ In treating of this subject, two reflections naturally suggest themselves—the first is, that if the government thought it advisable to imitate the conduct of other states, by entering into an arrangement with the Pope for the regulation of the Catholic Church in Ireland, it should not proceed on the principles of distrust, but of confidence in its own subjects; for, to depend more on papal aid, to adjust our civil relations, than on the tried fidelity, loyalty, and interests of the Irish Catholics, would be, in my opinion, not only an oversight in policy, an infringement of our rights as British subjects, and a disparagement to our government and country; but it would give an advantage in the discussion to the court of Rome which she ought not to have. For what has Rome to lose by the rejection of a proposal to which the Catholics of Ireland are not a party?

“The second reflection is, that a proposal made to Rome by the Government, acting in concert with the Irish Catholic Clergy and people, would not only be irresistible, if well conducted, but would, at the same time, operate most beneficially on the public mind and feeling at home, and ensure a favourable reception to an arrangement, which if entered into under suspected circumstances, might be looked upon with indignation or treated with contempt.

“I have said thus much upon securities, not because I consider them necessary, for danger to the Constitution is as likely to proceed from Mecca as from the Vatican; but because I think an arrangement such as I have mentioned would be useful to Ireland, and would serve to allay the apprehensions of those whom your Grace is, perhaps, obliged to satisfy. Were I a Minister of the King, I would say to His Majesty—‘Sire, if you govern Ireland justly, and give to your Catholic subjects the full benefit of equal law, they will be contented, faithful, and loyal, and among the foremost to resist all encroachments on the constitution of the country, or the prerogatives of the crown. But should they act otherwise; should they become forgetful of their allegiance—regardless of their oaths and interests—traitors to their King and country, which I deem impossible,—then your Majesty can earn the applause of mankind, and the approbation of your own conscience, by restraining and punishing them—even as much as you now do, by not extending to them all the constitutional blessings to which they aspire.’

“To my colleagues in office, I would say—‘The Papal influence which is feared, may be considered as it has been found to operate since the gradual but general, and now universally acknowledged, extinction of that power in the

civil concerns of the European states. If, then, in the first place, this power were to continue such as it now is, and such as the present notions of mankind doom it to be hereafter, no security beyond those which we possess is at all necessary. For a disposition to revive a power which would not be respected, but condemned, cannot exist on the part of the Pope, unless he be totally destitute of common sense; and to suppose that the Catholic bishops in Ireland would be induced, by such a Pope, to violate their oaths, and become hostile to a government and country which cherishes and protects them, is to suppose them not only capable of the most atrocious crimes, but equally destitute as the Pope himself of common sense and common prudence.'

“The other light in which this papal power may be considered is—by supposing that Europe may retrograde to that state of feudalism and barbarity from which she has been advancing for the last four hundred years. Supposing that this may happen, and that the temporal power of the Pope may advance even more rapidly than it has declined, and that, in its progress, it may attempt to influence the Irish Catholic clergy to become disaffected to the state; we ought to reflect that, in this country, the Pope can have no means of exercising this influence, unless such as are purely spiritual; and is it credible that, with such auxiliaries, he can persuade any body of intelligent men to adopt his interpretation about the two swords of Peter, or persuade them that the kingdom of Christ is other than the Redeemer has described it? But, admitting the worst that can be imagined, is this nation and government to be also blindfolded, and the legislature rendered incapable of providing for the safety of the state

—endangered, as you suppose it may be, by those ecclesiastical traitors, and their fanatical adherents?

“ I have done, my Lord Duke, with this subject—at least for the present; I should not have noticed it, but for the purpose of proclaiming that, as far as my sentiments prevail, there is, in the Catholic body, combined with the most firm determination to persevere in their constitutional pursuits, a disposition to concur, earnestly and zealously, with the King’s government, in settling this great national question, on the basis of preserving and securing every existing institution, whether Catholic or Protestant, in all their integrity. I have the honour to be, my Lord Duke,

“ Your Grace’s most obedient, humble servant,

“ *Carlow, June 19, 1828.*

+ J. DOYLE.”

APPENDIX.—No. VIII.

ON THE IRISH TITHE SYSTEM, FROM “LETTERS ON THE ACTUAL STATE OF IRELAND.”

LETTER IV.—“MY DEAR ———. I approach the subject of this letter with a feeling of reluctance amounting to disgust. The Irish tithe system has long been the theme of reprobation to the most eloquent and enlightened members of the community; nor do I recollect that a palliation of its excesses has been attempted by any person distinguished for integrity or talents. But, although little has been said in defence of the tithe system, a great deal has been done of late to facilitate and strengthen the exercise of those oppressive powers with

which the clergy of the Established Church were already supplied in abundance. An annual exposition in Parliament of Irish tithe grievances, has now become a matter of course; and, amidst the general acquiescence in the severity of the hardship, some new law is introduced, to place the unfortunate tithe payer more securely within the grasp of his reverend oppressor. Such, for the most part, has been hitherto the result of imploring legislative attention to the vexations, the unfairness, and the ruinous policy of this mode of providing for the clergy of the Established Church in Ireland. At the very first step, the injustice is manifest, of compelling a people to support the ministers of a religion differing from their own, and from whom, consequently, they cannot receive those spiritual services on which the only rational claim to that support must be founded. A Church living is not an inheritance; the embryo rector has no special grant from heaven of the unrequited toil of his fellow Christian. His right rests on the express understanding, that spiritual duties should be performed towards the tithe payer; and, where it is notorious that such duties cannot be in any way discharged, what other name than consecrated rapine, can we give to the exaction of tithes by an ecclesiastical sinecurist? The difficulty can be solved only by the good old adage—

‘ For, Protestants still laws shall make,
 And Papists still obey;
 All gain and honour one shall take,
 The other toil, and pay.’

The impious pretence of a divine right to tithes, has been abandoned of late years; but the legislative provisions, by which the wholesome conviction was wrought, were of that fostering and favourable nature, that left the advocates of the tithe system little to regret, in exchanging

the authority of Leviticus for that of King, Lords, and Commons. To say truth, there are certain passages of Holy Writ, touching the allotment of part of the tithes to the maintenance of the stranger, the widow, and the orphan, which make a reference to scriptural authority uncomfortable and injudicious.

“ But, dismissing the question of the justice, or the injustice of the principle, as applied to Ireland,* there cannot be a second opinion as to the unfitness of this mode of provision for the clergy. A Christian pastor is supposed to be called by the immediate inspiration of the Divinity, to take on him the duties of his sacred office. His whole existence should be devoted to the worship of his Creator, and the welfare of his fellow-men. To cheer the afflicted, to counsel the inexperienced, to succour the distressed, to protect the weak, to reprove the wicked, are peculiarly his province; thus causing religion to be respected and loved, by the exemplification of its pure and amiable precepts in his own conduct. What a contrast to all this does the tithe-hunting Irish parson present! From the hour that he is nominated to ‘the cure of souls,’ his attention is incessantly occupied in watching the advance of industry, that he may seize on a proportionate increase of produce. He has scarce any intercourse with his flock, except what arises from pecuniary altercations.

* “ I utterly deny the assertion that the enormous sinecure temporalities of the Irish Church have any necessary connection with the establishment of *the Church of England*. For the cases to be at all similar, the majority of the English nation, being Protestants, should be compelled to build churches and pay tithes, for the benefit of the Roman Catholic minority. In England, the church property is enjoyed by priests who profess the religion of the payers; and if the latter, thinking themselves aggrieved, should claim redress at law, no one dreams of accusing *them* of radicalism, or of disaffection to the state.”

If Providence should crown the labours of the husbandman with a plenteous return, the clerical harpy is at hand to sully and diminish the blessing; and, if a season of blight should frustrate his expectations, the inexorable tithe proctor, nevertheless, attends to make that little less, and to fill up the measure of divine wrath.

“The landlord gives his ground as an equivalent for the rent he is to receive; the amount of that rent is fixed, and the means of recovering it are the known and ordinary laws of the land. But, the amount of tithe is as uncertain as the nature of the claim itself is indefinite and perplexed. It is hardly to be expected that an Irish Catholic should contribute, without some reluctance, to the emoluments of a corporation, which he cannot but consider as the enemy of his religious faith, and which the experience of every day proves to be the inveterate opponent of his political rights. How then can rural improvements be looked for from an Irish farmer, when the first and necessary consequence of the exertion of industry, or the expenditure of capital, is an increase of the unearned and riskless profits of that privileged class, to whom the sweat of his brow was mortgaged even in his mother’s womb? The case has been of recent occurrence in my immediate neighbourhood. A farming society has been established and premiums were offered, for the purpose of favouring the introduction of green crops. No sooner had this been attempted, than the bishop of the diocese, in the receipt of many thousand pounds a year, claimed his share of these green crops, in a parish of which his lordship was the rector, although that description of tillage was altogether new there; and, not finding the usual law authorities sufficiently ample, proceeded to enforce his demand by a suit in equity.

Having thus lightly touched on some of the leading features of this onerous and destructive tax, and exhibited to your view the relative position of the payer and receiver, you may, perhaps, desire to know what remedy is left to the farmer, if he should conceive himself injured by an unjust or excessive demand on the part of the incumbent.

“ As the payment of tithes sometimes rests on custom and precedent, and in other instances is defined by written law, it is very possible that without intending to exceed his legal right, the parson may often inflict intolerable hardship on his parishioners. To give the protecting powers of the legislature their due merit, it must be admitted, that though little facility of obtaining redress has been afforded to the tithe payer, much has been done to confirm the doubtful claims of the Church, and to render the mode of enforcing them more distinct and efficient. If a poor man should be aggrieved by the demand of a clergyman of the Established Church in Ireland, and can pay it without utter ruin, it is best for him to submit; if the amount claimed be such as he cannot discharge, he must fly. For, as to contesting the point in the ‘ Court Christian,’ nothing, save the very phrenzy of despair, could suggest such a hopeless undertaking. Involved in the barbarous intricacies of ecclesiastical law, the tithe system sits secure; the approaches are guarded by extravagant costs and by harassing regulations; and when, after great expence and trouble, the seat of judgment is at length reached, a parson most frequently presides there!

“ A clergyman may cite his parishioners to the ecclesiastical court for a very small sum; or he may cite him for a sum already paid. If the farmer submit at once and pay, all is well; he is ‘ a loyal subject’ and ‘ an honest fellow.’ If, however, he should dispute the parson’s de-

mand, he instantly becomes 'a combining knave' and 'a conspirator against church and state,' at an *unavailing* expence to himself of about fifty pounds—*unavailing*, because, when his case comes on, his counsel, however respectable, may be silenced at once, *ex cathedrâ*;* and when thus exposed defenceless to the attack of his reverend antagonist, if he should call a witness, his testimony may be rejected, unless fresh fees are paid; and, moreover, if the defendant should have contributed to a fund for the purpose of procuring legal redress, whatever evidence he may produce, even should he bring forward the very carman who had been employed by the parson to draw home the tithes for him, and whose testimony can scarce be considered objectionable, the parishioner may nevertheless be compelled to pay the full amount of tithe claimed. No matter at what distance of time the claim is made, nor what degree of credit ought to be attached to a valuation got up under such circumstances, *the farmer must pay the demand*, though, perhaps, it may be double or treble the real value of the tithes that he had given out fairly so many years before, and which had been regularly drawn away by the incumbent.

“It is true, the parishioner may appeal; but the very first step is an expence of five pounds, and the appeal lies to another ecclesiastical court superior in jurisdiction, but agreeing in principle, if not in practice, with the court below; and out of which besides, if the complainant escape at the expence of an hundred pounds only, he may consider himself as comparatively fortunate.

* “Exceeding even the hard rule of Rhadamanthus, the surrogate punishes without hearing the accused either before sentence or after, unmindful of the precept, ‘non licet civem inauditum damnare.’”

“ Now, it may so happen, that an extra demand of ten, or even of five pounds occasionally repeated, according to the conscience of the parson, might be more than sufficient to ruin a poor Irish farmer, who has seldom the means of entirely discharging all the regular legal demands against his property, and must be but indifferently prepared for these ecclesiastical gambols. What is he then to do? The most unfeeling heart must shudder at the last fearful alternative that remains. It has been exemplified too often, and too fatally, in various parts of Ireland.

“ If any individual member of the community, urged by an imprudent indignation at such extortion and mockery of justice, or terrified at the usual consequences of these inhuman proceedings, should endeavour to substitute legal redress for brutal retaliation; then, indeed, the sad condition to which Ireland has been reduced becomes visible in all its weakness and deformity. You may revile religious tenets, you may *complain* of exclusive laws, you may even load the Orange party with every sort of abuse; and they may rebut the charge with a yeomanry bayonet, or fill the columns of their newspapers with all manner of blasphemous buffoonery about the Cross and the Virgin Mary, as objects of peculiar veneration to Papists: all this may be said and done with impunity; in short, there are few displays of theological rancour, or of political vituperation, however offensive to decency and good feeling, that may not be freely indulged in as occasion suits, *provided you keep clear of the Church Establishment*. At the bare mention of any resistance, however just and lawful, to that tremendous power, the ascendancy men, one and all, break out into the most ungovernable fury. Moderate Protestants are alarmed for what they

are pleased to term 'the Keystone of the Constitution,' and feel their growing liberty abate; the very victims of ecclesiastical rapacity themselves, tremble and decline the fierce and unequal conflict.

“One would imagine that the existence, or the welfare at least, of the human race, were at stake; or that the order of the universe were menaced with interruption, when the slightest attempt is made to check the power, or to inquire into the irregularities of the Irish Church establishment. It would seem that among all sects and conditions of men, the very abuses of that establishment are held more sacred than the most essential rights of the people. Thus it was with the inquisition abroad: whoever fell under the displeasure of its ministers, was shunned as if infected by the plague; his friends deplored his fate, and fled from him; and even they who in their souls abhorred that diabolical institution, shrank in dismay from the fearful duty of opposing its abominable jurisdiction.

“It is evident that although the existence of public opinion has been recognized, there is yet but little appearance of public *spirit* in Ireland. Knowing, by repeated experience, the difficulty of procuring redress in ecclesiastical matters, and, that not content with the defeat and the ruin of the audacious complainant, the victorious party mark him for persecution at the first favourable opportunity. The Roman Catholics of Ireland, generally speaking, submit to all the demands of the Church, and witness with desponding resignation, the usual course of oppression, suffering, retaliation and outrage. Neither will the impugner of clerical pretensions receive any decided support from the Roman Catholic priesthood. It has been said, but I am persuaded without foundation, that they are averse to laymen meddling with

rights, or property which, though for the present in other hands, may ultimately revert to their own. There may, perhaps, be a few individuals of that body who are weak enough to imagine, that if the nation were once fairly rid of this incubus of the establishment, it would again court the yoke, and revive these rights, privileges, and perquisites for the clergy of the Church of Rome; but I am convinced, that the great majority of the latter are too well informed, too rational, and, I will add, too sincerely pious, to indulge in any such extravagant vision:

‘*Quæ bellua ruptis
Cum semel effugit, reddit se prava catenis?*’

There is little fame, scarce any gratitude, and still less personal satisfaction to be derived from rousing the implacable hostility of the church, by exposing the tenacity with which it adheres to obsolete claims, and the greediness with which it incessantly seeks to augment its enormous and anti-Christian possessions.

“ He who, in pursuit of public justice, enters the lists with the Church militant of Ireland, must prepare for heavy expence, and for innumerable legal impediments: he will have to encounter all that malice, calumny, and perverse ingenuity can devise to afflict, to injure, and, if possible, to destroy him. Far from meeting that support he deserves, from those for the sake of whom he exposes himself to such annoyance and loss, they look on him as a foolish man, rashly undertaking a desperate and superfluous task, from which no advantage can be derived, and which will probably end in drawing down a heavier vengeance on their heads. Many who would not contribute a shilling to the attainment of constitutional redress, would not hesitate to assist to the uttermost in deeds of

violence, when the terrible account has been opened between sacerdotal injustice and popular retribution.

“ The ordinary vindicators of Catholic grievances carefully avoid interfering in a contest which, they are well assured, must prove troublesome and expensive. If they do express themselves on the subject, they touch it tenderly and briefly, abstaining altogether from any thing in the shape of a practical measure.

“ It has been said, I know not how truly, that previous to passing the act for the suppression of the Catholic Association, in one of the demi-official, mysterious negotiations that we hear of between the government and the ‘ agitators,’ an offer was made to tolerate the continuance of the assembly, provided a distinct pledge could be given that all discussion of matters relative to the church establishment should be precluded.—However this may have been, the leaders of the New Catholic Association, with one exception, seem to have an intuitive feeling, that it is safer to avoid an interference with the ‘ *noli me tangere*’ of church property.

“ It is surprising that the Irish Roman Catholics have not long since perceived that the church establishment is the grand obstacle to the acquirement of their constitutional rights; that the possessors of that unearned and unhallowed opulence are invariably ranked among the foremost and most inveterate of their antagonists; and, what is also important to observe, that the morbid sensibility they betray with regard to the system, the quick and angry alarm with which they bristle up at the mere allusion to the most flagrant abuse, clearly point out how vulnerable the object of such irascible anxiety must be. Shakspeare tells us that ‘ a rotten case abides no handling.’ The day will come, however, when the Irish church

establishment must submit to 'handling'. Revision and consequent reform cannot be averted for ever :—

“ *Capta quidem sero Pergama, capta tamen.*”

“ The sooner this investigation takes place, the greater the probability will be of a peaceable arrangement to the satisfaction of all parties ; but how, or whenever so salutary a change may be effected, there can be no doubt that it must ultimately tend to exalt the character of the Reformed Church, and to promote the real interests of Christianity. In the mean time, I pity the man from my soul, who ventures on the forlorn hope of procuring legal redress for the sufferers under clerical aggression in Ireland. If he should advance boldly to the contest with the sable host, what fearful responsibility he incurs, what days of care, what nights of waking anxiety he must pass ! Uncheered in the moment of doubt and of peril,—unthanked for hard-earned victory, if, by next to a miracle, he should achieve it,—overwhelmed with censure for unmerited defeat !

“ Some few gallant spirits may be found at his side, who, disregarding the dangers and the obstacles in the way, look only to the principle, and generously cling to the remote possibility of success. But, the patriots are dumb, the moderate stand aloof, the press is silent, while the church is vigorous. Treachery, intimidation, and falsehood, are unblushingly and unsparingly employed. They who contribute large sums for the conversion of the Jews, or for the spiritual illumination of the distant heathen, and who can weep over the wrongs of Hottentots—they, too, who figure at the head of public charities, and would make any sacrifice to place Solomon's Canticle in the hands of every youthful female in the land—the illustrious patriots, also, who are in the habit of risking thou-

sands on the turn of a card, or the fidelity of a horse-jockey—Protestants, Catholics, Dissenters, Deists, Atheists, all, all refuse to part with a farthing for the truly charitable, meritorious, and patriotic purpose of curbing tyranny and preventing outrage!

“The editors of the English newspapers, also, appear to take a much more lively satisfaction in recording the excesses of ‘the wild Irish,’ than in recommending measures that might lead to the prevention of crime among them. When these journalists do condescend to occupy a portion of their columns with the sad consequences of tithe exactions in Ireland, the merits of the case are seldom investigated, but a contemptuous malediction is hurled alike at the oppressors and the oppressed, for presuming thus to disturb the imperial tranquillity of Great Britain with their barbarous clamour.

‘————— confounded be your strife,
Presumptuous vassals! are you not asham’d
With this immodest, clamorous outrage,
To trouble and disturb the King and us?’

“As a curious specimen of the proceedings in Irish consistorial courts, I shall copy the notes of a late trial, in a tithe case, taken, among others of the same description, by a Protestant gentleman of fortune and respectability, who was so good as to send it to me, and on whose accuracy you may place the fullest reliance.

““Another case was called on: same plaintiff against another parishioner.

““The tithe proctor swore to the value of the crops, and amount claimed by the plaintiff.

““The defendant’s proctor then urged in defence, that this citation must now be dismissed, as the statute enacted that two suits could not be instituted for the same tithe. That a citation had been served on his client for the same tithes for a former court day. That

his client had attended, and the cause was actually heard, for a decision had been made by the surrogate. He now, therefore, prayed a dismiss, with costs against the plaintiff. The court admitted there had been a former citation in this cause. It was true the case had been called on a former day, but the merits had not been entered into; it had been dismissed without prejudice, and therefore did not come within the meaning of the statute. Defendant's proctor stated that he was instructed by his client differently; for that a positive decision had been made; that his client had been *decreed*, and *that with costs*; and which costs so given against him by the *court*, his client had actually paid to the Rev. Mr. ———, the plaintiff, and *he had got his receipt*, and that the court could not now proceed, without violating the statute.

“ ‘The court remarked that there was no proof of this assertion, and that it must now proceed.

“ ‘Defendant's proctor replied, the court had the means of knowledge within itself; it could refer to its own records. And he appealed to the registry-book then in court, lying before them on the bench, and would now proceed to examine the registrar as a witness.

“ ‘The court said it would not order the registrar to give evidence, the registrar might do as he liked. That, if the defendant wished to have a search made in the registry, he must pay the fees for making it, and that the court would not exert authority to deprive the registrar of fees he was entitled to.

“ ‘Defendant's proctor then called on Mr. ———, the registrar, to say, whether his client had not been decreed with costs, on a former day, in this cause?

“ ‘The registrar said he would not answer, unless ordered by the court.

“ ‘The court said it would not order the registrar to

forego his fees : that it was open to the defendant to take out an attested copy of the entry in the court-book ; he was sure Mr. —— would make the copy on being paid his fees, and the court would receive it as evidence : that the court could not tell which way the former entry might cut, but if the defendant wished for it as evidence, this was the regular way to obtain it.

“ ‘ Defendant’s proctor wished to know what was the legal fee ?

“ ‘ The court understood an attested copy was *six shillings and eight pence*

“ ‘ Defendant’s proctor thought he could arrive at the fact by another way ; as the court did not think it necessary to search its own records to ascertain whether it could legally proceed now. He now held in his hand a receipt in the plaintiff’s own hand-writing, for the costs paid by the defendant pursuant to the decree obtained on a former court-day. He trusted this would be conclusive that there had been a decision already on this cause. He then handed the receipt to the court. The surrogate, perceiving that there was no stamp on the receipt, apparently became very indignant, that His Majesty’s revenue should suffer by such a fraud on the stamp act, rolled up the receipt, and *flung* it at the proctor, ‘ wondering he could presume to offer such a document to a court !’ [Query. Was a stamp required by law, the sum being under two pounds, Irish currency ?]

“ ‘ The poor defendant, nearly distracted, in a very feeling manner said, Mr. —— is sitting there opposite to me ; I am sure he is an honourable gentleman ; I appeal to himself, he knows I paid him the amount of the costs, and that he gave me this receipt ; I am sure he will not deny his own hand-writing.

“ ‘ Mr.—stood up and said, ‘ Indeed, my good man, I would, in any other place, be most happy to answer any question you might ask me. You know I never refused to converse with any of you; but *here* I cannot answer you; I am under the guidance of my proctor.’

“ ‘ The defendant gave a long sigh. His proctor said he supposed he had no resource now left, but to pay a fee to the registrar for making a search. To which the court assented, and wished he had done so long since, as the time of the public had been wasted by this useless discussion, and there were a great many other causes to be disposed of.

“ ‘ Defendant’s proctor then handed the registrar *two shillings and sixpence*, and requested him to take his *legal* fee out of that, which the registrar did, returning the *balance!*

“ ‘ The registrar, on referring to the entry made in the book of the proceedings of the former court-day, after a considerable pause, said, ‘ Before I read the entry I find here, I must state that I am not answerable for any mistake that may be in it; I was absent on that day, and two persons were sworn in court to do the duty of registrar for the time.’ He then read the title of the cause, and that defendant *had appeared*, and *was decreed with costs*; he supposed it must have been a mistake.

“ ‘ The court agreed that it must be a mistake. Defendant’s proctor contended his client had a right to a dismiss now against the plaintiff, with costs. That an extract from that book would be evidence in the superior court, and was, of course, evidence in this; that his client was not to suffer for the mistakes of the officers of the court, and had already, if it was a mistake, been substantially injured in having to pay costs under that order of the court.

When the surrogate suddenly exclaimed, ‘It is a mistake, I know it’s a mistake; I have a right to correct the mistakes of this court, and I now decree the defendant in the full sum claimed by the plaintiff.’

“The registrar had pocketed his fee; the former record stood amended; and the defendant, who was at the expence of setting the court right, now hoped, at least, the court would deduct the sum he had paid in his own wrong by the former order of the court, from that which it now ordered him to pay to the reverend plaintiff. He was answered, that the court had nothing to do with it, and would not interfere; it was a private transaction. The poor fellow, then, with tears in his eyes, made a similar application to the Rev. Mr. —, who, however (out of consistency, it must be presumed, the question being asked in court) returned no answer; and, in order that JUSTICE might be no longer impeded, the crier shouted ‘silence!’ and the other causes were then disposed of, according to the rules and regulations of a ‘Court Christian.’*

“I shall make no comment on this report; but you can no longer be surprised at the harsh terms in which I have expressed myself relative to such modes of administering ‘justice.’

“The Church rates exhibit another very oppressive feature of the ecclesiastical proceedings in Ireland. It is galling enough for people to be taxed without their consent, for the purposes of building or ornamenting Churches, for the accommodation of a few persons of a different Communion. Formerly, the limits of the law were frequently exceeded; but, from the difficulty and expence, as well as the danger of seeking redress, the imposition was paid

“* I have given this trial *verbatim* from the notes.”

with 'curses, not loud but deep.' At length, the enormous abuses did attract the notice of the legislature; and what was the result? Why, in order to prevent the possibility of an unlawful charge in future, a law was made to authorize, in the fullest manner, every demand that human ingenuity could devise. *This* is the sort of relief that has been afforded to the Irish people, when they utter any complaint affecting the wealth or the influence of the Church, as by law established!

"I am the landlord of two rather extensive parishes, united with several others, to form a leviathan living for the minister of Him who had not where to lay His head. In these two parishes, there is not one single individual professing the reformed faith, nor is there even a tradition of a house of Protestant worship having ever been in either. Nevertheless, my tenantry have always paid a heavy acreable church-rate, and we have been deprived, by a late '*relief*,' or vestry act, of the wretched satisfaction of knowing that the levy was illegal, as it is exorbitant and oppressive.

It is not necessary for me to qualify what I have written regarding the treatment that the majority of the established clergy inflict on their parishioners in Ireland, by the trite admission that there are among the reverend community, as amiable, as pious, and as benevolent individuals as exist in any human society. I am acquainted with several whose conduct is above the reach of censure in every respect; and I am inclined to believe, that if the number of irreproachable ecclesiastics be not greater, the fault may, in a great measure, be laid on the debasing nature of the vile system from which their income is derived; a system that confers recompense for service unperformed, substitutes tables of interest for the tables

of Divine Law, and converts the pious offerings of reverential gratitude into an insulting tribute, rigorously exacted from a vanquished, injured, and therefore not to be forgiven, people.”

APPENDIX.—No. IX.

DR. POYNTER'S OBSERVATIONS ON THE SPIRITUAL SUPREMACY.

The following observations on that declaration in the oath of supremacy, which says, that “*No foreign Prelate ought to have any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Pre-eminence, or Authority, ECCLESIASTICAL or SPIRITUAL, within these Realms,*” were made by the late Dr. Poynter, in March, 1821, and transmitted, by him, to the Managers of Mr. Plunkett's late Catholic Relief Bill. He has herein placed the distinction between *spiritual* and *temporal, ecclesiastical* and *civil*, power and jurisdiction, in so clear a point of view; and has so happily illustrated his positions by one or two cases, in which the two powers would seem to conflict, that our most strenuous adversaries may rectify their confused or erroneous notions on this subject, and thus be induced generously to cease from alarming the ignorant, the prejudiced, and the bigotted part of the community, by the unfounded versions that are continually promulgating of this article of our doctrine.

“ If the Pope *ought not* to have any ecclesiastical or spiritual jurisdiction, &c. within these realms, he ought to have none at all; for he has no civil jurisdiction here. The above clause denies the divine right of the Pope, as head of the Church of Christ, to govern the universal church.

“ What is the proper and obvious meaning of the terms *ecclesiastical* and *spiritual*?

“ The term *spiritual* does not here mean the same as incorporeal or internal: but it means that which in its nature directly tends to a supernatural end, or is ordained to produce a supernatural effect. Thus, sacrifice, which is an external oblation of a sensible victim to God; and the sacraments, which are visible rites, are *spiritual* things, because they tend to the worship of God and to the sanctification of souls. That is called *temporal*, which in its nature and institution, tends directly to the good order of civil society.

“ The power of the Church is *spiritual*; and the power of the state is *temporal*.

“ By the term *ecclesiastical* is properly meant whatever in its own nature belongs to the spiritual power and government of the church—as by the term *civil* is meant whatever in its own nature belongs to the temporal power and government of the state.

“ This is the proper and limited meaning of the terms *ecclesiastical* and *civil*, when the two powers are in a state of separation from each other, and act without any mutual co-operation. Such was the *ecclesiastical* power of the Church under the heathen emperors; such was the *civil* power of the Roman state during the same period.

“ When the two powers are associated together by a friendly concordate, the *ecclesiastical* power has sometimes exercised acts of a *civil* nature, by the *concession* of the

state ; and the *civil* power has sometimes exercised acts of an *ecclesiastical* nature, by the *concession* of the church. In these cases, the term *ecclesiastical*, when applied to courts and causes of a mixed nature, under the jurisdiction of an ecclesiastical person as judge, is to be understood in a less strict and less proper sense. In this sense some of our courts in England retain the name of *ecclesiastical*. It is not in this mixed sense, that the spiritual power of the Pope, and of Catholic bishops in England, is now called *ecclesiastical*.

“ At the change of religion in England, the state totally divorced and separated itself from the Catholic church, and withdrew every portion of *civil* power from the Pope and Catholic clergy, which they had ever exercised in England by the *concession* of the state. Consequently, the spiritual powers which the Pope and Catholic clergy now hold and exercise over the Catholics in England, are **PURELY** *ecclesiastical* without the least mixture of any civil or temporal power whatever.

“ This power and authority, *purely ecclesiastical*, is that which Christ gave originally to his apostles ; and which was, by his ordinance, to be transmitted from them to their legitimate successors, to the end of time, for the purpose of enabling them to preach his faith, to promulgate his new law, to administer his sacraments, to govern his church, and to enforce the observance of his general commands by particular and efficacious regulations. By the exercise of this *ecclesiastical* power, the church, from the earliest ages, without the co-operation of the civil power, has issued many laws and ordinances relating to the form of divine worship, to the manner and circumstances of administering or of receiving the sacraments, to the observance of the great Christian festivals, to the rules of abstinence and to the fast of Lent, to the impedi-

ments and celebration of matrimony, to the conduct of the clergy, to the qualifications requisite for holy orders, to the limits of the jurisdiction of the different orders of the hierarchy, &c. Many such external and purely ecclesiastical regulations, were made by the Church, and enforced among the faithful in different parts of the world, before the Church had any where any connection with the state. The object of the Church in making them was, to enforce the observance of the commands and institutions of Christ; which are not of a temporal nature, but which tend directly to the worship of God and to the sanctification of the souls of men. The means by which the Church enforced the observance of them, were not of a *civil* nature, but were *ecclesiastical* and *spiritual*; viz. the influence of her authority, and the privation of the benefits of her communion. ‘*The weapons of our warfare are not carnal.*’ 2. Cor. x. 4.

“ In establishing and enforcing these ecclesiastical laws and regulations, the Pope has from the earliest ages borne a principal part. Every Catholic must acknowledge that the Pope, as head of the Church, has ecclesiastical and spiritual authority over all the members of the Catholic Church. This authority, which he now exercises over the Catholics in England, is *purely ecclesiastical* and spiritual; it has not the least mixture of any portion of civil or temporal authority annexed to it. It is chiefly exercised here in appointing bishops, and in giving them powers for the spiritual government of the Catholics in their respective dioceses or districts; in superintending the religious conduct of the Catholics; and in granting dispensations from the ecclesiastical impediments of matrimony, when necessity requires. But this ecclesiastical and spiritual authority of the Pope in England, as well as that of the Catholic bishops here, is not invested with any civil formality, nor

has it any civil effect. In its object and in its means, it stands in a very *distinct* order from the civil power of the state. This may be illustrated by one or two cases.

“A Catholic confesses to a priest that he has injured his neighbour in his property or good name. The priest admonishes him of the obligation of making restitution as far as he is able, to the extent of the injury done, if he wishes to be reconciled to God, and to be admitted to the sacraments. The man refuses to make restitution. In this case the priest can only urge him by advice and by command, to comply with this moral obligation; and if he persists in his refusal to do his duty, by refusing to admit him to the participation of the spiritual benefit of the sacraments. But the priest cannot employ any *civil* means, such as imprisonment, fine, &c. to compel him to make that restitution to which he is bound by the law of nature, and by the positive law of God.

“In the same manner, the pope cannot enforce in England the observance of a divine or ecclesiastical precept by any civil or temporal punishment, but only by ecclesiastical or spiritual means; such as depriving a Catholic clergyman of his spiritual powers, or others of the participation of the sacraments and of the communion of the church.

“In cases of impediments of matrimony, on which the laws of England are different from the laws of the Catholic church, the laws of the church have their proper and distinct effect, and are not enforced by any civil means. Suppose then that two Catholics, first cousins, marry according to the forms of the law of England, their marriage is valid and good according to law, as the degree of first cousins is not a legal impediment; but their marriage is considered by the Catholic church as invalid and null, *ab initio*, in conscience and in the sight of God; because

the degree of first cousins is an *impedimentum dirimens*, totally annulling the matrimonial contract in the sight of God. In this case, the Catholic bishop or priest would inform the parties of the invalidity of their marriage, and of the conscientious obligation of their separating. If they refuse to separate, he cannot compel them by any civil means; if they have children, he cannot declare them illegitimate, so as to make them incapable of succeeding to the titles and estates of the father, or of enjoying the temporal benefits of legitimate children. But if they refuse to separate, the priest can refuse to admit them to the sacraments of the Catholic church; and if they have children, these children will be ecclesiastically illegitimate, so as to be incapable of being admitted to holy orders. Hence it evidently appears, that the ecclesiastical and the civil powers are clearly distinct from each other in their means, and effects. Whilst the Catholic is bound by the law of God to acknowledge that the king has temporal authority for the government of the state, he is equally bound by the law of Christ to acknowledge that the pope has ecclesiastical and spiritual authority for the government of the Catholic church, and of all the members of the Catholic church wherever they are. If any Catholic were to swear that the Pope ought not to have any ecclesiastical authority in England, he would abjure the divine right of the Pope to govern the members of the Catholic church; he would abjure the principle of the supremacy of the Pope; he would separate himself from the centre of Catholic unity and communion; he would, *ipso facto*, cease to be a Catholic.

(Signed) WILLIAM POYNTER, V. A.

4, Castle Street, Holborn, March 5th, 1821.

APPENDIX.—No. X.

GENERAL PROOF OF OUR DOCTRINE ON THE EUCCHARIST FROM THE CATECHESSES.

PARTICULAR PROOFS FROM THE FATHERS.

I. Every one who has studied the monuments of tradition on the subject of the Eucharist, must have remarked a singular difference in the expressions of the Fathers, when they speak of the sacrament of the altar. Sometimes they explain themselves with all imaginable clearness, on the reality of the presence of Jesus Christ under the species, and on the change of substance. At other times they designate the gifts offered, by the expressions of symbols, types, signs, figures, representations, or allegories of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. This diversity of language, occurs not only among different doctors, but often even in the same Father; for example, in St. Chrysostom or St. Augustin. The Catholics, with good reason, attach themselves to the passages of the former kind, while they give the most satisfactory explanation of the others. The Protestant sacramentarians build upon the passages of the latter kind, which suit their opinions; and at the same time glide hastily over those of the first description, which overthrow their system. Both parties agree that the Fathers are not to be accused of being contradictory to one another, and still less to themselves. But, as far as I know, neither Catholics nor Protestants have ever yet asked themselves the cause of this difference of language on the same subject; why the fathers, after

having spoken entirely in the sense of the *real presence*, appear in other places to express themselves in that of a *figurative presence*. It is however a duty to make such enquiry; and this is the precise point to be investigated and cleared up, in order to dissipate the slightest cloud, and bring forth in the full blaze of day the true doctrine of the Fathers—the real belief of the primitive Church.

II. The answer to this important question is by no means difficult; and I am persuaded, Sir, that you have not arrived thus far, without foreseeing it yourself, without my suggestion. The Fathers, as you know, lived under the discipline of the *secret*, and observed it so strictly, that they were ready to shed their blood, as were the faithful after example, rather than violate it by betraying the mysteries; and among others, that of the Eucharist. They *could* speak openly of it, without fear, to the faithful, either in their family circles, or in the Church, in discourses delivered before them exclusively: they *were obliged* to expose them with all possible clearness to the neophytes, previous to admitting them to communion, and on the following days.* On the contrary, in presence of

* “On the eve of the great day of Easter and of your regeneration, we shall teach you with what devotion you must come forth from baptism, approach the altar, and partake of the spiritual and heavenly mysteries which are there offered, that your souls being enlightened by our instructions and discourses, each one of you may know the greatness of the presents which God gives him.” (*S. Cyr. of Jerus. Catech.* 18.) “We shall only speak now of things which cannot be explained before catechumens, but which it is necessary, nevertheless, to lay open to those who have been recently baptized.” (*St. Gaudentius to the Neoph.*) “In this paschal solemnity,” said St. Augustin, (*Serm. on the 5th Day after Easter*) “these first seven or eight days are devoted to the instruction of the children (the newly baptized) upon the sacraments.”

the unbaptized the *secret* was scrupulously kept. And you will readily conceive, that if it were prohibited to confide the least portion to a single individual uninitiated, it must have been much more so to speak openly of the mysteries in writings intended for public circulation. "How could it be allowed," says St. Basil, "to publish written explanations of what the uninitiated are forbidden to contemplate?"

III. What then, in these days, has he to do, who would understand clearly the sentiments of the Fathers on the Eucharist? What course will he take to attain his object? It would be the height of folly to seek their belief *in writings where they were not permitted to divulge it*; in those, for instance, which they published against the pagans and heretics of their times: or in discourses pronounced with open doors before catechumens and gentiles. Any sensible man wishing to learn in the school of the Fathers what has been revealed on the subject of the Eucharist, will open those instructions which they gave to the newly baptized. He will take his place, not among the catechumens, before whom they concealed the mysteries; but among the neophytes, to whom it was a necessary duty to display them. These are, in the outset, the writings which any man of sincerity will consult, when desirous of knowing with certainty the doctrine of the Fathers; but the *catecheses* before all, and even them alone, if he would spare himself much labour and research. For with them he is sure to discover what the Fathers believed, and what they taught: and by consequence, with them he may save himself all farther trouble.

Nevertheless, I would advise him to consult another kind of monuments, from which he will derive particular edification without any trouble, and a firmness in faith

most valuable in the evil days in which we live. I allude to the liturgies, which are so evidently connected with the catecheses. In fact, what did these latter teach the neophytes? They taught what passed at the altar. And what else do the liturgies describe?

Both then necessarily contain the same mysteries, the same doctrine, the same creed. What the catecheses put forth in theory, the liturgies exhibit in action. There are the principles, motives and reasons for believing: here, the sentiments of gratitude, love, and adoration which faith inspires. If a more extensive knowledge were desired, it might be found in the sermons preached before the faithful exclusively; for then the orator felt no restraint in expressing himself openly, whenever his subject led him to speak on the Holy Eucharist.

IV. But, at our distance from the primitive times, how are we in these days to distinguish, among so many homilies and sermons, those at which none assisted but the initiated, from those attended by other persons? How, after so many centuries, are we to understand, whether the audience was composed purely of the faithful, or was made up of the faithful and the profane, attracted, perhaps, by the reputation and eloquence of the orator? We shall be supplied in this case, with certain rules, by sound criticism. If the language of the sermon accords with that of the catecheses, if the preacher speaks of the Eucharist as openly as the catechist, we may conclude, with certainty, that the auditory was wholly Christian. But, when the preacher premises, like Theodoret, in his first Dialogue, that he shall express himself "in mystic and obscure terms, because, perhaps, he is speaking before persons uninitiated," when he testifies, like St. Cyril of Alexandria, "a fear of discovering the mysteries to the

uninitiated;”—when he declares, like St. Clement of Alexandria, that he shall “endeavour to say certain things under a veil, and to shew them, while he, in a manner, is silent upon them;” or when he uses that expression, so common to S.S. Chrysostom and Augustin: “*the initiated understand me, the initiated know it;*” or finally, when he seems to use expressions contradictory to those which he has elsewhere employed before the faithful;—then, and in all cases, we are perfectly assured that there were some of the profane among his hearers.

V. These preliminary observations will not appear to you, Sir, as I love to believe, inspired by prejudice; but rather dictated by the spirit of impartial criticism: and if you are desirous of acquiring an exact and thorough knowledge of the primitive doctrine on the Sacrament of our altars, you will doubtless seek out, in the first place, the elementary discourses still extant for the instruction of the neophytes; then the ancient liturgies of the Christian Churches; and finally, the discourses composed exclusively for the faithful. As to the sermons addressed indiscriminately to Christians and others, as also those works intended for the public; knowing that the discipline of the *secret* required the mysteries to be concealed, you will not think of seeking for them in writings of that kind; and when you see your own divines attaching themselves by choice to such works, and quoting passages from them, with self-complacency, you will say to yourself: “what can they mean by such a method? Why enquire of the holy Fathers their sentiments on the Eucharist, in circumstances in which they were obliged to conceal them? What they said at those times was never intended by them to guide us in this matter. To persist in taking them for judges, contrary to their known intention, is

wilfully to deceive oneself and others." This is entirely my opinion. To seek to discover what the Fathers thought on the Eucharist, in writings where they were obliged to conceal their sentiments, and not in those where duty made it a law to expose them openly, is assuredly following a method totally opposed to the dictates of common sense.*

VI. Open then with me the instructions addressed to the neophytes; read again the extracts which I shall point out to you; and remark, if you please, their conformity in doctrine with that of the liturgies. The venerable patriarch, St. Cyril, addressing the neophytes of Jerusalem, thus expresses himself:† “As then Christ, speaking of the bread, declared and said, *this is my body*, who shall dare to doubt it? And as, speaking of the wine, he positively assured us, and said, *this is my blood*, who shall doubt it, and say that it is not his blood?” (Who? Mr. Faber would reply to St. Cyril; I shall doubt it.) “Formerly, at Cana in Galilee, Jesus Christ changed water into wine, by his will only; and shall we think it less worthy of credit, that he changed wine into his blood?‡...Wherefore, with all confidence, let us take the

* Here observe that your divines, when combating the Real Presence, Transubstantiation, or the adoration of Jesus Christ in the blessed Sacrament, never reason from the catecheses, the liturgies, or the sermons preached before the faithful exclusively. At most, they will quote a few insulated phrases from them, carefully concealing what precedes and follows them. You will soon see more than one example of this.

† *Catech. Mystag.* iv. No. 1 and 2.

‡ After quoting thus far, the rector stops short, and says in a note, page 68; “I have selected this passage, because, *so far as I know*, it is the strongest which can be produced from antiquity, in favour of the Latin doctrine of Transubstantiation.” What an appearance of candour! How could it fail to deceive his readers? He knows that the very contrary to what he says is the fact. For

body and blood of Christ. For, in the type or figure of bread, his body is given to thee, and in the type or figure of wine, his blood is given; that, so being made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, you may become one body and one blood with him. Thus, the body and blood of Christ, being distributed in our members, we become *Christophori*, that is, we carry Christ with us; and thus, as St. Peter says, we are made partakers of the divine nature.*...Wherefore I conjure you, my brethren, not to consider them any more as common bread and wine, since they are the body and blood of Jesus Christ, according to his words; and *although your sense might suggest that to you, let faith confirm you. Judge not of the thing by your taste, but by faith assure yourself, without the least doubt, that you are honoured by the body and blood of Christ. This knowing, and of this being assured, that what appears to you bread, is not bread, but the body of Christ, although the taste judges it to be bread; and that the wine which you see, and which has the taste of wine, is not wine, but the blood of Christ.*† And in the succeeding catechesis, where he describes the liturgy of St. James, in use in his time in Jerusalem, St. Cyril prescribes the manner of receiving the chalice in these words: “After having thus

he sees in the same page, and he has seen in my book, the words I have cited in continuation; and yet he has the effrontery to suppress them! I blush to record so unworthy an artifice. How can a man, pretending to prove to his countrymen the truth, conceal it thus wilfully from their sight? I am at a loss for expressions which, without incurring impoliteness, might inflict well-merited correction on this shameful want of good faith. I defy any one, and above all, the champion of figure and moral change, to express Transubstantiation more clearly than St. Cyril does, in the words Mr. Faber has so artfully suppressed.

* *Catech. Myst.* No. 3.

† *Catech. Myst.* No. 6—9.

received the body of Jesus Christ, approach to the *chalice of his blood*, not extending your hands, but bowing in an attitude of homage and *adoration*, and answering — *Amen.*”*

GENERAL PROOF—FROM THE DISCIPLINE OF THE
SECRET.

I. I now pass on to the general proof which I extracted from the discipline of the *secret*; not, however, that I ever insisted that the Eucharist was its *sole, exclusive*, or even principal object. The rector makes me assert this, in his book, though he knows that I never said it in mine; he repeats it to satiety, as if to shew me up to his readers as in error, and enjoy a victory as easy as imaginary. Let him exult; I offer no interruption; I shall not disturb his triumph; I am ambitious of one more real and substantial; I will establish it upon incontestable monuments. Without producing them all, I will present you with several; and if I fatigue you with their number, you must blame the man who compels me to it. You shall see the discipline of the *secret* in vigour, from the epoch of the council of Ephesus, in 431, up to the days of the Apostles.

II. Century 5th. I begin with the celebrated president of the above council: these are the words of St. Cyril of Alexandria, in his seventh book against Julian. He does not notice the objections of that emperor against baptism, but contents himself with saying, that “these mysteries are so profound and so exalted, that they are intelligible to those only who have faith; that therefore he shall not undertake to speak on what is most admirable in them, lest, by discovering the mysteries to the uninitiated, he

† *Catech. Myst.* v. No. 22. This adoration is the same which we have seen in the liturgies rendered to Jesus Christ, under the species, and consequently the adoration of *latría*.

should offend Jesus Christ, who forbids us to give what is holy to dogs, and to cast pearls before swine." Observe, sir, that according to this learned patriarch, the precept of the *secret* discipline comes from Jesus Christ himself: and pray bear in mind this important testimony, which will furnish later the solution of a difficulty which the rector imagines to be insoluble. After saying some little of baptism, he adds: "I should say much more, if I were not afraid of being heard by the uninitiated: because men generally deride what they do not understand; and the ignorant, not even knowing the weakness of their minds, despise what they ought most to venerate."

"It is requisite," says St. Isidore, of Pelusium, "to have in the heart zeal, and the love of virtue, in order to eat worthily the *true and divine* passover. They fully comprehend my meaning, who, following *the sanction of the Legislator*, have been initiated in the mysteries." It was, therefore, by order of the Divine Legislator that they spoke clearly of the mysteries only to be initiated; and the mysteries of the Eucharist were comprehended in the number.

Innocent the first wrote thus to the Bishop Decentius: "I cannot transcribe the words [the form of confirmation] for fear of appearing rather to betray, than to reply to your consultation" ...and farther on: "as to those things which it is not lawful to write, I can tell you them when you arrive."

In the first of his three Dialogues, Theodoret introduces *Orthodoxus* speaking thus: "Answer me, if you please, in mystical and obscure words; for perhaps there are persons present who are not initiated in the mysteries. *Eranistes*.—I shall understand you, and answer you with the same precaution;" and farther on, "You have clearly proved what you intended, though under mystical terms." In the second Dialogue, *Eranistes* asks: "How do you call

the gift which is offered before the invocation of the priest? We must not mention it openly," replies *Orthodoxus*, "because we may be overheard by persons who are not initiated. Therefore speak in disguised and enigmatical terms; a food made of such seed." The same Theodoret, in his preface to Ezechiel, traces up the *secret* discipline to the precept of Jesus Christ. "The divine mysteries are so august, that we are bound to keep them with the greatest caution; and, to use the words of our Lord, these pearls ought never to be cast before swine. For, indeed, men finish with despising what they have obtained without difficulty."

St. Augustin in his discourses before catechumens, or in such writings as might fall into their hands, never failed to conceal from them the mystery of the Eucharist. His ordinary expression was, "*the faithful know it.*" In his fourth sermon on Jacob and Esau, speaking of this mystery, he does not venture to call it the sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, but only "the sacrament known to the faithful, made from corn and wine." In his epistle to the catechumen Honoratus, he says, "We render thanksgiving to the Lord our God in the great sacrament, in the sacrifice of the new law: when once you have been baptized, you will know where, when, and how it is offered." Speaking of the manna in the 12th Treatise on St. John: "We know what the Jews received; and the catechumens do not know what the Christians receive." And in the preceding treatise: "Ask a catechumen if he eats the flesh of the Son of man, and drinks his blood; he does not know what you mean;.....the catechumens do not know what the Christians receivethe manner in which the flesh of our Lord is received, is a thing concealed from them." "What is there hidden from the public in the church?" he says in his first dis-

course on the 103d psalm, "The sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist. The pagans see our good works, but not the sacraments. But it is precisely from those things which are concealed from their sight, that those spring which cause their admiration." And in the 10th sermon on St. John, "Those who know the scriptures understand perfectly what Melchisedech offered to Abraham; we must not here make mention of it, because of the catechumens: nevertheless the faithful are acquainted with it."

III. *Fourth century.*—St. Chrysostom takes occasion from baptism to express himself as follows on the secrecy of the mysteries in general: (*Homil. 40 on 1 Corinth.*) "I wish to speak openly, but I dare not, on account of those who are not initiated. These persons render explanation more difficult for us, by obliging us either to speak in obscure terms, or to unveil the things that are secret: yet I shall endeavour, as far as possible, to explain myself in disguised terms." "Take care not to give that which is holy to dogs, and to cast pearls before swine," says he in his first book on compunction of heart. He takes occasion from this divine precept to declaim against the abuses of granting baptism to catechumens not properly disposed, and admitting to the holy table impure and corrupt Christians. In the letter in which he informs the sovereign pontiff, Innocent the First, of the tumult excited against him in his church, he relates that "the seditious persons, *among whom were many of the uninitiated*, forced a passage to the place where *the sacred things were deposited: that they saw every thing there, and that the most holy blood of Jesus Christ was spilt upon their garments.*" Palladius giving an account of the same sedition in his life of St. Chrysostom, says only that the *symbols were spilt*. You see here the difference of expression: the Patriarch uses no circumlocution in a confidential

letter to the head of the church; but Palladius speaks with reserve, and in disguised terms in a history intended for the public. For the sake of brevity, I will repeat to you the words of your learned Casaubon. "Is there any one so much a stranger to the reading of the Fathers, as to be ignorant of the usual form of expression, which they adopt when speaking of the sacraments, *the initiated know what I mean?*" It occurs at least fifty times in the writings of Chrysostom alone, and as often in those of Augustin."

"I am ashamed," said St. Gregory of Nyssa, to an aged catechumen, "to see that after having grown old in probation, you still suffer yourself to be sent out with the catechumens, like a little weak boy who does not know how to take care of what is entrusted to him; join yourself to the mystic people, and become at length acquainted with our secret dogmas."

St. Gregory Nazianzen says, that the greater part of our mysteries ought not to be exposed to strangers; and further, that "we ought rather to shed our blood than publish them." (*Orat.* 42, *et* 35.)

"We receive," said St. Basil, "the dogmas transmitted to us by writing, and those which have descended to us from the apostles, beneath the veil and mystery of oral tradition—the words of invocation in the consecration of the bread, and of the Eucharistic chalice; which of the saints have left us them in writing? The apostles and fathers, who prescribed from the beginning certain *rights to the church*, knew how to preserve the dignity of the mysteries by the secrecy and silence in which they enveloped them. For what is open to the ear and the eye can no longer be mysterious. For this reason several things have been handed down to us without writing, lest the vulgar, too familiar with *our dogmas*, should pass from being accus-

tomed to them, to the contempt of them. A dogma is very different from a sermon,.....Beautiful and admirable discipline! For how could it be proper to write or circulate among the public what the uninitiated are forbidden to contemplate?" (*On the Holy Ghost, c. 27.*)

Listen to the synod of Alexandria, speaking of the Eusebians, enemies of St. Athanasius, in 340. "They are not ashamed to *celebrate* the mysteries before the catechumens, and perhaps even before the Pagans; *forgetting that it is written*, that we should hide the mystery of the King; and in contempt of the precept of our Lord, that we must not place holy things before dogs, nor pearls before swine. For it is not lawful to *shew* the mysteries *openly* to the uninitiated; lest through ignorance they scoff at them, and the catechumens be scandalized through indiscreet curiosity."*

St. Epiphanius (*Anchor. No. 37*) wishing to prove that the allegories of Origen were to be rejected, and that we must believe things without always seeing the reason for them, quotes the Eucharist as an example. "We see that our Lord took a thing into his hands, as we read in the gospel, that he rose from table, that he resumed the things, and having given thanks, he said, *this is this of mine. Hoc meum est hoc.*" This singular turn of expression and reservation conveyed no meaning to those who were uninitiated. But ought it not to speak very loudly to Mr. Faber? What think you, sir? Does it favour the opinion of a figurative presence? and do you not, at first sight, penetrate the meaning of the enigma?

* These motives were no less strong in the first century, in which the rector gratuitously conjectures that the mysteries were open to the catechumens. The synod was accountable to all the bishops for the catholicity of its condemnation of the Eusebians.

St. Jerome replying to Evagrius, who had consulted him on an obscure passage of the apostle touching the sacrifice of Melchisedech, says; “You are not to suppose that St. Paul could not easily have explained himself; but the time was not come for such explanation: he sought to persuade the Jews, and not the faithful, to whom the mystery might have been delivered without reserve.”

St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, expresses himself as follows, (*Catech.* 6, No. 29.)—“We do not speak clearly before the catechumens on the mysteries, but are obliged often to use obscure expressions, in order that while we are understood by the faithful who are instructed, those who are not so may not suffer injury.” And in *Catech.* 18, No. 32, 33, “at the approach of the holy festival of Easter;....you shall be instructed, with God’s grace, in all that it is proper for you to know; with what devotion, and in what order you are to enter the laver of regeneration,....with what reverence you must proceed from baptism to the holy altar of God, to taste the spiritual and heavenly mysteries which are there dispensed....after the holy and salutary day of Easter,....you shall hear, if it please God, other catechetical instructions....and on the mysteries of the New Testament which are celebrated upon the altar, and had their beginning in this city: all that is taught of them by the divine Scriptures, as also what is their force and power; in fine, how you are to approach to them; and when, and how they are to be celebrated.” Nothing marks more forcibly the importance of the *secret*, than the notice placed by St. Cyril at the end of the preface at the head of his Catecheses; the last five of which disclose the mysteries of Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist. It is as follows: “Give

these catecheses, made for their instruction, to be read by those who approach to baptism, and by the faithful who have already received it. But as for the catechumens, and those who are not Christians, take care not to communicate them to such. Otherwise take notice, you will be accountable to God. If you transcribe a copy of them, do it I conjure you, as in the presence of the Lord."

St. Gaudentius, Bishop of Brescia, contemporary with St. Cyril, speaking to the neophytes on their return from baptism, said to them, "In the lesson which you have just heard from Exodus, I shall choose such parts as cannot be explained in presence of catechumens, but which it is necessary to disclose to neophytes." In another place he proclaims, "that the splendid night of Easter requires him to conform less to the order of the text, than to the wants of the occasion; so that the neophytes may learn the established rule for eating the paschal sacrifice, and the faithful who are instructed, may recognize it." (*Treatise 5, on Exodus.*)

St. Ambrose, in his Book on the Mysteries, c. 1. n. 2, says—"The time admonishes us to treat of the mysteries, and to explain the meaning of the sacraments. If before your baptism and initiation we had thought of speaking to you on these subjects, we should have appeared rather to betray than explain them."

"It is not given to all to contemplate the depth of our mysteries. Our Levites exclude from them at first, that they may not be seen by those who ought not to behold them, nor received by those who cannot preserve them." In his book, *De Officiis*, "Every mystery should remain concealed, and covered by faithful silence, lest it should be rashly divulged to profane ears." And upon this

verse of Psalm 118, *I have hidden thy words in my soul, that I might not sin against thee*: “He sins against God, who divulges to the unworthy, the mysteries confided to him. The danger is not only of telling falsehoods, but also of truths, if persons allow themselves to give hints of them to those, from whom they ought to be concealed.” And he opposes such indiscretion by the words of our Saviour: “Beware of casting pearls before unclean animals.”

IV. *Third century.*—Zeno, Bishop of Verona, in a discourse on continence, exhorts the Christian woman not to marry an infidel, for fear she might betray to him the law of secrecy, *ne sis proditrix legis*. And he adds, “Know you not that the sacrifice of the unbeliever is public, but yours secret? That any one may freely approach to his, while even for Christians, if they are not consecrated, it would be a sacrilege to contemplate yours?” In a discourse on the 126th Psalm, we read these words.—“Custom has given the name of the house of God, or temple, to the place of our assemblies, which are surrounded with walls, in order to secure the secret celebration of our sacraments.”

St. Cyprian thus begins his book against the proconsul of Africa: “Till now I had despised the impieties and sacrileges which thy mouth discharged incessantly against the only true God;” he adds, that if he had been silent, it was not without the command of his Divine Master, “who forbids us to give that which is holy to dogs, and to cast pearls before swine.” He contents himself with establishing the unity of God, without saying a word on the Trinity, or the sacraments of the Church.

Origen, in his 13th homily on Exodus, preparing to treat of the mystery of the Eucharist, says: “I am afraid and doubt much if I shall find suitable hearers, and that

I shall be demanded an account of the pearls of the Lord; where, how, and before whom I have produced them." And in a homily on Leviticus, "Do not stop at flesh and blood, [the lambs and goats spoken of by Moses] but learn rather to discern the blood of the Word; hear what he himself says: *This is my blood which shall be shed for you.* Whoever is instructed in the mysteries knows the flesh and the blood of the Word of God. Let us not dwell on the subject, which is known to the initiated, and which the uninitiated ought not to know."

The very ancient author of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, book 3, ch. 5, admonishes, "that in speaking of mystic things, care must be taken not to be indiscreet, and to express oneself prudently, bearing in mind the words of our Saviour, 'do not cast pearls before swine, lest they trample them under foot.'"

St. Clement of Alexandria, in the 1st book of his *Stromata*, says:—"I pass over intentionally several things, fearing to commit to writing what I took great care not to say, lest those who read these writings should take my words in an improper sense, and we should be accused, as the proverb says, of putting a sword into the hands of a child. There are certain things which the scripture will shew me, though they are not there openly expressed—there are some which it will only touch upon; but it will endeavour to say them under a veil, to disclose them while it conceals them, and to shew them while it is silent."

Tertullian seeking to deter his wife from marrying an infidel if she should survive him, says to her among other reasons: "You would thereby fall into this fault, that the pagans would come to the knowledge of our mysteries... Will not your husband know what you taste in secret, before any other food; and if he perceives bread, will he

not imagine that it is that so much spoken of?" Therefore secrecy covered the mysteries of the Eucharist.

In the liturgy called that of the Apostles, and later of St. John Chrysostom, the priest and deacon bowing down, and each holding a part of the sacred host, make together an admirable confession, which begins thus: "I believe, O Lord, and confess that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, who didst come into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the chief; let me partake of thy mystical supper. I will not reveal the mystery to thine enemies."—Therefore the Eucharistic mysteries were covered by secrecy.*

The author of the *Recognitions*, which are very ancient, since they were translated by Rufinus in the fourth century, proves as follows, the difficulty of preaching before a multitude: "For what is, cannot be said to all as it is,† on account of those who give a captious and malignant ear. *What then will he do who imparts the word to a crowd of people unknown?* Will he conceal the truth? But how then can he instruct those who are deserving? If, however, he exhibits the clear truth before those who are indifferent about salvation, he is wanting to him by whom he is sent, and from whom he has received orders not to cast the pearls of doctrine before swine and dogs who would be furious against it by arguments and sophisms,

* This liturgy is still followed by all the Greeks who are in the West, at Rome, in Calabria and Apulia, by the Georgians, the Bulgarians, the Russians, and Muscovites; by all the Christians, the modern Melchites, under the patriarch of Alexander, resident at Cairo, under the patriarchs of Jerusalem and of Antioch, resident at Damascus.—See P. Le Brun's *Ceremonies of the Mass*, T. 4, in 8vo.

† Book 30.

envelop it in the mire of their sordid and carnal understanding, and by their barking and disgusting replies would tear and fatigue the preachers of God.”

V. *Second and first centuries.*—The secrecy of the first Christians on the Eucharistic dogmas is demonstrated from the unworthy calumnies spread and believed in the pagan world against their assemblies; by the punishments employed to extort from the Christians an avowal of what they practised, and by the origin of these calumnies and cruelties, which dates from the first century.

Tertullian, in his *Apology*, exclaims, when repelling the accusations of infanticide and impurities: “Who are those who have made known to the world these pretended crimes? Are they those who are accused? But how could it be so, since *it is the common law of all mysteries to keep them secret?* If they themselves made no discovery, it must have been made by strangers. But how could they have had any knowledge of them, since *the profane are excluded from the sight of the most holy mysteries*, and those are carefully selected who are permitted to be spectators?” The Pagans then were ignorant of what passed in the assemblies of the Christians; and this ignorance evidently pre-supposes the secrecy preserved by the faithful. The object of this secrecy was the Eucharistic bread; the mysteries of the altar. For these alone could have given rise to the calumnies, while at the same time the sight of them was forbidden to the profane, and permitted solely to chosen spectators. These reports indicate manifestly the sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ.

Let us hear the pagan Cæcilius, in the curious and interesting dialogue of Minutius Felix, which I recommend you to read: “Shall we allow men of an infamous and desperate faction to attack the Gods with impunity; and gathering together an ignorant rabble and credulous

women, instruct them for a profane society, not to say a conspiracy, which is not done by any holy ceremony, but by sacrileges, nocturnal assemblies, solemn fasts, and horrible meats : people who love darkness and fly from the light ; who say nothing in public, and talk incessantly when assembled together,—this evil sect increases every day ; wherefore we must endeavour to extirpate this execrable society. They know one another by certain secret signs, and love one another almost before they are acquainted....Certainly, if there were not such crimes among them, there would not be so loud a cry against them. The ceremony which they observe, when they admit any one to their mysteries, is not less horrible because it is public. They place before the new comer an infant covered with paste, in order to conceal the murder which they will have him commit. At their bidding he gives it several stabs with a knife. The blood runs on all sides ; they eagerly suck it up ; and the common crime is the common pledge of silence and secrecy. Their banquets are also known ; and our Cirtensis makes mention of them in his harangueI pass over many things designedly ; and indeed, here are already too many. And, truly, the darkness which they seek for their mysteries, are sufficiently evident proof of all we say, or at least the greater part of it. For why conceal all that they adore ? We are not afraid to publish what is proper : crimes only demand secrecy and silence.”

Mr. Faber could have no motive to make him afraid of communicating openly to Cæcilius his opinion of a figurative manducation, of a moral change in the substance of the bread, of the real absence of Jesus Christ. The Christian Octavius has no such replies to make. He does not disclose what is believed, nor what is done : he contents himself with repelling the infamous calumnies. “ I would now,” he replies, “ address myself to those who

say, or who believe that the murder of an infant is the ceremony of introduction to our mysteries. Do you then think it possible that a poor infant, a little body so tender, is destined to die beneath our violence; and that we shed the blood of a being newly born, as yet of imperfect form, and scarcely a human being? Let those believe it, who could be cruel enough to perpetrate it. You, indeed, expose your children to savage beasts and birds; as soon as they are born you strangle and suffocate them: there are even some who by cruel potions murder them in their wombs, and kill them before they see the light. This you have learned from your gods....Nor are those far removed from such a crime, who feed on savage beasts just come out of the amphitheatre, all bloody and full of those whom they have just devoured. As for us, we are not allowed to see murders nor to hear them; and blood so fills us with horror, that we do not even eat that of animals. As to the incestuous banquet, it is a calumny invented by the devils to sully the glory of our chastity, and deter men from our religion by the horror of so great a crime. What your orator Cirtensis has said, is rather an injurious accusation than a testimony...But the Christians do not place chastity only in the exterior; they place it in the mind, and do not so much study to appear chaste, as to be so in reality:—and if we are chaste in our assemblies, we are no less so in all other places. Many preserve the holiness of celibacy even until death....”

“If our accusers are asked,” said Athenagoras, “if they have seen what they assert, there will none be found impudent enough to say that they have. How can they accuse those of killing and eating human beings, who, it is well known, cannot bear the sight of a man put to death even justly? Men like us, who have renounced the spec-

tacles of gladiators and wild beasts, believing that there is little difference between seeing a murder and committing one?"

"Those," said St. Justin,* "who accuse us of these crimes, commit them themselves, and attribute them to their gods. For our part, as we have no share in them, we do not distress ourselves, having God for the witness of our actions and thoughts... We entreat you that this request may be made public—that it may be known what we are, and that we may be delivered from these false suspicions which expose us to punishment. It is not known that we condemn these infamous deeds which they proclaim against us, and that, for this very reason, we have renounced those gods who have committed such crimes, and require such. If you command it, we will expose our maxims to the world, that, if possible, it may be converted." Observe, he does not say, we will expose our *mysteries* to the world.

VI. *Punishments employed to extort from the Christians the secret of what passed in their assemblies.* Eusebius has preserved for us the admirable letter which the churches of Lyons and Vienne wrote to those of Asia and Phrygia, on the persecution which they had just suffered in Gaul. We find in it the following passages: "They took some of our servants, who were Pagans, and being filled with the spirit of the devil, and apprehensive of the torments which they had seen the faithful suffer, deposed falsely, through the violence of the soldiers, that we made feasts like Thyestes, that we indulged in the pleasures of Œdipus, that we committed abominations which it is not lawful to think or speak of; and of which we cannot believe that

* Second Apology addressed to M. Aurelius in 166.

any one would have been guilty. When these black calumnies were spread among the public, every one rose up with such fury against us, that our neighbours, who had previously treated us with some moderation, became the most enraged.....The number and cruelty of the torments, which the holy martyrs suffered, are beyond all that we can express.... This happy woman (the heroic servant Blandina) felt new strength as often as she renewed her profession of faith, and found relief and pleasure in repeating—‘ I am a Christian, and no evil is committed among us.’ Sanctus also supported the torments with a constancy more than human; and when in the midst of the most cruel punishments, the impious wretches interrogated him *in the hope of extorting from him by the violence of pain some word unworthy of him*, instead of replying to their questions....he answered nothing else, but ‘ I am a Christian’ .. The devil, who thought he had overcome Bibliada, because she had renounced the faith like certain others, was desirous of crowning her condemnation by calumny; and caused her to be tormented afresh, in order that, weakened as she was by her fall, she might depose against us. But this violence served only to rouse her from her profound lethargy. The punishments which the executioners exercised upon her, made her remember the fire of hell, and she said to them—‘ *How should the Christians devour infants, when they are not even permitted to eat the blood of beasts?*’ She then confessed that she was a Christian, and was numbered with the martyrs..... Those who had renounced the faith were shut up in prisons, as well as those who had confessed it: so far from deriving any benefit from their apostacy, they were arrested as criminals and *murderers*, and tormented more cruelly than the others....They were moreover despised by the Pagans

as cowards who had renounced the glorious character of Christians to become their own accusers of *murder*Attalus having been placed upon the iron chair and burnt, said to the people in Latin, pointing to the intolerable smoke which rose from his body, ‘It is truly eating men to do as you do: but for our part, we do not eat them, nor commit any other crime.’”

In the second apology which St. Justin addressed in 166 to Marcus Aurelius, I read as follows: “But kill yourselves then, all of you, you will say; and you will thus find God, without troubling us with your persons any longer.” St. Justin tells them in reply, that the faith which the Christians have in Providence does not permit them so to do; and he adds, that to justify the calumnies propagated against the Christians, they put to the torture, slaves, children, and women; they made them suffer horrible torments to extort from them a confession of the incests and banquets of human flesh, of which the Christians were accused. “They who accuse us of these crimes, commit them themselves, and attribute them to their Gods. For our part, as we have no share in such horrid crimes, we do not give way to uneasiness, having God to witness all our thoughts and actions.”

Pliny the younger, governor of Bithynia, giving an account of the Christians to Trajan, occasioned by the report which had gone abroad against them, says, that he had determined to take proper measures for ascertaining the truth.

“This made me consider it the more necessary to extort the truth by the force of torments from the female slaves, who were said to belong to the ministry of their worship: but I discovered nothing except a bad superstition carried to excess.”

VII. These calumnies and cruelties take their origin from the first century. Celsus, who writing *with grey*

hairs in the first years of Adrian, must have been born between the years 70 and 80 at the latest, begins with the reproach of clandestine practices, which he often repeats against the assemblies of the Christians. Origen replies, that the doctrine of the Christians was better known than that of the philosophers. "It is true nevertheless," he adds, "that there are certain points not communicated to every one: but this is so far from being peculiar to the Christians, that it was observed among the philosophers, as well as ourselves.....Celsus therefore attempts in vain to decry the *secret* kept by the Christians, since he does not even know in what it consists.* One would think that Celsus sought to imitate the Jews, who *when the gospel began to be preached*, disseminated false reports against those who had embraced it: that the Christians sacrificed a little child, and eat its flesh together."*

"For my part," says St. Justin, "when I, who am a disciple of Plato, heard the Christians denounced in so unworthy a manner, and saw them walking with such intrepidity to death, and to all that was terrible; no, said I to myself, it is impossible that such men should live in the depravity of vice, and the pursuit of infamous pleasures. Is there in fact a man so enslaved to voluptuous gratifications, or of such outrageous intemperance, as to find supreme luxury in a banquet of human flesh; and who at the same time will run gaily to punishments, and throw himself into the arms of death, to deprive himself voluntarily of what he loves?"

From the testimony of Eusebius, Saturninus and Basilides sprung from Menander, who himself sprung from Simon. "The devil," he adds, "who has no pleasure

* *Orig.* Book 1, No. 7—Edit. Bened. T. 1.

* *Ibid.*, Book 6, No. 28.

but in evil, made use of these monsters.....to give occasion to the infidels to cry down our religion.”*.....

“We are traduced,” exclaimed Tertullian,† “as the most wicked of men, bound to each other by an oath of infanticide, guilty of regaling ourselves upon the flesh of the infant which we have just slain ;.....The imputation of these works is dated, as I have said, from the reign of Tiberius. Hatred of the truth began with it; it was detested as soon as produced to the world.”

Finally, we learn from Tacitus, speaking of the burning of Rome, that Nero accused people of it who were odious by their crimes, and called Christians.....“They first apprehended those who confessed; afterwards a great multitude were convicted upon their information, not so much of the burning of Rome, as of hatred of the human race.”‡ He afterwards speaks of them as criminals deserving of death. Could we conceive that a society of men so pure and perfect could have been devoted to the hatred of mankind, if we were not informed by Eusebius and Tertullian of the abominable calumnies which the emissaries of the Jews had spread abroad against them, as early as the reign of Tiberius?

VIII. If Sir, you have paid attention to the passages from the Fathers, which I have now laid before you, relative to the affecting and admirable discipline of the *secret*, you can no longer entertain a doubt on either of the following points—1st, That the origin of this discipline is to be dated as early as the preaching of the gospel, and that it was in vigour in all the churches during the first four centuries—2dly, That the Eucharistic dog-

**Eus. Hist. Eccl.* Book 4, chap. 7.

† *Apol.* ch. 7.

‡ *Annal.* Book 15.

mas were concealed beneath the secrecy observed during this long period.

1. In fact, either we must attribute the discipline of secrecy to apostolic institution, or say, that the Church, after having delivered the mysteries to the public during a century, more or less, decided all at once upon depriving them of the knowledge of these mysteries. To impute to her such a decision, would be to charge her with a conduct most absurd and extravagant; or rather to accuse ourselves of absurdity, and lie open to just reproach. The *secret* so religiously observed in the fourth century demonstrates by the very fact, that it must necessarily have been so observed up to the days of the apostles.* Positive proof of this is furnished by the testimonies which have just passed in review before us. You must have remarked that the greater number of the Fathers, whose words I have cited, many more of which I could have produced, trace the discipline of secrecy up to the precept of Jesus Christ: "take care not to cast pearls before swine." We have seen moreover that the atrocious calumnies spread abroad against the Christians, arose from the privacy of their assemblies, and the inviolable secrecy as to what was done in them; and we learnt at the same time that these calumnies began even in the reign of Tiberius. In fine, it is here that the solidly true axiom of St. Augustin becomes applicable: "Whatever the universal Church holds, and has always held, *without its having been established by any council, is to be justly considered to have come down from apostolical tradition.*" We know of no council which established

* You will find the proof of this full developed in the 1st vol. of the *Discussion Amicale*, p. 350, *et seq.*

the discipline of secrecy; and we are sure that it was observed in all the churches in Christendom. Our witnesses are—for Rome and the whole of Italy, Julius the First, and Innocent the First—for the Milanese, Ambrose—for Aquilica, Rufinus—for Dalmatia, Jerome—for Brescia, Gaudentius—for Verona, Zeno—for Carthage, Tertullian and Cyprian—for Hippo and all Africa, the great Augustin—for Alexandria, Clement and his disciple Origen, and the patriarchs Athanasius and Cyril, and the synod of that famous metropolis in its encyclical letter to all the bishops of the world—for Jerusalem and Palestine, the celebrated catechist Cyril—for Cyprus and the islands of the Archipelago, Epiphanius—for the country about the Euphrates, Theodoret—for Antioch, the queen of oriental cities, Chrysostom—for the towns of Nyssa and Nazianzum, the two Gregories—for Cappadocia and Pontus, Basil—for Helenopolis, Palladius and Sozomen—for Constantinople, Isidore of Pelusium.

In a word, if the discipline of secrecy had been disregarded in one single church of consequence, it soon must have ceased every where else. Suppose that at the end of the first century, some one of the churches founded by the apostles had not conformed to this discipline: what would have been the result? The mysteries would have been divulged from one to another by persons travelling from that diocese into the neighbouring countries, and in a short time the *secret* would have been published every where. Put these various considerations together, and you will agree with me that the apostolicity and universality of the discipline of secrecy are of the number of facts the best attested in history.

2. It is no less certain that the dogmas of the Eucharist were concealed beneath the *secret*. Mr. Faber would

maintain the contrary. He must forgive me if I prefer the testimonies of contemporary Fathers to his views and opinions. You have read them ; almost all declare it in terms so positive, that it is impossible to be mistaken. They even go so far as to name among the mysteries concealed from the profane, the Eucharist, the Christian Passover, the sacrifice of bread and wine, prefigured by that of Melchisedech. And in fact, what could be the object of the infamous calumnies spread against our brethren from the birth of Christianity, but the Eucharistic mysteries ? To what could they allude by their tales of infants murdered, their flesh served up as meat, and their blood as drink—of banquets of Thyestes, &c. if not to the dogma of the real presence, to the manducation of the body of Jesus Christ ? And is it not clear that these abominable imputations were grafted on the communion of the faithful, and ridiculed in the most revolting manner by the Jews, in order to excite the hatred and horror of mankind against the rising Church ?

IX. And now, Sir, that you see these two points solidly established ; and the apostolicity of this discipline followed in all the churches during the first four centuries ; and the Eucharistic dogmas concealed beneath the secret ; address yourself, I pray you, to the Rector of Long Newton. Ask the teacher of a moral change, of a figurative presence, of a real absence, the champion of *literal* bread and *literal* wine, and the adversary, in consequence, of the adoration of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist—ask him how an opinion so simple as his own, so conformable to our natural ideas, could have been ranked by antiquity among the mysteries ? how the Fathers could have taught the faithful of their time that they must rather shed every drop of their blood than divulge it ? how the numerous martyrs

of Lyons could suffer themselves to be tormented and torn in pieces, rather than loudly declare it? and how the reply of the magnanimous Blandina has excited and will excite the admiration of every age?

What, Sir! are we to imagine, that while the most horrid calumnies were disseminated on all sides against the primitive Christians; while they were accused of murdering new-born infants in their secret assemblies, of feeding upon their palpitating flesh, and intoxicating themselves with their blood—and of abandoning themselves afterwards like blind furies to excesses unheard of upon the earth; while they were devoted as a race accursed to the execration of mankind, and to atrocious tortures; that they would not open their mouths to declare their innocence? At least for the purpose of charitably saving the magistrates and the multitude from the horror of commanding or contemplating so many barbarous and protracted massacres? From what motive could they have forbidden themselves an innocent and natural defence? Why at least did they not say to their fellow-citizens: “Come then to our assemblies; see what passes there amongst us; we take a little bread and wine in memory of our good Master, who delivered us from sin and opened for us the way to virtue. He himself commanded us to use this simple and affecting ceremony: come, and you will learn to know us better, and understand what we really are?”

X. Nay more; if the faith and practice of the first Christians had corresponded with the belief of Mr. Faber; if the Eucharist had been viewed in the same light by them, as it is by him, not only would it never have formed part of the discipline of secrecy, but it never would have occasioned the malignity of their cruel enemies, who, so

far from believing their unworthy calumnies, would never even have thought of inventing and propagating them.*

I assert, Sir, with full and entire conviction, that in this ancient discipline of secrecy, there is a certain mute, but perpetual and decisive, evidence in favour of the real presence. It is in vain for the rector to contend; he will always find himself borne down by its irresistible force; and struggle as he may, he will never rise from his overthrow. I say the same of your whole Church; let her assemble all her champions; let her put forth, through them, every resource of wit and learning—and undoubtedly she possesses much of both—she can never account for the establishment of secrecy with regard to the Eucharist. It will ever be to her a problem, whose existence will be as incontestable as its solution will remain impossible. To discover it, recourse must of necessity be had to Catholic principles; and she must behold with us, in the primitive Church, the belief of the real presence of our Saviour in his Sacrament, the heavenly, the ravishing object of our faith and adoration. Then it will be readily conceived that, by divulging the mystery so exalted and inaccessible to reason, scandal would have been given to the pagans and catechumens, and raileries provoked, which would infallibly have been poured forth by men who were not Christians, since you hear them incessantly, even now, from the mouths of your theologians and preachers. Then we can conceive that, by speaking openly of the real presence, and of the change of substance, they would have shocked the imagination of the Pagans,

* See page 363, vol. 1, of the *Discussion Amicale*—the fine theory of the two Anglican Bishops, Pearce and Hoadley, and of Prebendary Sturges, on the manner of presenting the Eucharist.

and kept those at a distance from the religion, whom it was their duty to attract to it. Then we can understand the precept of Jesus Christ, and the prohibition of the primitive Church, "to cast pearls before swine." Then, also, we can well conceive that, through obedience to the law of their divine Legislator, and the command of his Church, the faithful would rather shed their blood, than betray the secret. Then are we in admiration at the faith and heroism of those martyrs, who, without revealing the secret, were contented modestly to reply, in the midst of torments, "there is no evil committed among us." Then, in fine, every thing, in those illustrious ages, is understood and explained; the rule of the Church—the exact conduct of the faithful—the self-devotion of her martyrs—and the frightful calumnies and atrocious torments, of which they were the glorious victims.

I finish with one final conclusion. The discipline of secrecy, in the first four centuries, is evidently incompatible with the actual doctrine of your Church; but perfectly conformable with that of ours. I had reason, therefore, to say, that it was a general proof that, in the first four centuries, the Christians believed what the Catholics have believed, still believe, and will ever believe,—the reality of the presence of our divine Saviour in the most holy and most adorable Sacrament of the Eucharist.*

* Whoever may be curious to see other specimens of the *candour* and *fidelity* of Mr. Faber, may find them exposed to public view, in part 3d of the work from which the above extracts are taken; as also in *The Catholic Doctrine of Transubstantiation, &c.*, by the Reverend G. Corless; and in *A Letter to the Reverend G. J. Faber, &c.*, by the same.

APPENDIX.—No. XI.

TESTIMONIES IN FAVOUR OF THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION, AND OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

THE EUCHARIST.

It is an article of Catholic belief, that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly and really contained the body of Christ, which was delivered for us, and his blood, which was shed for the remission of sins ; the substance of the bread and wine being, by the power of God, changed into the substance of his blessed body and blood, the species or appearances of bread and wine, by the will of the same God, remaining as they were. This change has been properly called Transubstantiation.

SCRIPTURE.

John, vi. 51, 52. *I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever : and the bread, that I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world.—54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59. Except you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.—He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life : and I will raise him up in the last day.—For my flesh is meat indeed ; and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my*

blood, abideth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread shall live for ever. Matt. xvi. 26, 27, 28. — And while they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave it to his disciples, and said: Take ye and eat: This is my body. And taking the chalice, he gave thanks: and gave it to them, saying; Drink ye all of this.—For this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins.—Mark, xiv. 22, 23, 24. And whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread; and blessing, broke, and gave it to them, and said: Take ye, This is my body. And having taken the chalice; giving thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it.—And he said to them: This is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many.—Luke, xxii. 19, 20. And taking bread, he gave thanks, and broke, and gave it to them, saying: This is my body, which is given for you; Do this for a commemoration of me. In like manner, the chalice also, after he had supped, saying: This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you.—1 Cor. x. 16. The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?—Ibid. xi. 23, 24, 25, 26. For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered to you; That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks, broke it, and said: Take ye, and eat: this is my body, which shall be delivered for you: this do for a commemoration of me. In like manner also the chalice, after he had supped, saying: This chalice is the New Testament in my blood:

this do ye, as often as you shall drink of it, for the commemoration of me.—For, as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord until he come.

FATHERS.^(a)

CENT. I.

S. IGNATIUS,^(b) G. C.—These Gnostic heretics abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they do not acknowledge the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ,^(c) which suffered for our sins, and which the Father, by his goodness, resuscitated. Rejecting, therefore, this gift of God, they die in their disputes.” *Ep. ad Smyrn. p. 36, T. ii. PP. Apost. Amstelædami, 1724.*

CENT. II.

S. JUSTIN,^(d) L. C.—“Nor do we take these gifts as

^(a) The capital letters L. C. are used to designate the Fathers of the Latin Church, and G. C. those of the Greek Church.

^(b) St. Ignatius was bishop of Antioch, the second from St. Peter; and having governed that Church about 40 years, suffered martyrdom at Rome, by the command of the emperor Trajan, in the beginning of the second century, leaving behind him seven epistles, addressed to different Churches, and acknowledged to be genuine. He had been the disciple of St. John, and his letters breathe the whole spirit of that apostle.

^(c) *δια το μη ὁμολογειν την ἐνχαριστιαν σαρκα εἶναι του σωτηρος ἡμων Ἰησου Κριστου.*

^(d) A Christian philosopher, by birth a Greek, who suffered martyrdom at Rome, about the year 166, having, a few years before, addressed two apologies in favour of the Christians, to the emperor Antoninus Pius, and to the Roman senate. In these is contained much curious matter on the doctrine, the manners, and

common bread and common drink ;^(e) but as Jesus Christ our Saviour, made man by the word of God, took flesh and blood for our salvation; in the same manner, we have been taught, that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of the words which he spoke, and by which our blood and flesh, in the change, are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus incarnate.”^(f) *Apol. I. p. 96. Edit. Londini, an. 1722.*

TERTULLIAN,^(g) L. C.—“ Our flesh is fed with the body and blood of Christ,^(h) that the soul may be nourished with God.” *De resurrect. carnis, c. viii. p. 569.*—There are Christians worse than Jews; “ for these laid violent hands on Jesus but once, but they daily insult his body.”⁽ⁱ⁾ *De Idol. c. vii. p. 240.*

CENT. III.

ORIGEN,^(k) G. C.—You that have been accustomed to

the religious ceremonies of the early Christians. Justin is also author of other works, particularly of a *Dialogue with the Jew* named *Tryphon*.

^(e) οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινον ἄρτον, οὐδὲ κοινον πομα.

^(f) ἐκεῖνθ τῆ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σαρκὰ καὶ αἷμα ἐδίδαχθημεν εἶναι.

^(g) *Tertullian* was a native and citizen of Carthage, contemporary with St. Irenæus, whom he survived. The zeal and talents with which he defended the Christian cause, and vindicated its faith and discipline, have immortalized his name; which, however, suffered by his defection to the errors of the Montanists. His works are written with great erudition; but his style, though always nervous and impressive, is inelegant, rude, and often intricate.

^(h) Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur.

⁽ⁱ⁾ Quotidie corpus ejus lacessunt.

^(k) *Origen* was contemporary with St. Clement of Alexandria, and succeeded him as catechist or teacher, in the celebrated school of that city. Few men, from a variety of causes, have left behind them a greater name, applauded and opposed, admired

be present at the divine mysteries, know when you receive the body of the Lord,^(l) with what care and veneration you preserve it, lest any particle of it fall to the ground, or be lost; and you think yourselves guilty, and with reason, if it should so happen through your negligence." *Hom. xiii. in Exod. T. ii. p. 176.*—"In former times, baptism was obscurely represented in the cloud and in the sea: but now regeneration is in kind, in water, and in the Holy Ghost. Then, obscurely, manna was the food; but now in kind the flesh of the word of God is the true food;^(m) even as he said: *My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.*" *Hom.⁽ⁿ⁾ vii. in Num. T. ii. p. 290.*

S. HIPPOLYTUS,^(o) G. C.—Commenting on the words of Proverbs ix; *Wisdom hath built herself a house*, he says: "He [Christ] *prepared his table*, that is, the promised knowledge of the Holy Trinity; and moreover, his venerable and sacred body and blood, which are every day offered up^(p) in remembrance of that divine and mysterious supper.—*Come, eat my bread and drink the wine*

and persecuted. His works, as we have them, are imperfect; as written, they were almost innumerable. He died about the year 252.

^(l) Cum suscipitis corpus Domini.

^(m) Tunc in ænigmate erat manna cibus, nunc autem in specie caro verbi Dei est verus cibus.

⁽ⁿ⁾ These homilies, which are not extant in Greek, are thought to have been rather loosely translated by Rufinus of Aquileja; but as Rufinus lived in the fifth century, the contemporary and antagonist of St. Jerome, his testimony alone serves to prove the faith of the age.

^(o) *St. Hippolytus* flourished in the beginning of the third century, but of what see he was bishop is uncertain. Of the many works he wrote, only fragments remain, which were published by Fabricius, in 1716. He suffered martyrdom about the year 230.

^(p) το τιμιον και ακραντον αντου σωμα και αιμα, ε καθ' εκαστη επιτελουνται θυομενα.

which I have mingled for you, that is, his divine body and his venerable blood, which he gives us to eat and drink^(q) for the remission of sins." *In Prov. c. ix. p. 282. Edit. Hamburg. 1716.*

S. CYPRIAN,^(r) L.C.—This father laments that some ministers of the altar dared, before the forms of repentance and confession were fulfilled, to distribute the Eucharist, and “thus profane the holy body of the Lord.”^(s) *Ep. xv. p. 34.*—“At this time peace is necessary not to the weak, but to the strong; that while we excite and exhort them to battle, we leave them not naked and unarmed, but fortified by the body and blood of Christ.^(t)—For how can we urge them to shed their own blood, if we refuse them the blood of Christ? Or how do we fit them for the cup of martyrdom, unless we first admit them in the church to partake of the chalice of the Lord?” *Ep. lvii. p. 117.*

CENT. IV.

JUVENCUS,^(u) L. C.—Speaking of the institution of the Eucharist, he says “Christ taught his disciples, that he delivered to them his own body;” and when he gave them the chalice, “he taught them, that he had distributed to them his blood: and said; This blood remits the sins

(q) την θειαν αυτου σαρκα και το τιμιον αυτου σωμα.

(r) *St. Cyprian* was bishop of Carthage, and died a martyr in the year 258. Actively concerned in the affairs of his own and of other churches; he corresponded widely, and has left us eighty-one Epistles on various ecclesiastical subjects, and several Tracts; among which is one of the *Unity of the Church*, written against the Novatian schismatics, whod isturbed the peace of the church.

(s) Sanctum Domini corpus profanare audeant.

(t) Protectione sanguinis et corporis Christi muniamus.

(u) He was a native of Spain and a priest, and has left us the *Life of Christ* in hexameter verse. He flourished about the year 329, under Constantine the Great.

of the people: drink this, it is mine."^(x) *Bibl. Max. PP. T. iv. p. 74.*

EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA,^(y) G. C.—“He shall have delight in the Lord, whose mind being purged from all defilement, shall eat the living bread, the live-giving flesh of the Lord, and drink his saving blood.”^(z) *Com. in Psal. xxx. v. 1. T. ii. pa. 149. Collect. Nova Montfaucon. Paris, 1706.*—“We, who by faith are called to sanctification, possess the bread from heaven; that is, Christ, or his body.^(a) Should it be asked, what the power of that body is? we answer: It is vivifying, because it gives life to the world.” *Com. in c. iii. Isa. p. 368. Ibid.*

S. ATHANASIUS,^(b) G. C.—“Our Sanctuaries are now pure, as they always were; having been rendered venerable by the blood alone of Christ,^(c) and embellished by his worship.” *Apol. adv. Arian. T. 1. p. 127.* “Take care then, O Deacon, not to give to the unworthy the blood of the immaculate body,^(d) lest you incur the guilt of giving

^(x) Discipulos docuit proprium se tradere corpus;

Edocuitque suum se divisisse cruorem.

Atque ait: Hic sanguis populi delicta remittit:

Hunc potate meum.—

^(y) Eusebius was bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, and the confidential friend of Constantine the Great. Besides an *Ecclesiastical History*, in ten books, he is the author of other valuable works, some of which are extant. He died in the year 338.

^(z) ἔσθειν πον ψωντα ἄρτον και τας ζωοποιους ἀντου σαρκας, πινειν τε το σωτηριον ἀντου αίμα.

^(a) τουτ'εστι Κριστον, ἡτοι το σωμα ἀντου.

^(b) *St. Athanasius* succeeded *St. Alexander* in the patriarchal chair of Alexandria, in 326, and inherited all his zeal against the Arians. He was one of the most eloquent fathers of the church, and the most strenuous supporter of her faith during a period of forty-seven years. He died about the year 373, leaving us many monuments of his erudition, piety and zeal.

^(c) μονῳ σεμννομενα τῳ αίματι του Κριστου.

^(d) την πορφυραν του ἀναμαρτητου σωματος.

holy things to dogs." *Serm. de Incontam. Myst. T. ii. p. 45. Collect. Nova. Montfaucon.—Parisiis, 1706.*

S. HILARY,^(e) L. C.—“ If the *word*, truly, *was made flesh*, and we, truly, receive this word for our food:^(f) how can he be thought not to dwell naturally in us, who assumed the nature of our flesh inseparably united to him, and communicates, in the sacrament, that nature to us? For thus, we are all one: because the Father is in Christ, and Christ in us.—We are not to speak of heavenly things as we do of human.^(g) Of the natural verity of Christ in us, whatever we speak, we speak foolishly and wickedly, unless we learn of him; for it is he that said: *my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.* (John vi. 56.) There is no place left to doubt of the truth of Christ's flesh and blood:^(h) for now, by the profession of the Lord himself, and according to our belief, it is truly flesh, and truly blood. But he himself attests how we are in him by the sacramental communication of his body and blood; *And the world, says he, sees me not, but you see me, because I live and you shall live: for I am in my father, and you are in me, and I am in you.* (John xiv. 19, 20.) If he wished the unity of will alone to be understood, why would he establish a certain order and progression in the formation of it; but that he should be in the father, by the nature

(e) *St. Hilary* was bishop of Poitiers, in France, and the great champion of the orthodox faith in the Western Church, against the Arian heretics. He wrote a work, in twelve books, *On the Trinity; a Treatise on Synods or Councils*; and three *Discourses against the Arians*, addressed to the emperor Constantine. *St. Hilary* died in the year 367.

(f) *Verbum carnem cibo dominico sumimus.*

(g) *Non est humano aut sæculi sensu in Dei rebus loquendum.*

(h) *De veritate carnis et sanguinis non relictus est ambigendi locus.*

of the divinity; we in him, by his corporal birth; and he in us by the sacramental mystery." *De Trin. L. viii. p. 954, 955, 956.*

S. JAMES OF NISIBIS,⁽ⁱ⁾ G. C.—In his fourth discourse, *On Prayer*, he says: "None will be cleansed unless they have been washed in the laver of baptism, and have received the body and blood of Christ; for the blood is expiated by this blood, and the body cleansed by this body."

S. EPHREM OF EDESSA,^(k) G. C.—"His body, by a new method, is mixed with our bodies; and his most pure blood is transfused into our veins. He is wholly incorporated with us.^(l) And because he loved his church, he was made the bread of life that he might give himself to be eaten." *Hymn, xxxvii. de Virginitate, Bibl. Orient. Assemani, T. 1. p. 97.*

⁽ⁱ⁾ *St. James* was bishop of Nisibis in Mesopotamia, and was held in much estimation by his contemporaries. He was present at the council of Nice in 325, and died about the year 350. His works, mentioned by Gennadius in the fifth century, were published at Rome in Armenian and Latin, by Antonelli, in 1756. (N. B. Copies of this work are rare in England; there is one in the Collegiate Library at Manchester.)

^(k) *St. Ephrem* was a disciple of the above mentioned father, and a deacon of Edessa in Syria. He wrote many works in the language of his country, which were translated into Greek during his life; and were held in such estimation, that in many churches, as *St. Jerome* testifies in his Catalogue, they were publicly read after the canonical books of Scripture. They were published in Latin by Gerard Vossius, at Rome; and in Greek by Twaites, at Oxford. In 1732 and seqq., Cardinal Quirini, with the aid of J. S. Assemani, gave a new and splendid edition of his works, in six volumes, folio. The three first contain the works which had before been published in Greek and Latin; the three latter, those which he found in the Vatican Library, which are in Syriac, with a Latin translation. *St. Ephrem* died about the year 379.

^(l) *Corpus ejus nova ratione nostris corporibus immistum est; ipsius quoque sanguis purissimus in venas nostras diffusus, totus ipse nos totos pervasit.*

“You believe that Christ, the son of God, for you was born in the flesh. Then why do you search into what is inscrutable? Doing this, you prove your curiosity, not your faith. Believe then, and with a firm faith receive the body and blood of our Lord.^(m)—Abraham placed earthly food before celestial spirits, (Gen. xviii.) of which they ate. This was wonderful; but what Christ has done for us greatly exceeds this, and transcends all speech and all conception. To us that are in the flesh, he has given to eat his body and blood. Incapable as I am of comprehending the mysteries of God, I dare not proceed; and should I attempt it, I should shew only my own rashness.” *De Nat. Dei. T. iii. p. 182. Ibid.*

S. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM,⁽ⁿ⁾ G. C.—In his instructions, addressed to those who had been newly baptised, he says: “The bread and wine, which before the invocation of the adorable Trinity were nothing but bread and wine, become after this invocation, the body and blood of Christ.”^(o) *Catag. Mystag. 1. n. 4. p. 281.*—“The eucharistic bread, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer common bread, but the body of Christ.”^(p) *Ibid. Catech. iii. n. 3. p. 289.*—“As Christ, speaking of the bread, declared and said: This is my body; who shall dare to doubt it? And as speaking of the wine, he positively assured us, and said: This is my blood; who shall doubt

^(m) Si ista curiosè rimaris, non jam fidelis nuncupaberis, sed curiosus. Esto itaque fidelis. Participa immaculatum corpus et sanguinem Domini tui fide plenissimâ.

⁽ⁿ⁾ *St. Cyril* was patriarch of Jerusalem, and died about the year 385. The works which he has left, in twenty-three *Catechetical Discourses*, form a full and very accurate abridgment of Christian Doctrine.

^(o) ὁ μὲν ἄρτος γίνεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ὃ δὲ οἶνος ἅμα Χριστοῦ.

^(p) ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ἐνχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, οὐκ ἐστὶ ἄρτος λιτός, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ.

it, and say that it is not his blood?"^(q) *Catech.* iv. n. 1. p. 292.

“Jesus Christ, in Cana of Galilee, once changed water into wine, by his will alone; and shall we think it less worthy of credit, that he changed wine into his blood?^(r) Invited to an early marriage, he wrought this miracle; and shall we hesitate to confess that he has given to his children his body to eat, and his blood to drink?^(s) Wherefore, with all confidence, let us take the body and blood of Christ. For in the type or figure of bread, his body is given to thee; and in the type or figure of wine, his blood is given;^(t) that so being made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, you may become one body and one blood with him; thus, the body and blood of Christ being distributed in our members, we become *Christofori*, that is, we carry Christ with us; and thus, as St. Peter says, ‘we are made partakers of the divine nature.’” *Ibid.*

S. OPTATUS OF MILEVIS,^(u) L. C.—“What is the altar, but the seat of the body and blood of Christ?^(x) What offence had Christ given, whose body and blood, at certain times, do there dwell?^(y) This huge impiety was

(q) *ἀντου ὄν ἀποφθναμενου, και ἐιποντος περι του ἄρτου, τουτο μου ἐστι το σωμα, τις πολμησει ἀμφιβαλλειν λοιπον; και ἀντου βεβαιωσαμενου και ἐιρηκοτος, τουτο μου ἐστι το ἅιμα, τις ἐνδοιασει ποτε, λεγων μη ἐιναι ἀντου το αιμα;*

(r) *και οὐκ ἀξιοπιστος ἐστιν ὄνον μεταβαλων ἐις ἅιμα;*

(s) *την ἀπολαυσιν του σωματος ἀντου και του ἅιματος.*

(t) *ἐν τυπῳ ἄρτου, διδοται σοι το σωμα, και ἐν τυπῳ ὄνου, διδοται σοι το ἅιμα.*

(u) *Milevis* was a city of Africa, of which St. Optatus was bishop about the middle of the fourth century. The work quoted was written against the Donatists, in seven books, addressed to Parmenianus, a bishop of that sect. It abounds with innumerable passages in favour of the unity, and other marks of the true church.

(x) *Sedes et corporis et sanguinis Christi.*

(y) *Cujus illic per certa momenta corpus et sanguis habitabat.*

doubled, when you broke also the chalices, the bearers of the blood of Christ.”^(z) *Contra Parmen*, L. vi. p. 91, 92, 93.

S. BASIL,^(a) G. C.—“About the things, that God has spoken, there should be no hesitation, nor doubt, but a firm persuasion, that all is true and possible, though nature be against it.^(b) Herein lies the struggle of faith—*The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said to them: amen, amen I say unto you: except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.*” (John vi. 53, 54.)—*Regula viii. Moral. T. ii. p. 240.*

S. GREGORY OF NYSSA,^(c) G. C.—“The body of Christ, by the inhabitation of the word of God, was transmuted into a divine dignity: and so I now believe, that the bread, sanctified by the word of God, is transmuted into the body of Christ.^(d) This bread, as the apostle says, *is sanctified by the word of God and prayer*, not that, as food, it passes into his body, but that it is instantly changed into the body of Christ, agreeably to what he said, *This is my body.*^(e) And therefore does the divine word commix

(z) Calices, Christi sanguinis portatores.

(a) *St. Basil*, surnamed the *Great*, for his admirable eloquence and profound erudition, was bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, and died about the year 379, leaving many valuable works.

(b) *καὶ ἡ φύσις μαχῆται.*

(c) *S. Gregory* of Nyssa was the younger brother of *St. Basil*, like him, highly celebrated for his acquirements, and Bishop of Nyssa, on the confines of Cappadocia, in Asia Minor. His writings are numerous. He died late in the fourth century.

(d) *καὶ νῦν τὸν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁγιαζόμενον ἄρτον εἰς σῶμα τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου μεταποιεῖσθαι πιστενομαί.*

(e) *ἐνθὺς πρὸς τὸ σῶμα τοῦ λόγου μεταποιούμενος, καθὼς εἴρηται ὑπο τοῦ λόγου, ὅτι τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου.*

itself with the weak nature of man, that, by partaking of the divinity, our humanity may be exalted. By the dispensation of his grace, he enters, by his flesh, into the breasts of the faithful, commixed and contempered with their bodies,^(f) that, by being united to that which is immortal, man may partake of incorruption." *Orat. Catech. c. 37, T. ii. p. 534, 535, 536.*—"The bread also is, at first, common bread; but, when it had been sanctified, it is called and is made the body of Christ."^(g) *Orat. in Bapt. Christi, T. ii. p. 802.*

S. AMBROSE,^(h) L. C.—"The manna in the desert was given in figure. You have known things more excellent. For light is preferable to the shadow; truth to the figure; the body of Christ to the manna from heaven. But you may say: I see somewhat else; how do you assert, that I shall receive the body of Christ?—This remains to be proved.—How many examples may we not make use of to shew, that we have not here what nature formed, but what the divine blessing has consecrated; and that the virtue of this blessing is more powerful than that of nature, because by it nature itself is changed? Moses held the rod; he cast it on the ground, and it became a serpent. Again he took it by the tail, and again it became a rod. See you not that, by the prophetic power, the nature of the rod and the serpent was twice changed?"—He proceeds to instance many other miraculous changes, as re-

(f) *ἑαυτον ἐνσπειρει δια της σαρκος, οἷς ἡ συστασις ἐξ οἴνου τε και ἄρτου ἐστι τοις σωμασι των πεπιστευκοτων κατακριταμενος.*

(g) *σωμα Κριστου λεγεται τε και γινεται.*

(h) *St. Ambrose* died in the year 396, having held the see of Milan twenty years, with great profit to the church, edified by his exalted virtues the western provinces, and instructed them by his writings. These are numerous, comprising *Commentaries* on many parts of Scripture, and moral Treatises.

corded in Scripture, and then adds: "If now the blessing of men was powerful enough to change nature, what must we not say of the divine consecration, when the very words of our Lord operate? For that sacrament, which you receive, is accomplished by the word of Christ. If the word of Elias could call down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ, be able to change the form of the elements?⁽ⁱ⁾ You have read concerning the creation of the world: *He spoke, and it was done; he commanded, and it was formed.* Therefore the word of Christ, which could draw out of nothing what was not, shall it not be able to change the things that are into that which they were not?^(k) For it is not a less effect of power, to give new existence to things, than to change the natures that were.—We will now establish the truth of the mystery, from the example itself of the incarnation. Was the order of nature followed, when Jesus was born of a virgin? Plainly not. Then why is that order to be looked for here? It was the true flesh of Christ which was crucified, which was buried; and this is truly the sacrament of his flesh.—Our Lord himself proclaims: *This is my body.* Before the benediction of the celestial words, the bread (*species*) is named; after the consecration, the body of Christ is signified. He himself calls it his blood. Before consecration, it has another name; afterwards it is denominated blood. And you answer *Amen*; that is, it is true."^(l)

(i) Non valebit Christi sermo ut species mutet elementorum ?

(k) Sermo Christi...non potest ea quæ sunt, in id mutare quod non erant ?

(l) Ipse clamat Dominus Jesus: *Hoc est corpus meum.* Ante benedictionem verborum cælestium species nominatur; post consecrationem: corpus Christi significatur. Ipse dicit sanguinem suum. Ante consecrationem aliud dicitur; post consecrationem sanguis nominatur. Et tu dicis, *Amen*; hoc est, verum est.

ST. EPIPHANIUS.^(m) G. C.—“The Church is the tranquil port of peace, and daily distributes to us that drink which disperses care, the true blood of Jesus Christ.”⁽ⁿ⁾
In Acephalos, T. ii. p. 152.

S. JEROME,^(o) L. C.—“The fatted calf, which is offered to obtain the salvation of repentance, is the Saviour himself, whose flesh we daily eat, and whose blood we daily drink.”^(p)

S. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM,^(q) G. C.—“Elias left his garment to his disciple; but the Son of God left us his own flesh.^(r) The prophet indeed threw off his covering; but Christ ascending, took with him his body, and left it also for us.^(s) Let us not therefore repine nor fear any difficulties; for he who refused not to shed his blood for all, and communicated to us his body and blood, what will he not do for our salvation?” *Homil. ii. ad Pop.*

^(m) St. Epiphanius was chosen bishop of Salamis, in the Isle of Cyprus, in 368, and was the author of many works, particularly against the reigning heresies of the time. The unity of faith was never more zealously maintained than in these early ages. He died in the beginning of the fifth century.

⁽ⁿ⁾ το λυσιπονον ἡμιν πομα καθ' ἑκαστην ἡμεραν, ἕμα Κριστε χαριζομενη, ἀκρατον, ἀληθες.

^(o) *St. Jerome* was the most eloquent, learned, and accomplished scholar of his time. He lived to the advanced age of ninety-one. His works are numerous, and marked by a peculiar elegance of style.

^(p) Cujus quotidie carne pascimur, cruore potamur.

^(q) *St. John Chrysostom* was bishop of Constantinople, and received the appellation of *Chrysostom*, (the golden-mouthed) on account of his transcendent eloquence. His works are numerous; indeed, there is scarcely any subject connected with religion that he has not illustrated. His expositions of Scripture are particularly valuable. He died in the beginning of the fifth century, about the year 407. The edition of his works quoted is that of Paris, 1636.

^(r) την σαρκα ἡμιν κατελιπε την ἑαυτου.

^(s) και ἡμιν κατελιπε.

Antioch. T. 1. p. 37.—“ Let us then touch the hem of his garment ; rather let us, if we be so disposed, possess him entire. For his body now lies before us not to be touched only, but to be eaten, and to satiate us.^(t)—And if they who touched his garment drew so much virtue from it ; how much more shall we draw who possess him whole?^(u)—Believe, therefore, that the supper at which he sat, is now celebrated ; for there is no difference between the two. This is not performed by a man, and that by Christ ; both are by him.^(x) When, therefore, thou seest the priest presenting the body to thee, think not that it is his hand, but the hand of Christ that is stretched out towards thee.”^(y) *Homil. li. in cap. xiv. Matt. T. vii. p. 553, 554.*
 —“ Let us believe God in every thing, and not gainsay him, although what is said may seem contrary to our reason and our sight. Let his word overpower both.^(z) Thus let us do in mysteries ; not looking only on the things that lie before us, but holding fast his words ; for his word cannot deceive ; but our sense is very easily deceived.^(a) That never failed ; this, often. Since then his word says, *This is my body* ; let us assent, and believe, and view it with the eyes of our understanding.” *Homil. lxxxiii. in Matt. T. 7. p. 868.*—He that was present at the last supper, is the same that is now present and consecrates our feast. For it is not man who makes the things lying on the altar become the body and blood of

(t) ὥστε και φαγηται και ἐμφορηθῆναι.

(u) οἱ ὅλον αὐτον κατεχουτες.

(x) οὐδεν γαρ ἐκεινο τῆς διεννηροχεν—ἀλλα και τῆς κακεινο αὐτος.

(y) ἀλλα την τῆς Κρισθ χειρα εἶναι την ἐκτεινομενην.

(z) ἀλλ' ἐστῶ και λογισμου και ὀψεως κυριωτερος αὐτου ὁ λογος.

(a) ὁ μεν γαρ λογος αὐτου ἀπαρλογιστος, ἡ δε αἰσθησις ἡμῶν εὐξαιπατητος.

Christ, but that Christ who was crucified for us. The words are pronounced by the priest; but it is the power and grace of God that consecrate them. He said, *This is my body*: these words make the change.”^(b) *Homil. de Prodit. Judæ. T. v. p. 415.*—“As many as partake of this body, as many as taste of this blood, think ye it nothing different from that which sits above, and is adored by angels.”^(c) *Homil. iii. in c. 1. ad Ephes. T. x. p. 885.*

CENT. V.

S. AUGUSTIN,^(d) L. C.—“As you know the sacrifice of the Jews, according to the rite of Aaron, consisted in the offerings of beasts, and this in mystery: as yet the sacrifice of the body and blood of the Lord was not, which the faithful understand,^(e) and they who have read the gospel, which sacrifice is now diffused through the whole world.” *In Psal. xxxiii. T. viii. p. 92* —“Wherefore the sacrifice of Aaron was taken away; and that, according to the order of Melchisedec, commenced.—Our Lord was willing that our salvation should be in his body and blood. And this was an effect of his humility. For had

^(b) σχημα πληρων ἕστηκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς, τὰ ρηματα φθεγγομενος ἕκεινα· ἡ δὲ δυναμις, καὶ ἡ χάρις τῆ θεοῦ ἐστίν. Τῆτο μου ἐστὶ τὸ σωμα, φησὶ τῆτο τὸ ρημα μεταρρυθμιζει τὰ προκειμενα.

^(c) ἐννοεῖτε ὅτι τῆ μηδεν ἕκεινου διαφεροντες, οὐδε διεστῶτος μετεχομεν, ὅτι ἕκεινῆ τῆ ἀνω καθημενω τῆτῆ ἠπογενομεθα.

^(d) *St. Augustin* was bishop of Hippo, in Africa, and himself an African. His works are very numerous, and his name, on account of the erudition of those works, their vast researches, and their deep insight into all the ways of the divine economy, has ever borne the greatest weight in the Christian churches. He illustrated the close of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth century in the Latin church, while *St. Chrysostom* shone in the east. He died in the year 430.

^(e) Nondum erat sacrificium corporis et sanguinis Domini, quod fideles norunt.

he not been humble, he would not have been to us meat and drink.”^(f) *Ibid.*—“When committing to us his body, he said: *This is my body*, Christ was held in his own hands. He bore that body in his hands.”^(g) *Ibid.* p. 94.—“Our Saviour taught us this in mystic words—but many who were present not understanding this, were scandalized; for hearing him, they thought of nothing but their own flesh.—He therefore said, *The flesh profiteth nothing*; that is, it profiteth nothing as they understood it; for they understood it to mean flesh as it is in a dead body, or as it is sold in the market, not as animated by life.”^(h) *Tract xxvii. Ibid.* p. 95, 96.

ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA,⁽ⁱ⁾ G. C.—“Wherefore, let us receive the body of life itself: that life, which for us has dwelt in our body; and let us drink his sacred blood for the remission of our sins, and to partake of that immortality which is in him; believing Christ to be the priest and the victim, the offerer and the offered.”^(k) *Hom. in Mysticam Cœnam, T. v. parte ii. p. 378.*

COUNCIL OF EPHEBUS, G. C.—The following extracts are from an epistle of S. Cyril, and an Egyptian Synod,

^(f) Nec manducaretur, nec biberetur.

^(g) Ferebatur Christus in manibus suis, quando, commendans ipsum suum corpus ait: *Hoc est corpus meum*. Ferebat enim illud corpus in manibus suis.

^(h) Carnem sic intellexerunt, quomodo in cadavere dilaniatur, aut in macello venditur; non quomodo spiritu vegetatur.

⁽ⁱ⁾ St. Cyril of Alexandria succeeded Theophilus in the patriarchal see of Alexandria in 412, and was the active and successful opponent of Nestorius, against whom was called, in 431, the Council of Ephesus, in which St. Cyril presided. He died in 444. The best edition of his works, in Greek and Latin, is that of Paris, by J. Aubert, 6 vol. folio, 1638.

^(k) μεταλαμβάνωμεν ἡμεῖς τῆς αὐτοζώης σωμα—καὶ πινώμεν αὐτοῦ το ἄμα το ἅγιον—πιστευόντες ὅτι περ αὐτοῦ μενεῖ ἱερεὺς καὶ θυσία, αὐτοῦ ὁ προσφερωὺν καὶ προσφερομενοῦν.

read in the general council of Ephesus, in 431, and approved by the council, as conveying the belief of the universal Church. They write to the heresiarch Nestorius:—"On this occasion it is our duty to add, that while we announce the death of Jesus, the only Son of God, and his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven, we likewise celebrate the unbloody sacrifice in the Churches, approach to the mystic thanksgivings, and are thus sanctified, being made partakers of the sacred flesh and precious blood of Christ, the Saviour of all men, and receiving it, not as common flesh: far be this thought from us:⁽¹⁾ nor as the flesh of a sanctified man, and united to the word by an equality of honour, nor as having obtained a divine inhabitation; but we receive it as the truly vivifying flesh of the word made man. For as the word, as God, is essentially life, the moment it became one with its flesh, it imparted to this flesh a vivifying virtue. Wherefore, although Christ said: *Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you*; (John, vi. 53.) we are not to imagine, that it is the flesh of a man like to ourselves, but truly the flesh of him who for us was made and called the Son of man. For how could the flesh of man, according to its own nature, give life?" *Ep. ad Nest. Conc. Gen. T. iii. p. 404.*—In confirmation of this doctrine, they then add the following anathema: "He that does not confess the flesh of the Lord to be vivifying, and the proper flesh of the word of God made man; but to be the flesh of some other, united in dignity to the word, or that has obtained only a divine inhabitation; and shall not acknowledge that

(1) την ἀναμακτον ἐν ταις ἐκκλησιαῖς τελουμεν θυσίαν, προσίμεν τε οὕτω ταις μυστικαῖς εὐλογίαις, καὶ ἀγιαζομεθα, μετοχοὶ γενομενοὶ τῆς τε ἁγίας σαρκος, καὶ τοῦ τιμιῶν ἡμᾶτος τοῦ παντῶν ἡμῶν σωτηρος Κριστου, καὶ οὐχ' ὡς σαρκὶ κοινῆν δεχομενοὶ μὴ γενοῖτο.

flesh to give life, as we have said, because it is the flesh of the word that gives life to all things, let him be anathema." *Ibid.* p. 409.

S. PETER CHRYSOLOGUS,^(m) L. C.—“ Let Christians understand, who every day touch the body of Christ,⁽ⁿ⁾ what helps they may draw from that body, when the woman was perfectly cured by only touching the hem of his garment.” *Serm.* xxiv. p. 872. *Edit. Lugduni*, 1676.

THEODORET,^(o) G. C.—“ After the consecration, the mystical symbols lose not their proper nature: they remain in the former substance, figure, and appearance, (or rather in the shape and form of the former substance,^(p)) to be seen, and to be felt, as before; but they are understood to be what they have been made; this they are believed to be; and as such they are adored.” *Dial.* ii. T. iv. *Edit. Paris.* 1642.

SYLVIANUS,^(q) L. C.—“ The Jews ate manna; we

^(m) He was placed on the archiepiscopal chair of Ravenna, about the year 430, and governed that Church about twenty years. We have 176 of his discourses, which were so much esteemed in those days as to procure him the name of *Chrysologus*.

⁽ⁿ⁾ Qui quotidie corpus Christi attingunt.

^(o) *Theodoret* is best known as the author of an *Ecclesiastical History*. He was Bishop of Cyrus, a city of Syria; was connected with many of the great men of the age, and involved in various controversies. Few men have written more, or with so extensive a knowledge of all the subjects he treats, scriptural, moral, and historical. He died at an advanced age, about the year 457, or perhaps later.

^(p) μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτερᾶς οὐσίας, καὶ τῆς σχήματος, καὶ τῆς εἰδὸς. —The word *προτερᾶς* (*former*) seems to imply the second translation.

^(q) *Sylvianus* was a learned priest of Marseilles, who flourished from about the middle to the end of the fifth century; and of whom we have eight books “ On the Government of God,” and four books “ Against Avarice,” addressed to the Catholic Church, under the name of Timotheus; besides some epistles. Baluze published them, together with the “ Commonitorium” of Vincent of Lerins, at Paris, 1684.

Christ: they the flesh of birds; we the body of God: they the dew of heaven; we the God of heaven.”^(r) *Adv. Avaritiam*, L. ii, p. 246. *Edit. Paris*. 1684.

S. NILUS,^(s) G. C.—“ Before the prayer of the priest, and the coming of the Holy Spirit, the things laid on the table are common bread and wine; but after the solemn invocations, and the descent of the adorable spirit, it is no longer bread, and no longer wine, but is the body, and pure and precious blood, of Christ, the God of all.”^(t) *Ep. xlv. L. 1. p. 21*.—“ Let us not approach to the mystic bread as to mere bread, for it is the flesh of God, the venerable, and life-giving flesh.”^(u) *Ep. xxxix. L. iii, p. 322*.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

Our Saviour, in leaving to us his body and blood, under two distinct species or kinds, instituted not only a Sacrament, but also a Sacrifice; a commemorative sacrifice, distinctly shewing his passion and death until he come. For as the

^(r) Nos Christum,—nos corpus Dei—nos Deum cœli.

^(s) *St. Nilus* was a disciple of the great *St. Chrysostom*. After having been governor of Constantinople, he retired into the desert of Sinah, and there led a solitary life. He flourished under the emperors Arcadius and Theodosius, and died about 451. He has left us several treatises, and a great number of letters on religious subjects.

^(t) οὐκ ἔστι ψιλον ἄρτον, καὶ κοινον οἶνον τα ἐπιτεθειμενα τη ἁγια τραπεζῃ, ἀλλ' σωμα, καὶ ἅμα τιμιον, καὶ ἀχραντον Κριστη, τῷ Θεῷ των ἁπαντων.

^(u) μη ὡς ψιλω ἄρτῳ προσερχομεθα τῷ ἄρτῳ τῷ μυστικῷ, σαρεξ γαρ ἕπαρχει Θεῷ, σαρεξ τιμα, καὶ προσκυνητη, καὶ ζωοποιος.

sacrifice of the cross was performed by a distinct effusion of his blood, so is that sacrifice commemorated in this of the altar, by a distinction of the symbols. Jesus, therefore, is here given not only to us, but for us; and the Church is hereby enriched with a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, usually termed the Mass: propitiatory, we say, because representing in a lively manner the passion and death of our Lord, it is peculiarly pleasing to our eternal Father, and thus more effectually applies to us the all-sufficient merits of the sacrifice of the cross.

SCRIPTURE.

As the bloody sacrifices ordained by the Jewish law, are understood to have prefigured the sacrifice which the Redeemer of Mankind was once to offer on the Cross, by the effusion of his blood; so do we believe that the unbloody offerings of the same law, but much more than these, the bread and wine, which Melchisedec, "*the priest of the most high God,*" presented to Abraham, (Gen. iv.) were a type or figure of that unbloody sacrifice, which Christ, *the priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec,* (Ps. cix.) would continue to offer, through all ages, under the symbols or species of bread and wine.

Malach. i. 10, 11. *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hands.—For, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a clean*

offering.—Matt. xxvi. 28. *This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many,^(x) for the remission of sins.*—Mark, xiv. 24. *This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many.^(x)*—Luke xxii. 19. *This is my body that is given for you:^(y) do this for a commemoration of me.*—20. *This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.*—1 Cor. xi. 24. *This is my body which is broken for you:^(z) this do for the commemoration of me.*—25. *This chalice is the New Testament in my blood; do ye this as often as you shall drink it, for the commemoration of me.*—26. *For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord until he come.*

According to the translation of these passages, which is conformable to the Greek, our Saviour speaks in the present tense (or time) of the actual immolation of his body, and the actual effusion of his blood *for the remission of sins*; because at that moment, he really, but *mystically*, offered up his body and blood for the salvation of the apostles and of all men; while the words, *do this for a commemoration*, or *in remembrance of me*, plainly denote the institution of a sacrifice to be celebrated to the end of time. Thus Christ seems to say: As I now immolate my body and shed my blood for the remission of sins; so do you offer up this same body and this same blood in remembrance of me. What I now do, do you and your successors.—In this sense, as we have seen, and shall see, have the words of Christ always been understood in the Catholic Church.

1 Cor. x. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. *Wherefore, my*

(x) το ὑπερ πολλων ἐκχυνομενον. (y) το ὑπερ ὑμων διδομενον.

(z) το ὑπερ ὑμων κλωμενον.

dearly beloved, fly from the service of idols.—I speak as to wise men; judge ye yourselves what I say.—The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?—For we beiny many are one bread, one body all that partake of one bread.—Behold Israel according to the flesh: are not they that eat of the sacrifice, partakers of the altar?—What then? Do I say that what is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing? Or that the idol is any thing?—But the things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; And I would not that you should be made partakers with devils.—You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils; you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils.

As the Apostle speaks of the participation of the victims among the Jews, which were offered on their altars, and of a similar participation among the Gentiles; so, instituting a comparison, he plainly speaks of Christians partaking of the body and blood of our Lord from the Eucharistic altar.

Heb. xiii. 10, 11, 12. *We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle.—For the bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp.—Wherefore, Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.*

The meaning of the passage is not plain, but it seems to intimate the superiority of the Christian worshippers. Not only the Jews, but even their priests, were not allowed to taste of the victims which were solemnly offered for sin; whereas we have an altar and a victim, typified by those of the Jews, of which we may at all times partake: a

victim once offered for sin, and represented by the daily oblation of his body and blood.

Acts xiii. 2. *And as they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them.*—The *breaking of bread* is often mentioned in the same Acts; and in the two quotations just given from St. Paul, the *altar* and *table*⁽²⁾ are mentioned, which must refer to sacrifice.—Rev. v. 6. *And I saw: and behold in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the ancients, a lamb standing as it were slain.*—8. *And when he had opened the book, the four living creatures, and the four and twenty ancients, fell down before the lamb.*—9. *And they sung a new canticle, saying: Thou art worthy, O Lord, to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: because thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God in thy blood, out of every tribe and tongue, and people and nation.*—10. *And hast made us to our God a kingdom and priests, and we shall reign on the earth.*

FATHERS.

CENT. II.

S. JUSTIN, L. C.—“Truly we are the sacerdotal offspring of God, as he himself attests, saying, that in every place among the nations, we offer to him well-pleasing and clean victims. These victims he accepts from his own priests alone. Wherefore, shewing preference to all those who, through his name, offer the sacrifices which Christ ordained to be offered; that is, in the Eucharist of bread and the chalice,^(a) which in all places of the earth are

(2) θυσιαστηριον—τραπεζη.

(a) ἐπι τη εὐχαριστια τῶ ἀρτῶ καὶ τῶ ποτηρίῳ.

celebrated by the Christian people, God declares that they are well-pleasing to him. But the sacrifices of you Jews, and of your priests, he rejects, saying: *I will accept no offering from your hands; because from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles, but ye have profaned it.*" Malach. 1.—*Dial. cum Tryphon. Judæo*, p. 386.

S. IRENÆUS,^(b) L. C.—“Christ took bread into his hands, and giving thanks, said, *This is my body*. Likewise he declared the cup to be his blood, and taught the new oblation of the new Testament, which oblation the Church receiving from the apostles, offers it to God over all the earth,^(c) of which the prophet Malachias spoke: *I will not accept offerings from your hands. For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to my name, a clean sacrifice.*(1.) Manifestly hereby signifying, that the first people [the Jews] will cease to offer to God; and that in every place a sacrifice, and that clean, will be offered to him,^(d) and that his name is glo-

^(b) *St Irenæus*, though by birth a Greek, was bishop of Lyons in the second century; and in his youth had lived with St. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, the disciple of St. John the evangelist: this brings him near to the apostolic times. In what year he died is not ascertained; probably about the close of the century. He left behind him a *Treatise against the Heresies of the Age*, in five books. Of this work, which contains much that is highly valuable, and which was written in Greek, a Latin version of great antiquity, but harsh and often obscure, alone remains, some passages excepted, which have been preserved in their original language. Some fragments also are extant.

^(c) *Calicem—suum sanguinem confessus est, et novi Testamenti novum docuit oblationem, quam ecclesia ab apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo.*

^(d) *Omni autem loco sacrificium offeretur ei, et hoc purum.*

rified among the gentiles.”^(e) *Adver. Hær. L. iv. c. xxxii. p. 323, 324.*—“As then in simplicity the Church offers, her offering is accepted by God as a pure sacrifice.” *Ibid. c. xxxiv. p. 326.*

CENT. III.

S. CYPRIAN, L. C.—“It is the sole duty of the ministers of the gospel to attend to the altar and sacrifices,^(f) and to prayers and supplications. Those who are promoted by clerical ordination, should not be called away from the service of God, nor perplexed by worldly business; but, receiving aliment from their brethren, should not withdraw from the altar and from sacrifices,^(g) day and night intent on heavenly things.” “In the priest Melchisedec we see prefigured the sacrament of the Christian sacrifice,^(h) the holy Scriptures declaring: *Melchisedec king of Salem brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God, and he blessed Abraham.* (Gen. xiv.) And that he bore the resemblance of Christ, the Psalmist announces: *Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec.*” (Ps. cix.) He afterwards adds:

^(e) On this passage, the learned Protestant editor of Irenæus, Dr. Grabe, observes: “It is certain that Irenæus and all the Fathers—either contemporary with the apostles, or their immediate successors, whose writings are still extant—considered the blessed Eucharist to be the sacrifice of the new law, and offered bread and wine on the altar, as sacred oblations to God the Father; and that this was not the private opinion of any particular Church or teacher, but the public doctrine and practice of the universal Church, which she received from the apostles, and they from Christ, is expressly shown in this place, by Irenæus, and before him by Justin M. and Clement of Rome.”—*Nota in Irenæum, p. 323.*

^(f) Altari et sacrificiis deservire—debeant.

^(g) Ab altari et sacrificiis non recedant.

^(h) Sacrificii Dominici sacramentum.

“ If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, be himself the high priest of his Father ; and if he first offered himself a sacrifice to him, and commanded the same to be done in remembrance of him ; then that priest truly stands in the place of Christ, who imitates that which Christ did, and then offers in the Church a true and complete sacrifice to God the Father,⁽ⁱ⁾ doing what he ordained. For the whole discipline of religion and of truth is subverted, if that which was commanded be not faithfully complied with.” *Ibid.* p. 155.

I could quote many other passages from the letters of S. Cyprian, and from his other tracts, in which he speaks of the Christian sacrifice of the new law, in terms the most plain and obvious, such as : “ We are mindful of you day and night, and when we offer up prayer in the sacrifices.” *Ep.* xxxvii. p. 72.—“ As often as we celebrate the anniversary days of the martyrs, we offer sacrifices for them [the relatives of Celerinus].” *Ep.* xxxix. p. 77.—“ To God and his Christ, whom I serve, and to whom with a pure and undefiled conscience, in persecution and in peace, I unceasingly offer sacrifices.”^(k) *Ep.* lxvi. p. 169.—“ Whilst we were offering sacrifice,^(l) the girl was brought in by her mother.” *De Lapsis*, p. 132.

CENT IV.

EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA, G. C.—“ And as he [speaking of Melchisedec,] who was the priest of the Gentiles, seems never to have offered animal sacrifices, but wine alone and bread, while he blessed Abraham ; so our Sa-

⁽ⁱ⁾ Ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit, imitatur, et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in ecclesiâ, Deo Patri.

^(k) Sacrificia indesinenter offero. ^(l) Sacrificantibus nobis.

viour and Lord first, and then the priests who are descended from him, performing, in all nations, according to ecclesiastical ordinances, the sacerdotal function, represent, in bread and wine, the mysteries of his body and salutary blood,^(m) which mysteries Melchisedec had so long before by the divine spirit foreknown and used in figure. The Scripture of Moses says: *And Melchisedec, &c.*" (Gen. xiv.) *Demonst. Evang. L. v. c. iii. p. 223. Coloniae, 1688.*

S. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, G. C.—He mentions the various prayers and ceremonies which accompany our sacrifice of the altar, and adds: "When this spiritual sacrifice, this unbloody worship over the victim of propitiation, is ended,⁽ⁿ⁾ we supplicate God for the common peace of the Churches, for the tranquillity of the world, for kings, for their armies and their allies, for the sick and the afflicted; and in a word, for all who want assistance. Again, when we offer this sacrifice, we commemorate those who have departed this world before us.—We offer up that Christ who was slain for our sins, that he who is most kind, may be propitious to us and them." *Catech. Mystag. v. n. 6, 7. p. 297, 298.*

S. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUM,^(o) G. C.—"Julian, in

^(m) ὀινῷ καὶ ἀρτῷ, τῷ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ σωτηρίου ἵματος ἀνιπτονται τὰ μυστήρια.

⁽ⁿ⁾ πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀναιμακτὸν λατρείαν, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τῷ ἰλασμῷ.

^(o) *St. Gregory of Nazianzum* was the friend of *St. Basil*, with whom he studied at Athens; he became bishop of Constantinople, which see he afterwards relinquished, retiring to Nazianzum in Cappadocia, near which city he was born, and where he died, about the year 389. He was much celebrated for his eloquence, in which he is said to have excelled the greatest orators of the age; and of that eloquence many examples are yet extant in the various discourses or sermons, which form the principal body of his works.

impure and wicked blood, washes away his baptismal rite, opposing initiation to initiation—he defiles his hands in order to purify them from that unbloody sacrifice^(p) through which we communicate with Christ, with his divine nature, and his sufferings.” *Orat. iii. in Julian. T. 1. p. 70.*

S. OPTATUS OF MILEVIS, L. C.—*See the quotation from him above, p. 659.*—“What is the altar,” &c.

S. AMBROSE, L. C.—Commenting on the appearance of the angel to Zacharias, (Luke 1.) he says: “It were to be wished, that while we burned incense on our altars, and offer sacrifice, the angel would assist and become visible to us. That he does assist, cannot be doubted, while Christ is there, while Christ is immolated.^(q) L. 1. *in Evang. Luc. c. T. iii. p. 12.* “Although Christ is not now seen to offer, yet is he offered on earth, when his body is the victim.^(r) Indeed he manifestly offers in us, since it is his word that sanctifies the sacrifice that is offered.” *Enarr. in Psal. xxxviii. T. ii. p. 740.*

In a letter to his sister Marcellina, giving an account of some disturbances at Milan, when an attempt was made to seize the church, he relates: “The next day, which was Sunday, after the reading and sermon, when I was explaining the creed, word was brought that officers were sent to seize the Portian church, and that part of the people were flocking thither. I continued to discharge my duty, and began Mass;^(s) but as I was offering, I was informed that the people had laid hands on an Arian priest.

(p) τῆς ἀναμακτε θυσίας ἀποκαθαίρων.

(q) Quando Christus assistit, quando Christi corpus immolatur.

(r) Ipse offertur in terris, quando Christus offertur.

(s) Missam facere cæpi.

This made me weep, and I prayed to God in the midst of the offering,^(t) that no blood might be shed in this quarrel." *Ep.* xiv. *T.* v. *p.* 205.—Having heard from the emperor Theodosius, of the victory which he had gained over the tyrant Eugenius, Ambrose writes to him. "I took your letter with me to the church; I laid it on the altar; and whilst I offered sacrifice^(u) I held it in my hand, that by my voice you might speak, and your august letter perform with me the sacerdotal office." *Ep.* lviii. *T.* v. *p.* 322.

As the *Mass* has just been mentioned in a quotation from S. Ambrose, I will here subjoin a passage on the subject, from the learned and pious cardinal Bona, who flourished at Rome in the seventeenth century.—"There is an epistle of Pius I., acknowledged to be genuine, written about the year 166 to the bishop of Vienne, in the opening of which he thus speaks: 'Our sister Euprepia, as you well recollect, made over her house to the poor, where we dwell and celebrate Mass.'" *Conc. Gen. T.* 1. *p.* 576.—A letter also from pope Cornelius to another bishop of the same city, written about the year 254, remarks, that on account of the persecutions, the Christians could not publicly "celebrate Mass." *Ibid.* *p.* 681.—In the fourth century, St. Ambrose writing to his sister, mentions the Mass, as likewise in his thirty-fourth discourse: "I exhort you, you that are near the church, and can do it without great inconvenience, to hear Mass daily. *T.* v. *p.* 48.—In his preparatory prayer before Mass, he says; "Grant me thy grace on this day, and on every other, with a pure mind and clean heart, to celebrate the solemn

(t) Et orare in ipsâ oblatione. (u) Cum offerrem sacrificium.

service of Mass."^(x) *Ibid.* p. 335.—“ St. Augustin and other ancient Fathers use the same expression, and they use it as if it were common and generally received at the time.” *L. 1. Rerum Liturg. c. iii. p. 17, Edit. Paris, 1678.*

In this fourth century, various councils were held, which in plain terms speak of the Christian sacrifice.

COUNCIL OF ANCYRA,^(y) G. C.—Against such priests who, in the times of persecution, had shown great weakness, it enacts: “ That they be not deprived of their stations; but that they be not allowed to *offer*,^(z) nor to address the people, nor to perform any priestly function.” *Can. 1. Conc. Gen. T. 1. p. 1455.*

COUNCIL OF NEOCÆSAREA,^(a) G. C. —“ Country priests, in the presence of the bishop, or the priests of the city, cannot *offer*^(b) nor give the sanctified bread, nor present the chalice. *Ibid. Can. xiii. p. 1483.*

COUNCIL OF NICE^(c) G. C.—“ The holy synod has been informed that, in some places and cities, the deacons present the Eucharist to the priests. This thing no canon nor custom has taught—that they, who have themselves no power to *offer*^(d) should present the body of Christ to those who possess that power.” *Can. xviii. Conc. Gen. T. ii. p. 38.*

(x) The two works quoted by Cardinal Bona, as productions of St. Ambrose, are not allowed, by the learned, to be his, though of some ancient author.

(y) This council, held about the year 314, consisted of bishops from all the principal sees of the East, to the number of, at least, 118.—They enacted twenty-five canons for the establishment of discipline.

(z) προσφέρειν.

(a) This council was called soon after that of Ancyra, and consisted of nearly the same bishops.

(b) προσφέρειν.

(c) Held in 325, against the errors of Arius.

(d) προηφέρειν.

COUNCIL OF LAODICEA,^(e) G. C.—Having established certain rules to be observed in the service of the Church, it adds: “And after the priests have given the kiss of peace to the bishop, the laity must do the same one to the other, and thus the holy offering^(f) be completed: but the ministers alone may approach the altar, and there communicate.” *Ibid. Can. xix. p. 1499.*

SECOND COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE^(g) L. C.—It enacts that, if any priest, having been reprimanded by his bishop, withdraw from his communion, and “offer sacrifice privately,^(h) erecting altar against altar, contrary to established discipline—he be deprived of his office.” *Ibid. Can. viii. T. ii. p. 1161.*

S. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, G. C.—On the words of the prophet Malachias; *And in every place incense shall be offered to God, and a clean offering*; he says, addressing the Jews: “When did this happen? When was incense thus offered? When this clean sacrifice? You can produce no other time than this, after the coming of Christ.⁽ⁱ⁾ And if of this time the prophet had not spoken; had he prophesied, not of our sacrifice but of that of the Jews, his prophecy would have been contrary to the law; for Moses forbids sacrifices to be offered in any other place than that which God had chosen: to this he con-

(e) This council met about the middle of the fourth century, and has left us sixty canons, which have ever been held in the greatest estimation.

(f) προσφοραν.

(g) This council was called by Genethlius, bishop of Carthage, who presided at it, in 390. It enacted thirteen canons, respecting the celibacy of bishops, priests, and deacons, and other points of discipline.

(h) Separatim—sacrificium Dei obtulerit.

(i) Οὐκ ἂν ἔχοις ἕτερον εἶπειν καιρον, ἀλλ' ἡ τῶτον, τον μετα την τε Κριστε παρῴσιαν.

finest them. But Malachias declares, that in *every place* incense shall be offered, and a clean sacrifice. In the first place, the prophet foretels that, not in one city, as among the Jews, but from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, offerings shall be made. Then, by calling the sacrifice *clean*, he plainly denotes of what victim he spoke. And finally, the offerings will be made, not in Israel, but in all nations. In *every place*, says he; evidently showing, that wherever the sun sheds its light, there the gospel shall be preached. He speaks of a *clean offering*, not as if by its own nature, that of the Jews had been unclean, but only through the will of the offerers. Nevertheless, if our present sacrifice be compared with the former, so vast will the difference be found, that ours alone can merit the name of clean." *Adv. Judæos. Orat. iii. T. 1. p. 437.*—"When you behold the Lord immolated, and the priest at the altar offering sacrifice, and pouring out prayers, and then the surrounding multitude partaking of the sacred blood,^(k) can you, at that moment fancy you are among mortals, and dwelling on the earth? Rather, are you not transported to the heavens?" *De Sacerd. L. iii. c. iv. T. iv. p. 27.*—"But when the priest shall have invoked the Holy Spirit, and shall have completed this tremendous and awful sacrifice, the common Lord of all being handled by him;^(l) I ask you, what integrity of life, and what sense of religion shall we not demand from him? Meanwhile, the angels stand by the priest, the army of heavenly powers cry out, and the space around the altar is filled by them in honour of him

(k) τον κυριον τεθυμενον και κειμενον, και τον ιερα εφεστωτα τω θυματι—και παντας εκεινω τω τιμω φοινισσομενες αιματι.

(l) τον φρικωδεστατην επιτελη θυσιαν, και τω κοινω παντων συνεχωσ εφαπτηται εεσποσθ.

who lies there." *Ibid. L. vi. c. iv. p. 82.*—These sentiments he often repeats.—“He has ordained a sacred rite, changing the victim; and in the place of animals, commanding himself to be immolated.”^(m) *Hom. xxiv. in 1 Cor. T. x. p. 256.*—“All the people being present, and raising their hands to heaven, and the sacred victim lying there,⁽ⁿ⁾ shall not God be rendered propitious to them?” *Hom. iii. in c. 1. Ep. ad Philip. T. ci. p. 32.* — “But do we not (it may be asked) offer sacrifice daily?” We do; but in remembrance of his death. And the victim is one, not many. But how is this? Because it was once offered and brought into the sanctuary. This sacrifice is a copy of that; the offering is the same. Not one on one day, and on the next another; but always the same^(o) Thus then the sacrifice is one. But are there many Christs, as the offering is made in many places? By no means: it is the same Christ every where; here entire and there entire; one body. As then, though offered in many places, there is one body, and not many bodies: so is there one sacrifice. He is our high priest, who offered the victim of our expiation: that same victim we now offer that was then offered; which cannot be consumed. This is done in remembrance of what was done. *Do this, he said, in remembrance of me.*” *Hom. xvii. in c. x. Ep. ad Hebr. T. xi. p. 856.*

S. JEROME, L. C. — “According to thee, the Roman bishop does wrong, who offers sacrifices to the Lord, over the bodies of Peter and Paul, which bodies we call vener-

^(m) την ιερουργίαν μετεσκεύασε, και την θυσίαν αὐτὴν ἀμείψας, και ἀντὶ τῆς ἀλογῶν σφραγῆς, ἑαυτὸν προσφέρειν κελύσας.

⁽ⁿ⁾ προκειται ἡ φρικτὴ θυσία.

^(o) τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν αἶμα προσφερομένον ὄν νυν μὲν ἕτερον, ἀκριβὲς δὲ ἕτερον, ἀλλὰ αἶμα τὸ αὐτό· ὥστε μὴ ἔστιν ἡ θυσία.

able remains, but *you*, vile dust. To him their tombs are altars." *Adv. Vigilantium, T. 1. p. 591.*

CENT. V.

S. AUGUSTIN, L. C. — " This eating and drinking, of which the wise man speaks (Eccles. iii.) relate to the participation of this table, which the mediator of the new covenant, the priest, according to the order of Melchisedec, offers of his body and blood. This sacrifice has succeeded to all those of the ancient covenant, which were offered, as the shadows of this that was to come." *De Civ. Dei, L. xvii. c. xx. p. 1138.*—" The prophet Malachias foretelling the Church, which we now behold propagated by Christ, thus manifestly speaks to the Jews in the person of God: *I have no pleasure, &c.* (Malach. 1.) Since, then, we behold this sacrifice, in every place, offered to God, by the priesthood of Christ,^(p) according to the order of Melchisedec; and as the Jews cannot deny that their sacrifices have ceased, why do they still look for another Christ?" *Ibid. L. xviii. c. xxxv. p. 1210.*

Speaking afterwards in reply to those who asked, why miracles were not then wrought; he recounts many, to most of which he was himself a witness, and among them relates, that the property of a great man, whom he names, having been much troubled by wicked spirits, he requested that, " in my absence some of the priests would go, and by their prayers remove the evil. One of them went, offered there the sacrifice of the body of Christ,^(q) praying that the mischief might cease; and, by the mercy of God, it instantly ceased." *Ibid. L. xxii. c. viii. p. 1485.*

(p) Hoc sacrificium per sacerdotiam Christi, cum in omni loco videamus offerri.

(q) Obtulit ibi sacrificium corporis Christi.

To the objection of his adversary, that the Catholics had substituted the martyrs in the place of the idols of the Gentiles, he replies: "The Christian people celebrate the memories of the martyrs with a religious solemnity, in order to excite themselves to an imitation of their constancy, to be united to their merits, and to be aided by their prayers; but to no martyr, to the God alone of martyrs,^(r) in memory of them, alone do we raise altars.‡ For what prelate, assisting at the altar where the bodies of the martyrs lie, was ever heard to say: To thee Peter, to thee Paul, or to thee Cyprian, do we make this offering? To God alone, who crowned these martyrs, is sacrifice offered.—We frequently sacrifice to God in the Churches of the martyrs, by that rite, according to which, as the Scriptures of the New Testament declare, he commanded sacrifice to be offered to him. This pertains to that worship, which the Greeks call *Latria*, and which can be offered to God alone." *Con. Faus. p.* 156.—"It cannot be doubted that, by the prayers of the holy Church, and by the salutary sacrifice,^(s) and by alms which are given for the repose of their souls, the dead are helped; so that God may treat them more mercifully than their sins deserved. This the whole Church observes, which it received from the tradition of the Fathers, to pray for those who died in the Communion of the body and blood of Christ, when, in their turn, they are commemorated at the Sacrifice, and it is then announced that the Sacrifice is offered for them."^(t) *De verbis Apostoli, Sermon. xxxii. T. x. p.* 154.—See other passages, p. 665, &c., above.

^(r) At nulli martyrum, sed ipsi Deo martyrum sacrificamus.

^(s) Orationibus sanctæ Ecclesiæ, et sacrificio salutare, et elemosynis.

^(t) Hoc a patribus traditum, universa observat ecclesia, ut pro

S. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, G. C.—“ We offer in the Church a holy, vivifying, and unbloody sacrifice;^(u) not believing it to be the common body and blood of man, but the real body and the real blood of the life-giving word.^(z) For common flesh cannot give life, which our Saviour himself attested, saying: *It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.* (John vi. 64.)” *Declar. Anathem.* xi. T. vi. p. 156.—“ God said plainly to the Jews, that they were not pleasing to him, or rather, that he would not accept their sacrifices in shadows and figures: but foretels, that his name shall be great among all nations, and that, in every place and nation, pure and unbloody sacrifices shall be offered.^(y) *Comm. in c. 1. Malach. T. iii. p. 830.*—*See also the letter read at Ephesus, p. 666, as above.*—“ On this occasion,” &c.

COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, G. C.—In this council, which was held in the year 451, the following complaint was read against Dioscorus, the bishop of Alexandria: “ So great was his audacity against all—not as became a bishop, and a bishop of so great a city, and of this evangelical see—as not to permit the corn to be received, which our kind emperors had granted to the Churches of Lybia, on account of the sterility of the province, and because no corn is grown in it. It was granted, in the first place, that of it, the unbloody sacrifice might be offered;^(z) and then that travellers and the poor inhabitants might be aided. From this oppressive act it has hap-

eis, qui — defuncti sunt, cum ad ipsum sacrificium commemorantur, ac pro illis quoque id offerri commemoretur.

(u) και ἀναιμακτον ἐν ταις ἐκκλησιαῖς τελεμεν θυσίαν.

(x) μαλλον ὡς ἴδιον σωμα γεγονος, και μεντοι και ἄιμα τῶ παντα ζωογονεν τος λογῶ.

(y) θυσιαι καθαραι και ἀναιμακτοι.

(z) την ἀναιμακτην θυσίαν ἐπιτελεισθαι.

pened that the tremendous and unbloody sacrifice has not been celebrated.^(a) *Libellus Ischyronis, &c. Conc. Gen. T. iv. p. 400.*

S. LEO,^(b) L. C.—Thus writes to Dioscorus, the bishop of Alexandria: “That the discipline of our Churches may in all things agree, this should be observed: That, when a more solemn feast calls the people together, and more assemble than the Church can contain, the offering of the sacrifice be repeated,^(c) lest any be deprived of it; for religion and reason demand, that the sacrifice should be as often offered,^(d) as there are people to partake. Otherwise, if the custom of one mass be followed, they who cannot find place must be deprived of the sacrifice.^(e) We therefore anxiously exhort you, that you do not neglect, but join with us, as in faith so in practice, to observe a rule that by tradition is come down to us.” *Ep. xi. al. lxxxix. ad Diosc. p. 437.*

S. EUCHERIUS,^(f) L. C.—“Let all unbelief be gone,

(a) μητε φρικτην, και αναιμακτον θυσιαν επιτελεισθαι.

(b) *St. Leo*, by his exalted qualities and signal government of the Church, obtained the appellation of *Great*, while the works which he has left, comprising many sermons and letters, prove the solidity of his judgment, the extent of his acquirements, and the firmness of his courage, on many trying occasions. His style is at once elevated and elegant. He died in 461.

(c) Sacrificii oblatio indubitanter iteretur.

(d) Toties sacrificium subsequens offeratur.

(e) Si unius tantum Missæ, more servato, sacrificium offerere non possint.

(f) *St. Eucherius* was bishop of Lyons, and had been a monk in the convent of Lerins. Some works, very elegantly written, are ascribed to him; but I would not say that the sermon, from which I quote this passage is from him, though I find it under his name. It is admitted, however, to be ancient; and as it delivers explicitly the doctrine which, in this and the preceding centuries, had been taught, its authority may fairly be added to the general mass of evidence. He probably was contemporary with Vincent of Lerins; and died about the year 454. (*See Dupin and Cave.*)

since he is witness of the truth, who is the author of the gift; for the invisible priest does, by his word and secret power, change the visible creatures into the substance of his body and blood,^(g) saying thus: *Take and eat, this is my body, &c.* And therefore, as at the command of the Lord, the highest heavens, the deep waves, and the vast earth, suddenly rose out of nothing; so, by the like power in the spiritual sacraments, the virtue of the word commands, and the effect obeys.^(h) Let no one doubt that these creatures, by the nod of his power, by the presence of his majesty, pass into the substance of the Lord's body.⁽ⁱ⁾ When the creatures to be blessed by the heavenly words are placed on the altar, before they are consecrated by the invocation of the Most High, the substance of bread and wine is there; but after the words of Christ, it is the body and blood of Christ.^(k) And what wonder is it, that he who could create these things by his word, should change them when created?^(l) Nay, it seems matter of less wonder, if that which is acknowledged to have been created of nothing, be now changed into better.^(m) Search what is hard for him to do, to whom it was easy to raise things visible and invisible, by the power of his will; to whom it was easy to clothe man made of the matter of clay, with the image of his own divinity," &c. *Hom. v. de Pasch. sub nomine Eusebii. Bibl. PP. T. vi. p. 636, 637.*

(g) In substantia corporis et sanguinis sui, verbo suo, secretâ potestate convertit.

(h) Verbi præcipit virtus, et rei servit effectus.

(i) Novum et impossibile non debet videri, quod in Christi substantiam terrena et mortalia committuntur.

(k) Post verba Christi, corpus et sanguis est Christi.

(l) Verbo possit creata convertere.

(m) In melius valeat commutare.

APPENDIX.—No. XII.

IF we examine the various motives which induced the several inspired authors of the New Testament to write their respective portions of that sacred Volume, we shall immediately perceive that, in some instances, private, but in all, a particular or local circumstance, originally suggested the idea of writing.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW.

Having for some time preached the word through all Judea, St. Matthew, about forty-one years after the birth of Christ, and eight from his Ascension, yielded to the repeated solicitations of those amongst the Jewish people who had become believers in the doctrine of Christ, and accordingly drew up his Gospel, on purpose for their accommodation. Numbers of that nation willingly admitted that Jesus of Nazareth was of the royal house of David, and had performed both numerous and most stupendous miracles, yet still refused to recognize him for the Messiah. To identify that heavenly personage with the Saviour, the Evangelist directs the attention of the Hebrew nation to the various prophecies and portions of the sacred Volume, which prove, to demonstration, that the promised Messiah had in reality appeared in Jesus. That the immediate instruction of the Jews was the motive of St. Matthew for writing, is also testified by clear, internal evidence. Unlike the other Evangelists—he furnishes a dogmatical history of the Messiah, rather than a chronological biography of Christ. The language which he

uses is not of Greece, but the Syro-Chaldaic,⁽ⁿ⁾ the common tongue of Palestine. In the progress of his narration, he refers to customs, sects, opinions, and geographical descriptions, that could be familiar only to the Jews, and which he never pauses to illustrate by the faintest explanation. Now, these are circumstances which, while they satisfy us that the inspired Apostle was perfectly intelligible to those he was addressing, likewise warrant the assertion that he particularly intended his Gospel NOT FOR THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH, BUT FOR HIS HEBREW COUNTRYMEN.

GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.

From the authority of Papias, St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Epiphanius, and St. Jerome, we are informed that the Evangelist St. Mark was prevailed upon to draw up his Gospel by the earnest solicitations of the Christian Church at Rome. The converts of the imperial city entreated him to record for them the doctrine and the precepts he had gathered from the preaching of St. Peter, to whom he had attached himself as a most loving and devoted disciple. He yielded to their importunities, and in consequence composed the Gospel which bears his name, about the year 47, and at Rome.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE.

St. Luke addressed his Gospel not to the Church at large, but to some illustrious individual, by name Theo-

⁽ⁿ⁾ This is asserted by *Papias*, apud *Euseb. Hist.*, Lib. iii. Cap. 39; *Origenes*, *ibid.* Lib. vi. cap 25; *Irenæus*, Lib. iii. *Adversus Hæreses*, Cap. 1mo et 2mo; *Eusebæus*, Lib. iii. Cap. 24; *Hieronymus*, Præf. in quatuor *Evang.*; *Epiphanius*, *Hær.* 29; *Cyrellus*, *Cathec.* 14; *Chrysotomus*, *Hom.* 1mo in *Matth.* *Augustinus*, *de Consensu Evangelistarum*, Lib. 1mo. Cap. 2do.

philus, in all probability a distinguished Gentile convert to Christianity. That Theophilus was a real, not an imaginary personage, and of elevated dignity at Rome, may be gathered from several circumstances. The epithet *κρατιστος*, (most excellent,) by which the Evangelist has designated him, was a title which the usage of that period exclusively reserved for Governors of Provinces—for Cursule Ediles, and other public and important functionaries. As he intended his writings for a Pagan convert and a Roman, St. Luke is careful to translate, for his information, certain Hebrew words and phrases into Greek. Whilst he is also anxious to instruct his proselyte what kind of cities are Capharaum and Bethlehem, and where the country of the Gerasens and Mount Olivet are situated; yet, whenever his narration makes it necessary to speak of towns in Italy, or Sicily, or Malta, as it happens in the Acts of the Apostles, which are also the composition of St. Luke, and by him dedicated to the same illustrious individual, he passes onwards without offering any explanatory comment whatsoever, persuaded that as a Roman, Theophilus was already in possession of all necessary information, concerning his native country and its adjacent islands.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN.

As for St. John, we know that, at a very advanced period of life, about the year 97, and after he had already given to the world his Apocalypse, or Book of Revelations, he was importuned by the earnest and unanimous entreaties of all the bishops and pastors of the Church, throughout Asia Minor, to deliver to them an authentic testimony against Cerinthus, Ebion, and their followers, who were attempting innovations in the faith, and had denied the divinity of Jesus, and rejected a great number of the facts

and words of the Redeemer, which had been omitted by the other three Evangelists, though preserved by a constant tradition in the Church. Whilst he yielded to such pressing invitations, it is evident St. John was actuated by a particular and specific purpose in writing, as he did, the dogmatical history of Jesus Christ; and intended it for the Asiatic members of the Church, as an immediate antidote against the poisonous doctrines that had begun to contaminate that portion of the fold of Christ.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

The Acts of the Apostles were compiled by the Evangelist St. Luke, about thirty years after the Crucifixion of our Saviour, and dedicated by him to Theophilus, the same distinguished individual to whom he had, ten years before, addressed his Gospel.

The object of the sacred writer was to supply, by a divinely inspired and well-substantiated document, those several spurious Acts of the Apostles, and those supposititious histories of the infant Church, which were getting at that period into circulation.^(o)

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

The Epistle to the Romans, which St. Paul dictated to Tertius,^(p) at Corinth, and sent to the imperial city, by the Deaconess of Cenchre, Phebe,^(q) about the year 57, was occasioned by a serious and dangerous disputation, which arose between the Gentiles and the Jewish converts in that Church, each party asserting a superior title over

^(o) Such were the Acts of Andrew, of Philip, and of Thomas, condemned by Pope Gelasius; the Acts of St. Peter, the Acts of St. John the Evangelist—of St. Philip—of St. Matthew, &c.

^(p) Chap. xvi. verse 22.

^(q) Chap. xvi. verse 1.

the other, to the privilege of having received a calling to the faith. The proselytes from heathenism boasted of the doctrines of many of their sages; and, whilst they applauded, with earnestness, the integrity and moral justice which adorned the lives of some amongst them, they attributed such virtue to the pure results of their philosophy, and asserted that the defects and blemishes, which might be occasionally detected in their actions, were but of a trifling nature, and attributable rather to the ignorance in which they were born and educated, than to any thing evil and inherent in idolatry: and furthermore, they considered themselves warranted in despising the entire Jewish people, and in treating them as nothing less than Deicides.

The Hebrew believers, on the other hand, employed the most splendid language whilst proclaiming the holiness of their progenitors. They claimed to be the chosen people of the Lord, and affected equally to despise the believing Gentile and the infidel Idolater. To allay such dissensions was the object of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

The same Apostle had established a Church at Corinth, the capital of Achaia—but scarcely had he taken his departure from that city, than false teachers insinuated themselves amongst the faithful, to corrupt the doctrine of the Gospel. The infant Church beheld herself unhappily divided into various sects and parties—some declared for Apollo—others proclaimed themselves the followers of Cephas, or of Paul, according to the names of their respective instructors in the rudiments of faith. These Corinthian Christians were indifferently composed of Jewish and of Heathen converts.

To their belief in Jesus, the former still united a most religious reverence towards the ancient covenant: the latter, who had been accustomed to all the splendour and the charms of Grecian eloquence, preserved their taste for the learned disputations of the various schools of philosophy; and, hence, considered St. Paul, their Christian teacher, not only as a man of unpolished manners, but possessing very humble talents.

The manners, too, of the citizens were become so profligate, as to render Corinth proverbial for licentiousness and immorality; so much so, that *Κορινθία κορη* was used, through Greece, to signify a public courtesan, whilst *κορινθιαζεζθαι* came to be synonymous with leading an abandoned life.

One certain individual, amid the Christian converts, had openly espoused the relict of his very father. Chap. 5, v. 1st.

Before approaching to receive the holy Eucharist, it was a custom with the earlier Christians, to unite and eat together, in what was termed a Feast of Charity (*αγαπαι*). Imperceptibly, the most flagrant abuses introduced themselves into these assemblies. The poorer brethren were looked down upon with superciliousness by the more opulent, who would withdraw themselves from their immediate neighbourhood, and, sitting down at separate boards, indulge in all the luxury and riot of the table, and sometimes drink, even to intoxication. It was from being informed of these disorders, and moreover, from an anxiety to satisfy them concerning the things whereof they wrote to him (*Chap. vii. v. 1*), and to answer the questions they had proposed to him, concerning marriage, widowhood, and the state of virginity, that St. Paul composed his First Epistle to the Corinthians.

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

To this Epistle succeeded another which was drawn from the Apostle, by the account he had received from his favourite disciple Titus, that his letter had produced a most salutary effect upon the greater number of the Corinthians, though a portion of the former evil still remained to be eradicated from amongst them; and that certain false Apostles, pretending that the legal observations of the Mosaic constituted a portion of the Christian dispensation, had reiterated their clamours and their accusations against him. This it was that decided the Apostle of the Gentiles to address a second letter to the Church at Corinth.

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

The Epistle which St. Paul addressed, about the year 55, in all probability from Ephesus, to the Galatians, a people of Asia Minor, who had been converted to the Gospel, by his preaching, was occasioned by the information communicated to the Apostle that, after his departure from them, certain pretended Apostles had introduced themselves amongst the Galatians, and had contradicted the doctrine he had delivered; whilst they persuaded them that a belief in Jesus Christ was not alone sufficient for salvation, but that the law of circumcision, and the full observance of the Levitical rite was absolutely necessary. Moreover, to weaken the authority of St. Paul, they insinuated that he had never seen the Redeemer—that he was but a disciple of the Apostles—and had promulgated a doctrine contrary to theirs, and more especially to that of St. Peter. To caution the Galatians against the falsehood of such misguiding teachers, and to furnish a

refutation of their calumnies, St. Paul composed one of his most energetic and eloquent Epistles.

EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

The letter to the Ephesians was composed by St. Paul, whilst in captivity at Rome, about the year 60. It was entrusted by him to the Deacon Tychicus, to be conveyed to Ephesus. That city was the capital of Asia Minor, and, at this period, one of the most celebrated emporiums for commerce in the Roman empire. Its inhabitants professed a thorough belief in magic, and were very much addicted to the study of it; so much so, that the expression *Εφεσια γραμματα*, or Ephesian characters, came at length to signify magical writings, and St. Luke, in the sixth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, informs us, that so great was the number of books on this pretended science, which, on the preaching of St. Paul, the first believers in Christianity produced to be burned, that their value might be estimated at 50,000 denarii; which, if they were Roman ones, must have been equivalent to £1614. 11s. 8*d.*, calculating the denarius at 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ *d.* English.

Nor were the Ephesians less addicted to the absurdities of Idolatry. The goddess Diana, distinguished by the appellation of Multimammia, was the object of their most solemn and peculiar worship. St. Paul had succeeded in converting a multitude of these superstitious and idolatrous Ephesians: but, while a prisoner at Rome, that Apostle learned that they had relapsed into their ancient errors, by the persuasion of certain Jews and Pagan philosophers, who attributed their calling to the faith to the observance of the Mosaic dispensation, and the law of nature; and whilst they rejected the authority of St. Paul,

and of the rest of the Apostles, they maintained that marriage was illicit, and asserted the necessity of rendering a homage to the angels, as the *Mediators* between God and man. To recall the Ephesians to their former faith, and to fortify them against the erroneous systems of deceitful teachers, the Apostle of the Gentiles addressed to them this Epistle.

EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

This epistle which, about the year 62, was conveyed by Epaphroditus from St. Paul, in bonds at Rome, to the faithful at Philippi, one of the principal cities in Macedonia, was occasioned by the intelligence communicated to that apostle, concerning a dispute which had arisen between Evodia and Syntyche, whom he beseeches to be of one mind; and by the discord that existed amongst the believers in that city relative to certain points of Christian doctrine.

EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

Almost the same identical reasons that induced St. Paul to write to the Ephesians, prevailed upon him, conjointly with Timothy, to address a letter to the Colossians, about the year 62. Tychicus and Onesimus were charged with its delivery.

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

The first epistle to the Thessalonians bears the subscription not only of St. Paul, but also of Silas and of Timothy, and was written about the year 52, from Corinth, on account of the following circumstances. It was from Athens that the apostle of the Gentiles had dele-

gated his favourite disciple Timothy to Thessalonica, in order to ascertain the condition of the Church in that city, from which he had been driven by the persecution of the Jews. Timothy soon joined St. Paul at Corinth, to render him an account most favourable to the perseverance and the fervour of the Thessalonian proselytes. The disciple detailed to his master the solicitude exhibited by some amongst them to be more particularly instructed concerning the condition of those who had already died—the second coming of the Saviour—and the final judgment. In consequence of this, St. Paul rejoices with the Thessalonians on their adherence to the faith, and assures them that the other Churches are loud in their eulogiums; he then proceeds to communicate the instructions which they sought for, and in conclusion, we behold this fervent apostle with his usual energy, rectifying the ignorance of the less instructed—fixing the wavering faith of some—and whilst he chides the errors of others, with a winning gentleness exhorting all to patience and to mutual charity.

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

The second epistle to the Thessalonians, like its precursor, bears the subscription of St. Paul, of Silas, and of Timothy, and was written at Corinth about the year 53. In his first letter the apostle had animadverted on the erroneous opinion concerning the day of judgment. The receipt of this epistle only provoked the patrons of the novel doctrines to maintain, with redoubled obstinacy, that the day of final retribution was at hand. To chastise the temerity of these self-constituted teachers, and to repress the errors they were circulating, was the object of *this second epistle to the Thessalonians.*

EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

Timothy was one amongst the most cherished disciples of St. Paul, who had selected him to be his fellow-labourer and companion in almost all his various journeyings, and had deputed him to visit many of the Churches of the Gentiles in his name, and had employed him with singular success, in the conversion of the Jews. Solicitous to furnish his disciple with the most ample instructions on the duties of his holy ministry, on the government and discipline of the Church, St. Paul addressed a particular epistle to Timothy, in which he fervently exhorts him to guard himself against seducing teachers, and to perform with zeal all the obligations of his sacred calling. He informs him that he had cut off from communion with the Church, the blasphemous Hymeneus, and Alexander. He enumerates the virtues and the qualities which ought to ornament the character of such as are selected to compose the various orders of the hierarchy; he mentions how the household of a bishop should be constituted, and notices the conduct that ought to be observed by men and women in the religious assemblies.

SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

This epistle of Paul to Timothy was followed by a second from Rome, about the year 65. The apostle of the Gentiles most anxiously desired to behold once more his well-beloved disciple, and co-partner in many of his difficulties. On this account he urges him to come to Rome as expeditiously as possible. After having reminded Timothy of his various duties as a teacher of the word, St. Paul prophetically announces that the hour of his own death is not far distant, and exhorts him, also, to prepare for martyrdom if necessary.

EPISTLE TO TITUS.

Titus, also, was a devoted companion and disciple of St. Paul, and whilst he participated in the affections and paternal solicitude of that apostle, was, like Timothy, honoured with a particular epistle from their common master. In this letter, after having commissioned Titus to finish what he had himself begun at Corinth, and to appoint bishops in different cities, St. Paul repeats the same instructions we have lately heard him delivering to Timothy.

EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

This letter was produced by a strictly private circumstance. St. Paul had converted and baptized at Rome, Onesimus, a slave, who had fled the house of his lord, a distinguished Colossian citizen, by name Philemon, himself initiated in the faith by the apostle. Unwilling to retain Onesimus against his master's will, St. Paul sent him home again with a letter, in which he strongly supplicates the favour of Philemon towards his returning servant.

To the epistles of St. Paul succeed other seven, composed in part by different apostles, but not immediately addressed to any one particular portion of the faithful. Of the first of these the author was St. James the less, the bishop of Jerusalem, in which city he wrote it, probably between the years 58 and 63. His object was to encourage the brethren and more especially those dispersed through Palestine, and recently converted from the synagogue, to brave the persecutions enkindled by the Jews; and not only to fortify them against the dangers of apostacy, but to warn them also of the acts and errors of deceitful teachers.

FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES OF ST. PETER.

A mere partial perusal of the two epistles of St. Peter, will serve to convince us that the same reasons which prevailed with St. James, induced St. Peter also to address himself by writing, to the faithful, in order to guard them against the danger of returning to their former darkness; to console them amid their trials and the persecutions they endured for conscience' sake, and to exhort them to preserve the deposit of faith, pure and untainted by the falsehood of innovators.

FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN.

To confirm his spiritual children in the truths of Christianity, and to caution them especially against the erroneous doctrines that had been propagated by Ebion and Cerinthus, concerning the divinity of Jesus, were the motives which induced St. John to write this epistle, which he does not address to any particular Church, but, in all probability, communicated to the faithful at Ephesus and its vicinity.

SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN.

The second letter penned by this apostle is addressed to the lady Electa and her children. In it he notices that "many seducers had gone out into the world who confessed not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." (*verse 7.*) Hence, he exhorts this pious matron and her family to continue steadfast in the truth, and forbids them to say as much as "God speed thee," (*verse 10.*) or receive into their house the man who had revolted from the doctrine of Christ.

THIRD EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN.

His third letter the apostle wrote to Gaius, whom he

loudly praises for his walking in the truth, and for his charity towards the brethren and strangers, and while he strongly animadverts upon the improper conduct of Diotrophes, he yields a most willing and honourable testimony in favour of Demetrius.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE.

The efforts of certain heretics to vitiate the belief, whilst they corrupted the morality of such as listened to them, instigated St. Jude to write this epistle. In it that apostle calls upon the brethren "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," (*verse 3.*) and admonishes them that "certain men had secretly entered in, ungodly, turning the grace of our God into riotousness, and denying the only sovereign ruler, and our Lord Jesus Christ." (*verse 4.*)

THE APOCALYPSE.

The book of the apocalypse or revelations was written in the Island of Patmos, as we gather from the ninth verse of the first chapter, whilst its divinely inspired author was suffering exile. General opinion has fixed its composition about the year 96. Its contents are the revelations made to the apostle by the Holy Spirit, to be communicated by him to the seven Churches of Asia, (*verse 11.*) not to the universal body of the faithful: they are prophetic of the principal events about to happen in the Church. The sublime ideas—the splendid imagery, that are so conspicuous throughout this portion of the sacred Scriptures—together with the mystic nature of the language which envelopes them, have made it a labyrinth into which many a proud and giant genius has entered only to entangle and to lose itself. Without citing

a multitude of names, the idle interpretations and the reveries of our own illustrious Newton on this book, will be quite sufficient to establish the veracity of this assertion.

APPENDIX.—No. XIII.

FROM THE CATHOLIC MISCELLANY.

Archdeacon Nares says, that the apochryphal books were received neither by Jews nor Christians before the Protestant reformation. This assertion is perpetually in the mouth of Protestants; and in the angry discussions which are now going on relative to this subject, each party has shown how little they know about the question. It may therefore prove acceptable to your readers to be put in possession of what I may call the facts of the case; and for this purpose I shall compress the learned dissertation by the Rev. Mr. Kinsella, of Carlow, to be found in the appendix to his controversial letters.

Among the many differences between Catholics and Protestants, one of the most important regards certain portions of Scripture, which the latter refuse to receive as canonical. These parts of the Bible are by them considered as "Apocryphal," that is, of uncertain origin, and doubtful authority; while on the other side, the Catholic Church, guided by the testimony of antiquity, and directed by the Spirit of Eternal Truth, delivers these books to her children as the pure word of God. The portions of the Scripture which Catholics admit into the

canon, and which Protestants exclude from it, are as follows:—the Book of Wisdom,—the Book of Ecclesiasticus, the History of Tobias,—the History of Judith,—and the first and second book of the Macchabees. To these we must add the latter chapters of Esther, some chapters of Daniel, and the Prophecy of Baruch. According to the sixth of the Thirty-nine Articles, the English Church “doth read these books for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth not apply them to establish any doctrine.” The Catholic Church not only orders her children to read them for the instruction of life and manners, but also employs them to establish certain articles of doctrine; which articles, however, can be abundantly proved from other sources.

Christianity, when first established, was subjected to almost incessant persecutions, and its followers were comparatively few in number and widely scattered over the whole world. Under such circumstances each particular Church had scarcely any opportunities of consulting the other Churches, and the reader of ecclesiastical history will perceive that in those things which related to faith, as well as in those which regarded morals, the belief both of the people and the bishops was guided in most cases by the tradition of the particular Church to which they belonged. Now as many portions of the Scripture were addressed only to particular Churches, it is not wonderful that the bishops of other Churches should have remained ignorant of their canonicity; and as there were many writings which appeared scriptural, but which were really apocryphal, it is quite natural that the pastors of particular churches should have held different opinions as to a mere matter of fact: for no one ever asserted that particular bishops, or particular fathers, were incapable of mis-

taking a fact that could not be ascertained without considerable difficulty. It appears, therefore, most reasonable, that in determining the matter, we should look rather to the decision of the Fathers when assembled in council, than to their opinions when separated from each other ; for to say nothing of the theological argument in favour of Œcumenical Councils, the principles even of logic demonstrate, that as a motive of judgment, the testimony of individuals is fallible ; but the testimony of many men, assembled from different places, and guided by different feelings, is conclusive.

The Council of Laodicea is one of the first that appears to have turned their attention to this subject ; for though Jerome seems to say that the Council of Nice approved of one of those books which our adversaries reject, it must be allowed that we have no authentic copy of their decision. The Fathers at Laodicea, in their list of canonical books, included only one of the disputed books of the Old Testament ; and Protestants, though on every other occasion they refuse to pay any sort of attention to the decisions of Councils, are particularly fond of quoting the fifty-ninth canon of Laodicea as a most conclusive argument in their favour. I do not, however, see that the argument has any strength ; for though the pious canons of this Council have always entitled it to great respect, it was still merely a provincial Council, consisting of a very small number of bishops, and of course could only bear testimony to the tradition of one small province of the Universal Church. Moreover, the Council merely gave a list of those books, the canonicity of which was *at that time* clearly ascertained ; and if it passed over some of those which we receive, it was because their authenticity had not been, *at that period, and in that place*, finally determined. It is also particu-

larly worthy of remark, that though Protestants object this Council to us, they do not seem to think very highly of it themselves; and in point of fact, we pay more respect to its authority than our adversaries are disposed to do, *even on this subject*. We receive every one of the books mentioned at Laodicea, and if we add to the number, it is because we think that the general tradition was not then sufficiently ascertained. The Protestants reject the Prophecy of Baruch, which this Council inserted in their canon, and they receive the Apocalypse, which the Council refused to admit. This species of inconsistency is, however, very common with our adversaries; for I have remarked, that there is scarcely one ancient authority which they quote, that does not differ from them with regard to some particular books.

The Council of Carthage was held about thirty years after that of Laodicea, and is undoubtedly one of the most respectable that has ever met. The bishops of the great and enlightened Church of Africa were assembled, and Aurelius, the celebrated Archbishop of Carthage, presided. What must add very considerably to the authority of this Council is, that we have every reason to believe that the great and learned Augustine was present; it is, at all events, admitted, that he approved of its proceedings in every respect, and particularly with reference to the canon of the Scripture. When the Fathers assembled at Laodicea, the Church was scarcely recovered from the previous persecution; but when the Council of Carthage was held, she had enjoyed some years of repose, and the different national Churches had availed themselves of the opportunity of comparing their respective traditions: and as the canon of Scripture was a fact that, according to the Protestants themselves, must be decided by the testimony

of historical tradition, the Council of Carthage possessed an advantage in this respect to which the Council of Laodicea had no claim whatever. Accordingly we find that this Council extended the list of canonical books, by adding those whose authenticity had been fully ascertained by inquiries made among the other Churches; and the 47th canon of the Council of Carthage contains *precisely* the same books which the Council of Trent received about twelve hundred years after. It is to be remarked, that the acts of the national synod of Africa were afterwards confirmed by an Œcumenical Council held in Constantinople.

In a few years after the Council of Carthage, Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, wrote to Innocent the First, in order to learn what were the canonical books; and the Pope in his answer gives the very same list which had been approved of at Carthage, and which we receive at the present day. And Pope Gelasius, towards the close of the fifth century, having assembled a Council of seventy bishops, published the same canon which Innocent had previously settled. Thus we find that the tradition of the Western Church on this subject was complete, so early as the beginning of the fifth century.

The decisions of the Council of Carthage, of Innocent the First, and of the Roman Council under Gelasius, seem to have produced unanimity on this subject in the Western Church; for we do not find that any other Council thought it necessary to publish any list of the canonical books, until the Council of Florence assembled in the early part of the fifteenth century. In the interim, a few divines occasionally expressed a doubt of the perfect canonicity of some of the books, and by doing so *at that time*, they did not thereby break the unity of the Church; for though the Fathers of the preceding Councils had published their de-

cisions on this point for the instruction of the faithful, they had not published them in such a form as to *oblige* all Christians to believe them under pain of sin. It was sufficient to let the people know what books the Church approved of; but it was not as yet necessary to render it imperative on all to believe in their divine origin, particularly as those who doubted of their perfect canonicity had no doubt of the propriety of reading them with all the attention and respect that was due, as well to their venerable antiquity, as to the holy doctrine which they contained.

The Council of Florence is considered by Catholics as Œcumenical, and was assembled by Eugene the Fourth for the purpose of effecting a reconciliation between the Eastern and Western Churches. Besides the Pope and the Bishops of the Latin Church, it was also attended by the Emperor of the East, by the Patriarch of Constantinople, and by many other bishops and abbots of the Greek Church. The principal points of difference between the Greeks and Latins were discussed with great energy during twenty-five sessions; and we may conclude that there was no difference as to the canonical scriptures, from the fact of there having been no discussion whatever on this point. It would have been, therefore, unnecessary for the Council to have come to any decision on the subject, were it not that towards the close of their proceedings, a number of deputies arrived from the Armenians, who then formed a large schismatical Church. The patriarchs of these people came in order to have their Church once more united to the great body of Christianity; and this having been accomplished, the Council ordered a decree to be drawn up for their instructions. In this document we find a list of the canonical books, which corresponds

precisely with the list which had been published by the Council of Carthage, and which has since been republished by the Council of Trent. The Council did not think it necessary to frame this list in such a way as to render the belief of its accuracy a necessary article of faith.

It is known that many of the Greeks who attended the Council, relapsed into schism after returning into their own country; and that they are still separated from the unity of the Catholic Church. It is, however, very remarkable, that though they differ from us in other points, and though they deny the supremacy of the Pope, they continue to preserve the same canon of Scripture which we possess; and our adversaries have never been able to prevail upon the Greeks to conform to the Protestant doctrine in this, or indeed in any other point. This coincidence could not have arisen from any influence we had over them, nor for any love they bear towards our Church, for though they approach much nearer to the Catholic faith than any other sect, it is quite notorious that a strong aversion for the Western Church is a very general feeling among them. How then does it happen that they receive the same canonical scriptures? From the fourth to the ninth century we find nothing but jealousy and dislike on their part towards the Latin Church. From the ninth century to the present day, the two Churches have been openly opposed to each other; and most certainly the Greek Church would not willingly agree with us in the canon of the Scripture, if they could at all avoid doing so. But the force of truth is too great,—they cannot reject those books which their own most ancient tradition obliges them to receive.

The early reformers rejected or admitted as it best suited

their purposes ; at least, they seldom rejected a book until it had been quoted against them. When the epistle of Saint James was quoted against Luther, he called it an " epistle of straw ;" and when a verse of the epistle to the Hebrews was objected to Calvin, he answered the objection by rejecting the entire book. Sometimes, indeed, they were condescending enough to admit the authority of the book ; but Luther had always in reserve a most amusing rule for interpreting the Scripture backwards, which served as an infallible recipe for answering all objections. He prescribes as follows: " Let this be *your rule*;—when the Scripture *commands* you to do a good work, understand it in this sense, that it *forbids* you to do a good work, because you cannot do any good work."

Luther refused to receive some of the Catholic epistles, the Church of England receives them all ;—Calvin rejected the Apocalypse and the epistle to the Hebrews ; the Church of England, and even the Scotch Calvinists, have adopted into the canon both of these books.

The following is the authentic declaration of the Established Church on the canon of the Scripture :—" In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." (Art. 6th of the 39.) On this rule for deciding the canon of scripture, I have but two observations to make. First, the rule is not a good one. 2d. The Established Church has notoriously and in many instances departed from the very rule which they have themselves established.

First, the rule is not good, because the doubts that may have existed of the canonicity of any book is not a sufficient reason for rejecting it. I have shown in the second section that the state of the Church for the first three cen-

turies enabled us to explain most clearly the cause of these doubts, and that the impossibility of establishing any extensive communication between the different churches, rendered doubts almost unavoidable. A question on this subject is often proposed by Catholic theologians:—“Whether a book of Scripture which had been once rejected by the Church, could afterwards be received by the same Church?” To this the answer is perfectly plain:—If they could declare that any particular book was not divinely inspired, and that it was only the work of man, that book could never afterwards be received; because, as the decision of the Church must be always true, so her doctrine must necessarily be immutable. But if the Church should think that the inspiration of any book was doubtful, and should on account of that doubt decline inserting it in the canon, the same book may be afterwards received, provided that the doubt be removed, and that the Church becomes certain of its inspiration.

For instance, the Council of Laodicea would not receive the Apocalypse, but when the tradition became better known, the Councils of Carthage, Rome, Florence, and Trent received it; and the great Sir Isaac Newton says, “that there is not one book in the Bible which has a more complete chain of evidence to prove its canonicity.”—Yet *this* book we should reject, according to the rule laid down by the Established Church; for there have been doubts of it in the Church, and at one time, very serious doubts indeed. Therefore, in the first place, the rule adopted by the Established Church is in its own nature erroneous.

2nd.—The Established Church has in many instances notoriously violated the very rule it has adopted on this subject. It is scarcely necessary to prove this, for every

person that is at all acquainted with biblical literature, will recognize in the canon of the Established Church *many* books “whose authority has been *often* doubted of in the church;” for instance, Eusebius the historian (book 4. ch. 26.) Athanasius (Ep. 39.) Gregory Nazianzen (Carm. 33.) not only doubt of the part of Esther which the English church receives, but have even excluded it altogether from their catalogues; and Luther himself had repeatedly expressed his wish to have the whole of Esther rejected. As to the New Testament, it is notorious that the epistle of Saints John, Peter, James, and Jude, the epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse, had been *repeatedly* doubted of in the church; yet the English Protestants receive *every one of them*; and they still have the modesty to assure us, that by scripture “they understand those books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was *never any* doubt in the church.” I have read the 6th of the 39 articles at least a hundred times, in order, if possible, to discover some way of reconciling it with truth or with common sense; and verily, unless there be some mystery concealed under the words, I cannot understand it in any sense that will deliver the framers of the Established Religion from the charge, either of gross and childish ignorance, or of deliberate and notorious falsehood. Their ignorance of antiquity might excuse them in some small degree, but in the name of wonder, how could they avoid knowing that the Lutherans and Calvinists were not only “doubting;” but rejecting these books at the very moment that they themselves were receiving them? I cannot explain the matter, for I do not chuse to impute, even to the English reformers, so senseless a crime as a clumsy and notorious falsehood. It is however perfectly evident, that in no

way can they be acquitted of the most palpable inconsistency.

As then the Established Church has not followed even the erroneous rule which she had adopted for herself, it may be asked—what rule then did she follow? My answer is simply, that I have never been able to discover by what rule she was guided. Perhaps, some of her champions would point out to us even one Council, or even one ancient authority, which agrees, *in all respects*, with the canon of the Established Church.

The Fathers quoted by Catholics give *positive* testimony;—the testimony given by those on whom Protestants rely, is merely *negative*. The former, for instance, state positively, that the Book of Wisdom is the Word of God; the latter *do not deny this*, but they say there are some doubts of its canonicity, and therefore they omit it in their catalogues. Now, in my mind, the former opinion is of much more weight than the latter: because, those who thus *omit* the Book of Wisdom, might very naturally have been ignorant of the reasons for receiving it. Those who received it, *must* have had some grounds upon which to found their belief.

Others of the Fathers omit these books which we receive, and give no reason for their omission. The mere fact of not mentioning the Book, only proves that they were unacquainted with some facts which the others knew; but by no means proves that the books must therefore be rejected. Jerome omitted the Epistle to the Hebrews in his list; but surely, it does not follow that Augustine could not have had sufficient reasons for receiving it, as he did. Even Protestants agree with us in thinking that Jerome was mistaken on this point, for they also receive the Epistle.

The authority of the Church, after all, is the only *plain* and *certain* way of determining the canonicity of Scripture. I have already shewn, that every other criterion possesses more or less of uncertainty, and not one of them is sufficiently *plain*; for where even the most learned cannot agree, it is impossible that the generality of mankind could come to any decision. Yet the rule, in order to be good, should be fitted for *all*; and the only rule that will suit all capacities, is the authority of the Church. It is evident, that this rule is at least a very plain one; the declaration of the Church cannot be mistaken; and the Church herself is well known. She is “a city seated upon a mountain which cannot be hid.” She is “a mountain upon the top of mountains,” which, as St. Augustine says, all must discover, because it is impossible to mistake what is so eminently conspicuous. There can be, therefore, no rule more plain at all events than her declaration.

Your obedient servant,

P. H. J.

APPENDIX.—No. XIV.

SKETCH OF THE FIRST REFORMERS.

From the Right Rev. Dr. MACHALE'S “Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Church.”

“THOUGH the great actors in this drama [the Reformation] have been frequently sketched, yet it is impossible to finish their portrait. There is, in that event, so much of human folly and human wickedness; such irregular vicissitude of tragedy and comedy; and, in the lives of the Reformers,

such a strange mixture of whatever is ludicrous and depraved in the character of man, that one might hesitate whether, with the laughing philosopher, he should ridicule the follies, or, Heraclitus-like, weep over the miseries of human nature, as exemplified in the ' fathers of the Reformation.'

" Amidst the numerous group, the figures of Luther and Calvin principally force themselves on our attention; and the full and sturdy frame of the one stands in striking contrast with the melancholy form of the other. I allude to their exterior figures, since they were singularly expressive of the habits of their minds. Luther, possessed of a constitution which was equal to any labour, and endued with a courage which no danger could appal, indulged in a strain of coarse and virulent invective against personal abuses, of which the lives of some ecclesiastics unfortunately furnished him with a prolific theme. It might be expected that this censor of morals would rebuke, by his own virtues, the excesses against which he so vehemently inveighed. But, like Mahomet, who allowed to himself a larger license of immorality than to his followers, Luther soon claimed a dispensation to violate the vows which he had solemnly pledged to heaven.^(r) From personal abuse of the clergy, he soon passed to canvass the source of their power. His first success inflamed his natural intrepidity into enthusiasm; and the enthusiasm which he felt, he quickly communicated. The passions which he thus inspired, again reacted on himself; until, intoxicated by success, and disdainful of opposition, he assumed the tone of a prophet, and the authority of an apostle; while

(r) Steidan ad An. 1525. See the Reformer's *Sermon on Matrimony*, in the 5th volume of his works, edited at Wirtemberg.

monks, and priests, and princes, and pontiffs, and holy fathers, were involved in the torrent of his indiscriminate vituperation.

“ What Luther effected, in some measure by force, Calvin accomplished by the more insidious instruments of fraud and seduction. The one attempted to storm the citadel; the other had recourse to the slow labours of the mine. Actuated by a boundless ambition, which he had more art to conceal, he meditated the same revolution in France, which Luther had achieved in Germany. Knowing what magic there often is in a name, he amused the citizens of Geneva with the sound of ecclesiastical liberty; until the flames which he lit for Servetus, revealed to the world the hideous features of as great a tyrant as ever abused the name of freedom, to establish his own despotism. There was nothing consolatory or merciful in his doctrines. Out of the Christian code, which breathes so much of mercy and of love, Calvin would extract only the cruel dogmas of reprobation and despair. His countenance bore the impression of his blasphemous sentiments, and his exhausted and agitated frame attested the unwearied workings of the restless inhabitant within. By the opinion that grace is never forfeited, he sanctioned systematic profligacy; and doctrines of absolute predestination to punishment, precipitated men into despair.

“ To the two principal founders of the Reformation, in order to complete the triumvirate, we may add the character of Zuinglius, the minister of Zurich. Ambitious of rivalling the other leaders of the great revolution, he sought to compose their quarrels on the real presence, by giving the words of the institution a new interpretation. For five years, he confesses that he sought their meaning in vain; until, at length, it was revealed to him, by a

nocturnal spirit of ambiguous complexion. The practical commentary of his life and death, may best illustrate the nature of the mysterious apparition from whence he derived his inspiration. From the Gospel, which was taught by Zuinglius, the charms of virginity utterly disappeared; and, in fighting against the enemies of the faith, he relied more on the arms of the flesh than on those of the spirit. Perhaps he may deserve a place among those who, by dying on the field, have obtained military fame; but, to call such a fanatic by the name of a reformer of the meek religion of Jesus, is an abuse of propriety of thought and language which nothing can justify. From his veneration for the ancient pagans, one might consider Zuinglius better fitted for ministering at their worship, than at the altars of the Christian religion. Nay, his blasphemy extends so far as to confound our Redeemer with some of the Pagan deities, in one indiscriminate apotheosis.^(s)

Such were the principal heroes of the Reformation. Of the subordinate agents it is sufficient to observe, that they emulously endeavoured to imitate the conduct of their leaders.

^(s) "He proclaimed that, as far as depended on himself, he had rather take his chance for eternity with Socrates and Seneca, than with the Bishops of Rome, or the Emperors and Princes of Christendom. And, in his 'Exposition of the Christian faith,' presented to Francis the First, the heresiarch assures that monarch, that in heaven, his majesty should meet Socrates, Aristides, Numa, Camillus, the Catos, the Scipios, nay, even Theseus and Hercules, enjoying the bliss of eternal life, of which their piety and valour rendered them far more worthy, than the Dominicans and Cordeliers! The author of these sentiments was declared, by Luther, (in *Gen. c. 47.*) to be a Gentile and a Pagan." ... "Indeed, his general opinion of the discoveries of this fanatic, as well as of his followers, was not very flattering." *Sacramentarii hæretici, blasphemæ, infideles, ethnici, larvati diaboli, &c. Oper. tom. vii. fol. 379.*

“For every class of mankind they had a peculiar engine of persecution. The tepid and disorderly ecclesiastics were loosed from the restraints of discipline and obedience; the ambitious were allured by the hope of distinction, and the avaricious by the hope of ecclesiastical spoliation. The arch reformer found fit engines for his purpose in the passions of mankind. Our Redeemer’s prediction attests the perpetual recurrence of heresies and scandals. (*Matt.* xviii. 7.) At the time of the appearance of Luther the materials were highly inflammable; he had but to fling the torch and they were instantly in a blaze.

“But where can we discover the pacific influence of religion amidst a scene in which avarice, ambition, lust, revenge, and every passion of the human heart, struggled for the ascendancy? Nor let it be said, (and it is an apology that imposes upon numbers) that the crimes of that period were the natural effects of this struggle. It was, we are told, an era in which society was convulsed, and hence it is no wonder if the foulest disorders that lay at the bottom of the human heart were cast up by the violence of the agitation. Yes, it was a disastrous period, during which religious warfare had awakened the strife of contending passions. But where was the mild spirit of religion to be found, striving to appease the tumult? Was it among the reformers, who pretended to restore the ancient purity of the Christian religion? Instead of sending forth its meek and hallowed influence to lay the troubled elements, were they not found tearing up the deep with their ecclesiastical tridents, and having on its surface the accumulated crimes of ages?” *Vol.* ii. *pp.* 174—179.

APPENDIX—No. XV.

ON THE DIVINE COMMISSION.

From Dr. FLETCHER'S "*Comparative View of the Grounds of the Catholic and Protestant Churches.*"

"*As my Father hath sent me, even so do I send you.* These are words too plain to stand in need of any commentary. They very manifestly imply, and express, the conveyance of a divine commission from the hands of Christ to those of his apostles, giving authority to these holy men to govern his spiritual kingdom, and to perform all the functions of their sacred ministry; and founding, at the same time, their right to do this, upon the grounds of that very same sanction from which the great pontiff himself had derived his own pastoral delegation; *As my Father hath sent me, even so do I send you....All power is given to me in heaven and on earth; Go, therefore, and teach all men, and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*

"The import of the above passage, as well as that of several others similar to it, is so plain, that there are few Protestant writers, either ancient or modern, who have not assented to it. Thus Dr. Daubeny says: "the commission by which the apostles and their successors became governors of the Church, originally proceeded from the head of the Church. It consequently conveyed an investiture of authority from that holy fountain, from whence all authority in spiritual matters is to be derived. *As my Father hath sent me,* said Christ to his apostles, *so I send you.* And from the circumstance of the original delivery of the apostolic commission being accompanied

with a declaration which plainly imported the continuance of it to the end of the world, the Church has reasonably and *universally* concluded,—as might be proved from unanswerable evidence,—that it was the divine intention, that *this same commission*, for the accomplishment of the same divine object, should accompany the Church through every stage of its progress.”⁽¹⁾

“Should it be objected,” says the Bampton lecturer of 1817, “that this commission was merely personal; and that it ceased with the lives of those on whom it was bestowed, it may be answered, that we have the same evidence to prove the continuance of the commission to the successors of the apostles, as to substantiate the fact of its having been originally granted to them. For he, who is the source of all power, and from whom alone, whatever is done by the governors of the Church, derives its sanction, expressly declared, that the authority with which the ministers of his word were invested, was not temporary, but permanent; that it was granted, not to

⁽¹⁾ “If, in the series of these pages, I am observed to cite the authority of Dr. Daubeny, more frequently than I do that of any other Protestant divine,—I will here remark, that my motive for doing so, is this,—not that I entertain any peculiar esteem, either for the learning, the talents, or the character, of the man; (I, in fact, entertain no opinion of any of these qualities that could in any degree flatter his vanity) my motive is this, that he is now considered, by what is called “the orthodox” portion of the established clergy, as their leading oracle, and as the best champion, and defender of their Church. Whence he is so loudly praised by the reviewers of this party;—honoured by them with every flattering term of praise; denominated sometimes from his age and wisdom,—“*another Nestor* ;” sometimes, from his strength and valour,—“*another Hercules*,” &c. So that thus, by citing the authority of this redoubtable theologian, I consider myself as citing that of the great body of the established clergy. Such is my sole motive for introducing so often as I shall do, the words of Dr. Daubeny.”

the apostles only, to enable them to build the Church ; but to their successors also, throughout *all ages*."

Having, therefore ascertained these two important facts, —first, that the great Founder of the Church has established in it a divine commission, as the real basis of all pastoral power, and secondly, that he has ordained that this sacred charter should always, through the medium of succession, be perpetuated, and preserved;—having done this, it cannot appear necessary for me to describe, what the precise nature of this order of succession ought to be. The reader, if once impressed with the foregoing truths, will easily comprehend this: for, feeling that since every thing here is sacred, so, of course, every thing must be conformable to the character of the holy institution: "*No one can build upon any other foundation, but that which Christ Jesus hath laid.*" Hence, he will feel, that the line of succession ought essentially, in order to correspond with this great design, to be *lawful, regular, and direct*. It should be *lawful*; that is, it should be a succession not founded upon violence and usurpation; not upon fraud and injustice, but upon the strictest claims of right. It should be *regular, and direct*; that is, it should be, not a broken, interrupted lineage, but a series of inheritance, immediate and unimpaired, presenting a chain of pastors, in which not a single link is wanting, and reaching from the hands of the apostles, down to the hands of the present priesthood. Without this, the consequence would be, that neither could the divine charter be preserved, nor could the faithful ascertain, who, in reality, their true pastors are. So that even this, too, is again admitted by a multitude of Protestant writers; and particularly by the members of the Established Church. These, all allow, that the right to exercise any of the pastoral functions, is founded essen-

tially upon the claim of legitimate inheritance. They even assert, that a mere *defect* would be, here a fatal circumstance. "A defect in the mission of the ministers of the gospel," says Dr. Daubeny, "invalidates the sacraments. Where the commission, delivered originally by our Saviour, and by his authority continued in the Church, does not actually subsist, there the sacraments are not the seals of the divine covenant, but must be considered in the light of *human* ordinances." Whence, the Doctor very justly concludes, that the consideration of this subject, is "of *primary and essential* importance to every professor of Christianity."^(u)

It is, therefore, true, that by the application of one single principle, and of a principle plain and simple as it is important,—the mere verification of *a fact*,—it is easy to

^(u) "If there be no uninterrupted succession," says the acute reasoner, W. Law, in his answer to the bishop of Bangor, "then there are no authorized ministers from Christ. If no such ministers, then no Christian sacraments: if no Christian sacraments, then no Christian covenant, whereof the sacraments are the stated and visible seals. If there be not" he adds, "a succession of persons authorized from Christ to send others to act in his name, then both episcopal and presbyterian teachers are equally usurpers, and as mere laymen as any at all. For there cannot be any other difference between clergy and laity, but as one hath authority derived from Christ, to perform offices, which the other hath not. But the authority can be no otherwise had, than by an uninterrupted succession of men from Christ, empowered to qualify others. For, if the succession be once broken, people must either go into the ministry of their own account, or be sent by such as have no more power to send others, than to go themselves. And can these be called ministers of Christ, or received as his ambassadors? Can they be thought to act in his name who have no authority from him? If there be no succession of ordinances from Christ, every one is equally qualified to ordain. The administering a sacrament is an action we have no right to perform, considered either as men, gentlemen, or scholars, or members of civil society. Who, then, can have any authority to interpose, but he that has it from Christ? And how it can be had from him, without succession, is not easily to be conceived."

decide at once the whole controversy between the Catholic and the Protestant churches ; and to discover where actually subsists that divine sanctuary,—the only asylum of security,—which was reared by the hands of the first apostles. For, it is thus certain and acknowledged, that wheresoever that sacred credential is now preserved,—*there, and there only*, exists this blessed institution. So that if the sacrament be now vested in the hands of the Catholic ministry, then it is also certain, that the fold which they govern, is exclusively divine : as, in like manner, if it be the property of any one of the communities of the Reformation, then also it is equally certain, that this fortunate society is alone the genuine temple of the Christian religion. Without it, churches are not churches, but mere human fabrics which, cumbering the ground, upon which they stand, are alike injurious to man's salvation, and insulting to the God of truth.

It was, accordingly, upon these accounts, that,—referring to the conduct of the fathers, and early pastors, of the Christian church,—we find, whenever there was question of schisms, or sects, or innovations, those enlightened men used always, and beyond every other argument, to instruct their flocks to put the following, or such like, interrogatories to the authors, and abettors, of these evils : “ Who are you ? Whence came you ? Who gave authority to you ? Who bade you preach, and administer the holy sacraments ? Who made you pastors ? ” These, and such as these, are the questions, which the enlightened wisdom of the fathers of the church, not only for ever asked themselves, but put constantly into the mouths of the faithful,—thus guarding them against the artifices of seduction ; and enabling them, by this easy expedient, to preserve, or if lost, to recover, the knowledge

of the true church. There is, indeed, no better clue, that the hand of prudence can lay hold of, to find out the blessed sanctuary. Accordingly, it is still, as it was anciently, the great principle which the wisdom of Catholicity continues to recommend to the public,—exhorting both her own children and her adversaries, to consult it constantly, putting to themselves those same questions which I have just repeated, in order that by this means, distinguishing between the true and the false pastor, they may thus distinguish equally between the true and the false church. Would only that the useful process were employed more frequently than it is! But alas, such, in these days, are the indolence and the ignorance of the public, that seldom does even an individual give himself the trouble so much as to reflect upon it. Whilst, also, it is perhaps too true, that even we, as Catholics, do not so often and so urgently press forward the useful subject as we might do.^(x) If pressed with wisdom,—provided

(x) Speaking of the period of the Reformation, Rousseau condemns the Catholics for not having then sufficiently urged the subject upon the feelings of the Protestants. His words are remarkable; and as they are equally applicable to Protestantism, now, as they were on the occasion of its introduction, so I will for this reason, here transcribe them.

“Let us go back to the first origin of the Protestant religion. At the time when the first reformers began to raise their voices, the whole church was at peace. All sentiments were unanimous; and not a single essential dogma was contested amongst Christians. In this state of calm tranquillity, behold, two or three men came forward, and raised their voices. They cried out aloud throughout all Europe:—‘Christians, beware of yourselves. You are imposed upon, and seduced. Men are leading you on in the road to hell. The Pope is Antichrist. His church is the school of lies, and you are lost if you do not listen to us.’

“At these first clamours, Europe, astonished, remained for some moments in silence, awaiting the event. At length, the clergy, awaking from their first surprise, and seeing that these innovators

only that men would study it,—it would always produce some effect; either pointing out where the guilt of schism

drew followers after them, felt the necessity of coming to some explanation with them. They began, by asking them at what they aimed with all this uproar? ‘We are,’ they boldly answered, ‘the apostles of truth, sent to reform the church, and to lead back the faithful from those ways of perdition, in which the priests are now conducting them.’

“‘But,’ (it was again asked them,) ‘who gave you this fine commission to come and disturb the peace of the church, as well as the public tranquillity?’ ‘Our consciences,’ they replied; ‘—our reason; an interior light; the voice of God, which we cannot, without sin, resist. It is He that has called us to this holy ministry, and we but follow our vocation.’

“‘You are then,’ observed the Catholics, ‘the envoys of the Almighty? In this case, we certainly do allow, that it is your duty to preach, to reform, and to instruct; and it is ours to listen to you. But then, in order to obtain these rights, begin by showing us your credentials. Prophecy; heal the sick; give sight to the blind; perform miracles. In short, display the proofs of your mission.’

“‘We are the envoys of God,’ replied the reformers; ‘but our mission is not an extraordinary mission. We do not bring to you any new revelation. We confine ourselves to that, which has been delivered to you; but which you no longer understand.’

“If the Catholics, without amusing themselves in cavilling with the proofs of their adversaries, had confined themselves to the question of contesting their right to preach and instruct, they would, in this case, have perplexed them. In the first place, they would have said to them:—‘Your manner of reasoning is but merely begging the question. You say, you are the envoys of God; and you require, that we should believe you, upon your own word, because you give us no other sign, except new interpretations of the scriptures, which have always been understood in a different sense from yours. You do not preach, you say, new doctrines. But what then do you do by preaching to us your new interpretations? Giving a new sense to the words of the scriptures,—what is this, but establishing new doctrines? Is it not making God speak otherwise than he had spoken? It is not the sound, but the sense of words, that has been revealed. And to change, therefore, that sense, which has been acknowledged and determined by the church,—this is changing revelation. What title then have you to oblige us to submit our common

lurks, or bringing back its victims,—as it has often done, —to the pastures of the ancient fold.

I have said, that such, in these times, are the indolence and the ignorance of the public, in relation to this momentous subject, that seldom does an individual amongst them give himself the trouble to reflect upon it. Indeed, not only is this the case, but we hear the clergy of the Established Church lamenting every day, that, either from indolence, ignorance, or indifference, men appear, now, to have lost all notion of true religion, and all ideas of the real character of the Christian church,—of the nature and sin of schism, and of the obligation of true belief. “All correct knowledge,” says Dr. Daubeny, “upon a subject which made the strongest impression upon the minds of the primitive Christians, appears, at this time, so lost amid the confusion of religious persuasions, as to render any attempt to replace the subject in question on the ground in which it stood in the early ages of the church, almost an useless undertaking. The spurious liberality of the day, has, in a manner, brought every thing to the same level, by giving the world to understand, that all religious persuasions are equally acceptable

judgment to your private spirit? You declare open war against us. You blow the fire of sedition everywhere. And to resist your lessons is, according to you, being rebels, idolators, and deserving the fires of hell. What! *you*, a set of innovators;—*you*, merely upon the authority of your own opinion, supported by a few hundred individuals,—*you* burn your adversaries! Whilst *we*, with fifteen centuries of antiquity, and the voices of a hundred million believers, are wrong in opposing you! Either then cease to speak and to act as apostles, or else shew us your credentials.’

“To this discourse, what solid reply could our reformers have made? For my own part, I cannot see it. I think, that either they would have been reduced to hold their tongue, or else, to have performed miracles.”

to God, provided they are sincerely professed; and that provided men give the name of religion to their respective professional opinions, they are left at full liberty to fashion them in what shape they please. The ideas which now prevail, are such as never yet prevailed in the Christian world." These observations are, certainly, but too well founded; and it is a melancholy fact, that all the notions which, now, the great mass of the public entertain, respecting both the nature of the Christian church, and the character of the Christian pastor, are preposterous almost, as they are irreligious. They now look upon any thing as a church, where a sermon is preached; and any one as a pastor, who preaches it. Under these circumstances therefore, I can flatter myself with very little hope, that a treatise, like the present,—although now peculiarly important,—will produce any beneficial effect. If, happily, it should chance to do this, it can, at all events, be only upon the minds of a very small portion of thoughtful and prudent individuals. May such, then, read it with candour, and attention,—as it is merely for the sake of such, that I have been induced to undertake it.—pp. 36—43.

APPENDIX.—No. XVI.

DECLARATION OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS, THE VICARS APOSTOLIC AND THEIR COADJUTORS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

PREAMBLE.—When we consider the misrepresentations of the Catholic religion, which are so industriously and widely propagated in this country, we are filled with

astonishment. But our astonishment subsides, when we call to mind, that the character of Christ himself was misrepresented: he was charged with blasphemy, with breaking the sabbath, and with forbidding tribute to be paid to Cæsar:^(y)—that the apostles and disciples of Christ were misrepresented:—they were charged with speaking blasphemous words against Moses and against God, with exciting sedition, and with many other grievous offences entirely devoid of proof;^(z) and that misrepresentation was the general lot of Christians in the first ages of the church. The primitive Christians were first calumniated and held up to public contempt, and then persecuted and deprived, not only of their civil rights and privileges, but of their property, and even of their very lives. They were charged with idolatry, with horrid cruelties, and other flagitious crimes, even in their religious worship. In a word, their whole religion was described as a system of folly and superstition, grounded on no one rational principle.

St. Justin and Tertullian, in their Apologies for the Christian Religion, endeavoured to dispel these misrepresentations, by exhibiting the real doctrines and precepts, and explaining some of the sacred rites, of the Christian religion. They showed that these injurious misrepresentations were, in many instances, the inventions of men, who, unable to withstand the evidences of the divine establishment of Christianity, endeavoured to excite prejudices against it in the minds of the people, by holding out its doctrines as absurd and impious, and its professors as the causes of every public calamity.

(y) Matt. xxxvi. 65. Mark iii. 22. John ix. 16. Luke xxiii. 2.

(z) Acts vi. 11.—xxiv. 5.—xxv. 7.

St. Augustin complained of the calumnies which were circulated against the Catholic church, by the Manicheans and Donatists, in his age. He humbly confessed and lamented, that he himself had employed the same weapons against the church, when he was attached to the former of these sects,^(g) and acknowledged that he then blindly, and rashly, and falsely, accused the Catholic church of doctrines and opinions which, he was at length convinced, she never taught, believed, or held.

The Catholics of Great Britain have to lament and to complain that the doctrines and religious rites which, as Catholics, they are taught by their church to believe and observe, have been long grossly misconceived and misrepresented in this country, to the great injury of their religious character and temporal interests.

They are persuaded that many, who are opposed to them on account of their religion, suppose, without inquiry, that the Catholic church really teaches all that she is reported by her adversaries to teach; and imagine that she is responsible for every absurd opinion entertained, and for every act of superstition performed, by every individual who bears the name of Catholic.

We hope that all who are animated with a love of truth, and with sentiments of Christian charity, will be disposed willingly to listen to the sincere declarations of their Catholic fellow-countrymen, and will never impute to their religion, principles or practices which, as Catholics, they do not hold or observe, and which their church condemns as errors or abuses.

In this hope and persuasion, the British Catholics have

(g) *Gaudens erubui; non me tot annos adversus Catholicam fidem, sed contra carnalium cogitationum figmenta latrasse.*

made repeated declarations of their religious doctrines, and have shewn, they trust, to the satisfaction of all who have paid attention to them, that they hold no religious principles, and entertain no opinions flowing from those principles, that are not perfectly consistent with the sacred duties which, as Christians, they owe to Almighty God; with all the civil duties which, as subjects, they owe to their sovereign and the constitutional civil government of their country; and with all the social duties which, as citizens, they owe to their fellow-subjects, whatever may be their religious creed.

They had flattered themselves that the numerous and uniform expositions of their religious doctrines, given in public professions of the Catholic faith, in Catholic catechisms, in various authentic documents, and in declarations confirmed by their solemn oaths, would have abundantly sufficed to correct all misrepresentations of their real tenets.

But they have to regret, that some grievous misconceptions, regarding certain points of Catholic doctrine, are, unhappily, still found to exist in the minds of many, whose good opinion they value, and whose good-will they wish to conciliate. To their grief they hear, that, notwithstanding all their declarations to the contrary, they are still exhibited to the public as men holding the most erroneous, unscriptural, and unreasonable doctrines—grounding their faith on human authority, and not on the word of God—as enemies to the circulation and to the reading of the Holy Scriptures—as guilty of idolatry in the sacrifice of the mass, in the adoration, as it is called, of the Virgin Mary, and in the worship of the saints, and of the images of Christ and of the saints; and as guilty of superstition in invoking the saints, and in praying for the

souls in purgatory ;—as usurping a divine power of forgiving sins, and imposing the yoke of confession on the people—as giving leave to commit sin by indulgences—as despising the obligation of an oath—as dividing their allegiance between their King and the Pope—as claiming the property of the church establishment—as holding the uncharitable doctrine of exclusive salvation, and as maintaining that faith is not to be kept with heretics.

We are at a loss to conceive, why the holding of certain religious doctrines, which have no connexion with civil or social duties, whether those doctrines are taken in the sense in which they are misconstrued by others, or in the sense in which they are uniformly understood by Catholics, should be made a subject of crimination against British Catholics, by those who assume to themselves liberty of thinking what they please, in matters of religious belief. It is difficult to understand, why doctrines purely religious, in no wise affecting the duties which Catholics owe to their sovereign or to civil society, should be brought forward at all when the question relates only to the civil rights and privileges which they claim as British subjects. It is much to be wished, that those who declaim against what they call the errors and superstitions of popery, would first learn from Catholics themselves, by inquiry, what their real doctrines are, on the points above alluded to, and in what sense Catholics understand the terms by which their doctrines are expressed. They would, perhaps, find that they have been hitherto contending, not against the Catholic faith, but against the fictions of their own imaginations, or against their own misconceptions of the language of the Catholic church.

Though we might refer to former expositions of the faith of Catholics, which we deem amply sufficient to correct the misconceptions, and to refute the misrepre-

sentations of our doctrines; yet, it having been stated to us, that by publishing at the present time, a plain and correct declaration of our real tenets, on those points which are still so much misrepresented, or misconceived, a better understanding may be established among his Majesty's subjects, and the advancement of religion and charity may be effected; hence, we, the undersigned Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic and their Coadjutors in Great Britain, have thought it our duty to publish the following declaration, in the hope that it will be received by all who read it, with the same love of truth, and the same good-will with which it is given.

SECTION I.

On the General Character of the Doctrines of Faith professed by the Catholic Church.

The doctrines of the Catholic Church are often characterized as *erroneous, unscriptural, and unreasonable*.

All those doctrines, and only those doctrines, are articles of Catholic faith, which are revealed by Almighty God.

Whatsoever is revealed by God, who knows all things, as they are in themselves, and who cannot deceive us, by teaching falsehood for truth, is most true and certain; though it may entirely surpass the comprehension of created minds.

On the authority of divine revelation, the Catholic believes, as doctrines of faith, that in one God there are three distinct persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that Jesus Christ, who died on the cross for the salvation of all mankind, is the second person of the Blessed Trinity, true God and true Man; that there is no remission of sin, nor salvation but through him; that the sacraments of baptism and penance are divinely ap-

pointed means for the remission of sin ; that in the mass, a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice is offered to God for the living and the dead ; that the souls detained in purgatory are helped by the suffrages of the faithful ; that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated ; that at the last day our bodies will be raised from death, and that Christ will come to judge all men according to their works ; that eternal happiness will be the reward of the good, and eternal misery the punishment of the wicked.

If these, and other doctrines of Catholic faith, are really revealed by Almighty God, they are not erroneous, but most true and certain—they are not unscriptural, but agreeable to the true sense of the written word of God—the belief of them is not unreasonable, because it is reasonable to believe whatever is true, and taught by the God of truth.

The Catholic is fully persuaded that all the articles of his faith are really revealed by Almighty God.

Is he not at liberty to think so, as well as others are to think the contrary ; and in this empire especially, where liberty of thought is so loudly proclaimed and lauded ? Is it reasonable or charitable to condemn him for thinking so, when he may have good and solid grounds for his conviction ; and may feel that his eternal salvation depends on his firm belief of all the doctrines which Christ has taught ?

SECTION II.

On the grounds of certitude which a Catholic has, that all the doctrines which he believes, as articles of Catholic faith, are really revealed by Almighty God.

Catholics are often charged with grounding their faith on mere human authority, and not on the word of God.

Catholics deny this; because they are convinced, that their faith is grounded on the word of God, proposed to them by the authority of that ministry, which Christ established, and appointed to teach his revealed doctrines to all nations.

The Catholic believes all those doctrines which God has revealed.

The question *what* are those doctrines which God has revealed, is a question of FACT. It appears reasonable, that the existence of a *fact* should be ascertained by the evidence of *testimony*.

The body of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions, which were delivered by Christ to his Apostles, constitutes the new or the Christian law; as the body of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions, which were delivered by the Almighty to Moses, constituted the old law.

The true and certain knowledge of what is commanded by any law is generally communicated and obtained by the authoritative *promulgation* of the law.

By the ordinance of God, the doctrines and precepts of the old law were made known to the Israelites and Jewish people, by Moses, and the priests in succession, till the end of the law.

By the ordinance of God, the doctrines and precepts of the new law were to be made known to all nations, in all ages, by the Apostles and their successors, to the consummation of the world.

On the spiritual authority of the Apostles and their successors, who were divinely commissioned to promulgate and teach the law of Christ to all nations; and on the uniform and universal testimony, belief, and practice of all Christian Churches from the beginning, the certitude of the Catholic is grounded, that all the doctrines which

he believes, as articles of Catholic faith, and all the sacred precepts and rites which he observes, as the ordinances of Christ, were really revealed and instituted by Almighty God; and are the same as were originally delivered by Christ to his Apostles, and by them promulgated over all nations.

The Catholic is fully satisfied that this method which he follows, for ascertaining *what* are the revealed doctrines of divine faith, is the right rule, and that it leads him to the unity of truth.

Is he not at liberty to follow a rule which gives such satisfaction and security to his mind?

Is it fair for others who, by following a different rule, are led into a countless variety of contradictory doctrines on matters of Christian belief, to disturb the tranquillity of the Catholic on this head, or to condemn him for his submission to the authority of a ministry which, he is convinced, was established by Christ for the purpose of bringing all nations to the certain knowledge of his law, and to the unity of faith? Is not this rule perfectly natural and reasonable? Can any human legislator condemn the principle and rule of the Catholic in this regard?

SECTION III.

On the Holy Scriptures.

In England, the Catholic Church is held out *as an enemy to the reading and circulating of the Holy Scriptures.*

Whereas, the Catholic Church venerates the Holy Scriptures as the written part of the Word of God; she has, in all ages, been the faithful guardian of this sacred deposit; she has ever laboured to preserve the integrity of these Inspired Writings, and the true sense in which they

have been universally understood, at all times, from the apostolic age.

The Catholic Church has never forbidden or discouraged the reading or the circulation of authentic copies of the Sacred Scriptures, in the original languages. She binds her clergy to the daily recital of a canonical office, which comprises a large portion of the Sacred Volume, and to read and expound to the faithful, in the vernacular tongue, on Sundays, the Epistle or Gospel of the day, or some other portion of the Divine Law.

As to the translation of the Holy Scriptures into modern languages, the Catholic Church requires that none should be put into the hands of the faithful but such as are acknowledged by ecclesiastical authority to be accurate, and conformable to the sense of the originals. There never was a general law of the Catholic Church prohibiting the reading of authorized translations of the Scriptures; but, considering that many, by their ignorance and evil dispositions, have perverted the meaning of the Sacred Text, to their own destruction, the Catholic Church has thought it prudent to make a regulation, that the faithful should be guided in this matter by the advice of their respective pastors.

Whether the Holy Scriptures, which ought never to be taken in hand but with respect, should be made a class-book for children, is a matter of religious and prudential consideration, on which the pastors of the Catholic Church have a right to decide with regard to their own flocks; and we hold that, in this matter, none have a right to dictate to them.

The Catholics in England, of mature years, have permission to read authentic and approved translations of the Holy Scriptures, with explanatory notes; and are exhorted

to read them in the spirit of piety, humility, and obedience.

Pope Pius VII., in a Rescript dated April 18, 1820, and addressed to the vicars apostolic in England, earnestly exhorts them to confirm the people committed to their spiritual care, in faith and good works; and for that end, to encourage them to read books of pious instruction, and particularly the Holy Scriptures, in translations approved by ecclesiastical authority; because, to those who are well-disposed, nothing can be more useful, more consoling, or more animating than the reading of the Sacred Scriptures, understood in their true sense—they serve to confirm the faith, to support the hope, and to inflame the charity of the true Christian.

But when the reading and the circulation of the Scriptures are urged and recommended as the entire rule of faith, as the sole means by which men are to be brought to the certain and specific knowledge of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions of Christ; and when the Scriptures, so read and circulated, are left to the interpretation and private judgment of each individual: then, such reading, circulation, and interpretation, are forbidden by the Catholic Church, because the Catholic Church knows that the circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by each one's private judgment, was not the means ordained by Christ for the communication of the true knowledge of his law to all nations—she knows that Christianity was established in many countries before one book of the New Testament was written—that it was not by means of the Scriptures, that the Apostles and their successors converted nations, or any one nation, to the unity of the Christian faith—that the unauthorised reading and circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of

them by private judgment, are calculated to lead men to contradictory doctrines on the primary articles of Christian belief; to inconsistent forms of worship, which cannot all be constituent parts of the uniform and sublime system of Christianity; to errors and fanaticism in religion, and to seditions, and the greatest disorders in states and kingdoms.

SECTION IV.

On the charge of idolatry and superstition.

Ignorance or malice has gone so far as to charge the Catholic Church with IDOLATRY, *in the sacrifice of the Mass—in the adoration* (as it is called) *of the Virgin Mary, and in the worship of the Saints, and of the images of Christ and of the Saints;* and with SUPERSTITION, *in invoking the Saints, and in praying for souls in purgatory.* Now, idolatry consists in giving to any creature that supreme adoration, honour, or worship which is due only to Almighty God.

The Catholic Church teaches that idolatry is one of the greatest crimes that can be committed against the majesty of God: and every true member of this Church shudders at the idea of such a crime, and feels grievously injured by so horrid an imputation.

But it is said that Catholics adore the elements of bread and wine in the Mass; that they adore the Virgin Mary; that they adore the cross; and that they worship the Saints, and the images of Christ and of the Saints. Before we repel these horrid imputations, in the sense in which they are made, we must explain the different meanings of the words *adoration, honour, and worship*, that the calumnious charge, and its denial, may be understood in the same explained sense.

We find that in the language of the sacred Scripture in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin,^(b) as well as in the language of the ancient liturgies of the Christian Church, these words adoration, honour, and worship, are ambiguous terms, and are used in different senses, according to the nature of the object to which the act implied by the term, is directed, and according to the intention of him who performs the act. Hence we find them used as relating sometimes to God, and sometimes to creatures. Although in modern times, the exclusive idea of that supreme homage which is due only to God, is attached by some to the words *adoration* and *worship*; yet these words may still be retained by others in a different meaning, without affording the remotest cause for the imputation of idolatry. In this different meaning they are still retained in the unchanged language of the ancient liturgies used in the Catholic Church.

The words *adoration* and *worship* are equally referred, sometimes to God, and sometimes to creatures, as is the word *honour*. Now, because we are commanded in Scripture to *honour* God, and to *honour* the king; and children are commanded to *honour* their parents: it does not follow that the honour due to the king, or to parents, is the same as that which we owe to God. To God we owe supreme and sovereign honour, such as it would be a crime to pay to any creature. To the king we owe the highest civil honour. To parents, children owe the honour of filial respect and obedience. How unjust would it be to say, that

(b) See in Hebrew, *Prov.* iii. 9, and *Exod.* xx. 12, *Deut.* xxviii. 47 and 48, *Ps.* xcvi. 9, and 1 alias *3d Kings.* i. 23. In Greek, *Gen.* xxiv. 26, and *Gen.* xlix. 8. In Latin, *Adorare*, *Ps.* xxviii. 2, and *Gen.* xxiii. 7; and 4th alias *2 Kings* ii. 15.

because a subject honours his king, he pays him that supreme and sovereign honour which is due only to God! The same is to be said of the terms *adoration* and *worship*, as used in former times, and sometimes used at present in the language of the Catholic Church. To *adore*, even according to modern usage, often means no more than to express extreme affection or respect. To *worship* is used in the translation of the Bible, published at Oxford, to signify inferior as well as supreme worship. In the first book of Chronicles, xxix. 20, we read, in that edition, that the assembly *bowed down their heads and worshipped the Lord (Jehovah) and the king*. Did they worship the king with the same supreme worship which they paid to God? Certainly not. When a man says to the woman he takes to wife, "With my body I thee *worship*," can this be called idolatry? Surely nothing can be more unfair than arguments drawn from ambiguous terms, construed in a sense disavowed by those against whom the arguments are employed.

We answer, therefore, that if by the terms *adoration*, *honour*, and *worship*, be understood that *supreme* adoration, honour, and worship which is due only to God; Catholics do not adore, nor honour, nor worship any other than the one, only, true, and living God, the Creator and Sovereign Lord of the universe; they do not, in this sense, adore, nor honour, nor worship the Virgin Mary, nor any of the saints, nor the cross, nor images, nor any other creature whatsoever.

In the Mass, Catholics do offer supreme adoration, not to the elements of bread and wine, which they hold not to be present after the consecration; but to Jesus Christ, the Son of God, whom they believe to be truly, really, and substantially present, under the appearances only of bread

and wine after the consecration, and change thereby of the elements into his body and blood. To adore Christ by an act of supreme adoration, is no idolatry; because he is truly God, and consequently a legitimate object of supreme worship.

But if Catholics, using the ancient language of the Christian Church, are said,

First, to *worship* the saints; this worship must be understood to be only an *inferior* worship, honour, and respect paid to them proportionate to the limited perfections and excellencies which God has bestowed upon them; but this worship is infinitely below that supreme worship which they pay to God. Catholics acknowledge no perfection or excellence in any saint, not even in the blessed Virgin Mary, which they do not profess to be the work and gift of God in them. So that in honouring the saints, they celebrate the works of God, and consequently give glory to him. Whatever act of religious veneration we pay to the saints, is ultimately referred to God.

Secondly, to *adore* the cross. This word, if applied to the cross itself, means no more than an inferior and relative respect paid to the instrument of our redemption; but if in lieu of the cross it be applied to Christ himself, then it means, as it ought to mean, an act of supreme adoration.

Thirdly, to *worship* the images of Christ or of the saints. The word is here again understood by Catholics only of an *inferior* and relative respect shown to images, in consideration of the respect due to the objects which they represent, and to which the respect shown to the images is referred. In this sense respect is shown to the statue or to the throne of the king, in consideration of the majesty of the personage to whom they relate. An insult offered to his statue would be considered as intended to be offered

to the king himself. In this sense a son respects the image or picture of his parent; a parent that of his child; a friend that of his friend; not for any intrinsic virtue in the material substance, or work of art, but because it relates to, and brings to his mind, the object of his respect and affection.

To condemn this relative regard for images or pictures, would be to condemn the very feelings of nature. To charge the Catholic with idolatry because the term *worship*, meaning only an *inferior* and *relative* regard, is found in the ancient and modern liturgies of his church, is not consistent with candour or charity.

The charge that the Catholic Church sanctions the praying TO images, is a calumny, and carries with it an imputation of stupidity too gross to be noticed. Catholics sometimes pray BEFORE images, because they serve to collect their thoughts, and fix their attention in their meditations and prayers; but they are not, on that account, to be supposed to be so void of reason and sense as to pray TO the image: for they know that in it there is no virtue or power; and that it can neither see, nor hear, nor help them.

Catholics do solicit the intercession of the angels and saints reigning with Christ in heaven. But in this, when done according to the principles and spirit of the Catholic Church, there is nothing of superstition, nothing which is not consistent with true piety. For the Catholic Church teaches her children not to pray to the saints as to the authors or givers of divine grace; but only to solicit the saints in heaven to pray for them, in the same sense as St. Paul desired the faithful on earth to pray for him.

Catholics, according to the faith and pious practice of the Christian Church from the age of the Apostles, do

pray for the release and eternal rest of departed souls who may be detained for a time in a state of punishment on account of their sins, but in this we cannot discover even the shadow of superstition.

By invoking the intercession of the saints in heaven, and by praying for the suffering souls in purgatory, Catholics exercise acts of that communion of charity which subsists between the members of the mystical body of Christ; the principle of which communion they profess to believe when they say, "I believe the holy Catholic Church, the communion of *saints*."

After this explanation and declaration, we hope that our countrymen will never be so unjust or so uncharitable, as to charge Catholics with idolatry or superstition, nor be so illiberal as to attempt to give a colour to these injurious charges, by fixing an exclusive meaning to terms, which in the language of Scripture, Christian antiquity, and common usage, bear different senses in different circumstances.

SECTION V.

On the power of forgiving Sins, and the precept of Confession.

The Catholic Church is charged with impiety *in usurping the power of forgiving sins*, and with spiritual tyranny in imposing on the people the *yoke of confession*.

The Catholic Church cannot be charged with impiety for exercising powers given by Christ to his apostles, and to their lawful successors; nor with tyranny in enforcing the observance of the precept of Christ.

Catholics believe that Christ granted to his apostles, and to the priests of his Church, power to forgive sins, by the administration of the sacraments of baptism and penance, to those who are duly disposed to receive this grace.

They believe that the sacrament of penance is an institution of Christ, no less than the sacrament of baptism. The belief of both rests on the same foundation.

In both these sacraments, sin is forgiven by the ministry of man. *Be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins; (Acts ii. 38) whose sins YOU SHALL FORGIVE, they are forgiven. (John xx. 23.)* But no actual sin can be forgiven at the mere will of any Pope, or any priest, or any person whomsoever, without a sincere sorrow for having offended God, and a firm resolution to avoid future guilt, and to atone for past transgressions. Any person who receives absolution without these necessary dispositions, far from obtaining the remission of his sins, incurs the additional guilt of hypocrisy and profanation.

The obligation of sacramental confession to a priest is not an imposition of the Church, but a precept of Christ. Without the voluntary confession of the penitent, the power of forgiving, or retaining sins, could not be exercised with discretion and judgment by the minister of the sacrament of penance. The confession of sins could never have been introduced, had it not been received from the beginning as a divine ordinance for the remission of sin. It has been practised from the earliest ages of Christianity. It is attended with the most salutary effects. Besides being a means of obtaining the remission of sin, it affords relief to the troubled conscience, and opportunities of reclaiming deluded sinners from mischievous projects, and of causing reparation to be made for injuries done to persons, property, or character. It may be ridiculed by such as *blaspheme those things which they know not* (2 Pet. ii. 12), but will be ever cherished as a merciful and salutary institution by those who are sincerely sorry for their sins, and earnestly sue for pardon.

SECTION VI.

On Indulgences.

The Catholic Church is charged with encouraging guilt, by *giving leave to commit sin, and granting an anticipated pardon for sins to come by indulgences.*

The Catholic Church rejects with abhorrence the imputation, that by granting an indulgence, she grants permission to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come. An indulgence, in the sense of the Catholic Church, is no pardon for sin at all; it is only a remission of the whole or of a part of the temporal punishment, which the justice of God often reserves to be undergone by the sinner, after the guilt of the sin has been remitted. The power of granting the remission of this temporal punishment was given by Christ to St. Peter and his successors, and has been exercised from the earliest ages. An indulgence, so far from exempting sinners from works of penance and piety, is an encouragement to the performance of such works, since they are prescribed as conditions for gaining the benefit of an indulgence.

Surely, therefore, the doctrine of the Catholic Church concerning the sacrament of penance, confession and indulgences, does not tend to relax Christian morality, nor to encourage guilt, nor facilitate the commission of crime, but rather to put an end to sin, and to promote the exercise of every Christian virtue amongst men.

SECTION VII.

On the Obligation of an Oath.

CATHOLICS are charged with holding that *they are not bound by any oath, and that the Pope can dispense them from all the oaths that they may have taken.*

We cannot sufficiently express our astonishment at such a charge. We hold that the obligation of an oath is most sacred: for by an oath man calls the Almighty searcher of hearts to witness the sincerity of his conviction of the truth of what he asserts; and his fidelity in performing the engagement he makes. Hence, whosoever swears falsely, or violates the lawful engagement he has confirmed by an oath, not only offends against truth or justice, but against religion. He is guilty of the enormous crime of perjury.

No power in any Pope, or council, or in any individual or body of men, invested with authority in the Catholic Church, can make it lawful for a Catholic to confirm any falsehood by an oath; or dispense with any oath, by which a Catholic has confirmed his duty of allegiance to his sovereign, or any obligation of duty or justice to a third person. He who takes an oath, is bound to observe it, in the obvious meaning of the words, or in the known meaning of the person to whom it is sworn.

SECTION VIII.

On allegiance to our Sovereign, and obedience to the Pope.

Catholics are charged with *dividing their allegiance between their temporal sovereign and the Pope.*

Allegiance relates not to spiritual but to *civil* duties; to those temporal tributes and obligations, which the subject owes to the person of his sovereign, and to the authority of the state.

By the term *spiritual*, we here mean that, which in its nature tends *directly* to a *supernatural* end, or is ordained to produce a *supernatural* effect. Thus the office of teaching the doctrines of faith, the administration of the sacra-

ments, the conferring and exercising of jurisdiction purely ecclesiastical, are *spiritual* matters.

By the term *temporal*, we mean that which in its nature tends *directly* to the end of *civil* society. Thus the right of making laws for the civil government of the state, the administration of civil justice, the appointment of civil magistrates and military officers, are *temporal* matters.

The allegiance which Catholics hold to be due and are bound to pay to the sovereign, and to the civil authority of the state, is perfect and undivided. They do not divide their allegiance between their sovereign and any other power on earth, whether temporal or ecclesiastical. They acknowledge in the sovereign, and in the constituted government of these realms, a supreme civil and temporal authority, which is entirely distinct from, and totally independent of the spiritual and ecclesiastical authority of the Pope and of the Catholic Church. They declare that neither the Pope nor any other prelate or ecclesiastical person of the Roman Catholic Church, has in virtue of his spiritual or ecclesiastical character, any right, directly or indirectly, to any civil or temporal jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, within this realm; nor has any right to interfere, directly or indirectly, in the civil government of the United Kingdom, or any part thereof; nor to oppose, in any manner, the performance of the civil duties which are due to his Majesty, his heirs, and successors, from all or any of his Majesty's subjects; nor to enforce the performance of any *spiritual* or *ecclesiastical* duty, by any *civil* or *temporal* means. They hold themselves bound in conscience to obey the civil government of this realm, in all things of a temporal and civil nature, notwithstanding any dispensation or order to the

contrary had, or to be had, from the Pope, or any authority of the Church of Rome.

Hence we declare, that by rendering obedience in *spiritual* matters to the Pope, Catholics do not withhold any portion of their allegiance to their King, and that their allegiance is entire and undivided; the *civil* power of the state, and the *spiritual* authority of the Catholic Church, being absolutely distinct, and being never intended by their Divine Author to interfere or clash with each other.

“Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.”

SECTION IX.

On the claim of British Catholics to the property of the Church Establishment in England.

British Catholics are charged with entertaining a *pretended right to the property of the Established Church in England.*

We consider such a charge to be totally without foundation. We declare that we entertain no pretension to such a claim. We regard all the revenues and temporalities of the Church Establishment as the property of those on whom they are settled by the laws of the land. We disclaim any right, title, or pretension with regard to the same.

SECTION X.

On the Doctrine of Exclusive Salvation.

Catholics are charged with *uncharitableness, in holding the doctrine of exclusive salvation.*

Catholics are taught by their Church to love all men, without exception: to wish that all may be saved; and to pray that all may be saved, and may come to the knowledge of the truth, by which they may be saved.

If the Almighty himself has assigned certain conditions, without the observance of which man cannot be saved, it would seem to be an act of impiety to attempt to annul those divinely-established conditions: and an act of great uncharitableness towards a fellow-man to tell him, that he may be saved without complying with the conditions prescribed by the Almighty.

The doctrinal principle of exclusive salvation belongs to the law of Christ.

Has not Christ, who commands the belief of his revealed doctrines, pronounced, that he that *believeth not shall be condemned?* (Mark xvi. 16.) Has not Christ, who instituted baptism for the remission of sins, declared that *except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he CANNOT enter into the kingdom of God?* (John iii. 5.) Has not St. Paul enumerated a list of crimes, such as adultery, idolatry, hatred, seditions, heresies, murders, drunkenness, &c., of which he declares, that *they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God?* (Galat. v. 21.) Are not these exclusive conditions?

Whoever professes the law of Christ must profess the *principle* and doctrine of exclusive salvation. It is not the Catholic, it is God himself who will exclude from heaven those who are not duly qualified for it by faith and good works.

But the Catholic, whilst he is bound to admit, and with firm faith to believe this doctrinal *principle*, is bound also by the divine commandment not to judge. He is not allowed therefore to pronounce sentence of condemnation on individuals, who may live and die out of the external communion of the Catholic Church: nor to pronounce sentence of condemnation against those who may die in an apparent state of sin. All those he leaves to

the righteous judgment of the great searcher of hearts, who at the last day will render to every man according to his works.

But surely charity, as well as truth, must forbid one Christian to deceive another in a matter of such infinite importance as the eternal salvation of his soul. He who should persuade his neighbour that no condition for salvation is required on the part of man, would deceive him. He who admits that any one such condition is required by the Almighty, admits the *principle* of exclusive salvation.

SECTION XI.

On keeping Faith with Heretics.

Catholics are charged with holding the principle *that they are not bound to keep faith with heretics.*

As Catholics, we hold and we declare, that all Catholics are bound by the law of nature, and by the law of revealed religion, to observe the duties of fidelity and justice to all men, without any exception of persons, and without any distinction of nation or religion.

British Catholics have solemnly sworn, that “they reject and detest that unchristian and impious principle, that faith is not to be kept with heretics or infidels.”

After this, the imputation of their holding this principle, cannot but be felt by them as grievously injurious to their religious and moral character.

CONCLUSION.

Having in the foregoing declaration, endeavoured to state, in the simplicity of truth, such doctrines of our Church as are most frequently misrepresented or misunderstood in this country, and to explain the meaning in which Catholics understand the terms by which these

doctrines are expressed in the language of their Church ; we confidently trust that this declaration and explanation will be received by all our fellow-subjects in a spirit of candour and charity ; and that those who have hitherto been ignorant of, or but imperfectly acquainted with our doctrines of faith, will do us the justice to acknowledge, that, as Catholics, we hold no religious principles, and entertain no opinions flowing from those principles, which are not perfectly consistent with our duties as Christians, and as British subjects.

This declaration, we, the undersigned, approve and publish, as an exposition of our principles and doctrines, on the subjects to which it refers.

- + WILLIAM, *Bishop of Halia, Vic. Apost. in the London District.*
- + PETER BERNARDIN, *Bishop of Thespiæ, Vic. Apost. in the Western District.*
- + THOMAS, *Bishop of Bolina, Vic. Apost. in the Northern District.*
- + THOMAS, *Bishop of Cambysopolis, Vic. Apost. in the Midland District.*
- + ALEXANDER, *Bishop of Maximianopolis, Vic. Apost. in the Lowland District in Scotland.*
- + RANALD, *Bishop of Aeryndela, Vic. Apost. in the Highland District in Scotland.*
- + PETER AUGUSTINE, *Bishop of Siga, Coadjutor in the Western District.*
- + JAMES, *Bishop of Usula, Coadjutor in the London District.*
- + THOMAS, *Bishop of Europum, Coadjutor in the Northern District.*
- + ALEXANDER, *Bishop of Cybistra, Coadjutor in the Lowland District in Scotland.*

May, 1826.

AN ADDRESS FROM THE BRITISH ROMAN CATHOLICS
TO THEIR PROTESTANT FELLOW COUNTRYMEN.

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN,—We present to you a Declaration, drawn up and signed by those Ecclesiastics who, in this country, are the expounders of our faith. We beg earnestly to call your attention to this document, which distinctly repudiates the obnoxious tenets imputed to us. The Irish Bishops have given a Declaration of Catholic Principles, similar in effect to this. We ask you, can you believe that we are joined in a perfidious league to deceive you? Are those amongst us who are linked with you by social habits and friendly intercourse; those, in whom you confidently trust in matters of high importance; and from whom you meet, in return, with integrity and fair dealing, to be considered honest on every other occasion, and capable of deep designing fraud and duplicity on this?

To our sense of the sacred obligation of an oath,^(c) we daily sacrifice every object of ordinary ambition; is it in human nature that we can become perjured men in this solitary instance? We are accused of idolatry—we disclaim the imputation^(d); of not keeping faith with heretics—we disclaim the imputation^(e); of dividing the allegiance which is due to the King—we disclaim the imputation^(f); of acknowledging in the Pope a deposing power—we disclaim the imputation^(g); of believing that a priest can absolve from sin, at his mere will and pleasure—we disclaim the imputation^(h). Each and all of these opinions we most solemnly and most unequivocally disclaim.

(c) See the Declaration of the Catholic Bishops in Great Britain, as above, sect. 7.

(d) Ibid. sect. 4.

(e) Ibid. sect. 11.

(f) Ibid. sect. 8.

(g) Ibid. sect. 8.

(h) Ibid. sect. 5.

Our religion is called a persecuting religion. We reply, that the Catholic religion, and the policy of Catholic states, are unfairly confounded; and if the ministers of the Catholic religion have, at any time, co-operated with the civil government, in measures of persecution, they forgot the divine precepts of their Founder, in attempting to prevent the introduction of sects by violence and injustice; and we condemn the deed. Are we to suffer for their misconduct? In the unholy race of persecution, which has been run by various denominations of Christians at other times, in this or any other country, if members of the religion we profess were not exempt from blame, we deeply deplore their blind infatuation:—Why, then, are we to be punished for excesses in which we bore no part: which we as cordially condemn as you do; and for which *your* ancestors are not less liable to reproach than *ours*? If the professors of the Catholic faith were even *peculiarly* distinguished, in times long past, for their mistaken zeal (which we do not concede), the more deeply should we lament their errors; but let not the liberal Protestant, and the enlightened Catholic of the present day, allow themselves to be hurried, by prejudiced or interested men, into hatred of each other, and thus perpetuate dissension and religious bigotry, in the name of the God of charity and peace. We challenge calm inquiry into the practice of the present governments of Christendom, and we believe it will be found, on candid examination, that the principles of religious liberty are fully as well practised in Catholic, as in Protestant States.

We entreat you deeply to consider the effects of the example of the legislation of this country, on the various nations of the world. Above all, weigh well its consequences on the rising States of South America. We beg

of you to keep constantly in view, what power of argument the continuance of these laws of exclusion affords to every enemy of liberty, whether civil or religious, throughout the world.

We request you to put this question to your own minds—Is there another country in the world where, for conscience' sake, several of the most ancient Nobles of the land are deprived of their hereditary privileges? Where hundreds of Gentlemen, possessors of ancient and landed estates, are deprived of honours and rights, the usual attendants on birth and property? Where the industry of the merchant, and the talent of the lawyer, are checked in the midst of their respective careers? Where six or seven millions of the people are deprived of the benefit of equal chances under equal laws? And, as a proof of the direful but natural effects of such a system of law, we implore you to look at Ireland—that island of genius and fertility; behold her in all her nakedness and all her misery.

Our religion is said to be peculiarly proselyting. If to proselyte be to convince by the use of fair argument, then is ours a proselyting religion. As Englishmen, we claim the right of free discussion; and should be ashamed to call ourselves your fellow-subjects, could we forego this valuable privilege. But if to proselyte be to substitute force for argument, and to give premiums for apostacy and hypocrisy, such proselytism is a disgrace to any form of Christianity, and we solemnly abjure it. We entreat you to endeavour to divest your minds of pre-conceived impressions to our disadvantage, and calmly to examine the situation in which we stand. In a country boasting of peculiar liberality, we suffer severe privations because we differ from you in religious belief. The remaining

penalties—neither few nor trivial—of a penal code of unparalleled severity, still press upon us: a Catholic Peer cannot sit and vote in the House of Peers, and is thus deprived of his most valuable birthright; a Catholic Commoner cannot sit and vote in the House of Commons; a Catholic Freeholder may be prevented from voting at elections for members; a Catholic cannot sit in the Privy Council, or be a Minister of the Crown; he cannot be a Judge, or hold any Crown office in any of the Spiritual, Equity, or Common Law Courts; he may practice at the Bar, but he cannot become a King's Counsel; he cannot hold any office in any of the Corporations; he cannot graduate at either of the two Universities, much less enjoy any of the numerous beneficial offices connected with them, although both of those seats of learning were founded by Catholics; he cannot marry either a Protestant or a Catholic, unless the ceremony is performed by a Protestant Clergyman; he cannot settle real or personal property for the use of his church, or of Catholic schools, or for any other purposes of the Catholic religion; he cannot vote at vestries, or present to a living in the church, though both of those rights seem to appertain to the enjoyment of property, and may actually be exercised by infidels.

Such are our principal grievances; but more than all we complain of the galling brand of disgrace which is the consequence of these disqualifications; which is more intolerable to honourable minds than the severest pressure of penal infliction, and necessarily implies guilt on our part, or injustice upon yours.

From early youth, to the last stage of existence, we are doomed to bear about us a painful feeling of inferiority, and of undeserved reproach. It is to us, no matter of

surprise, that tales, which malevolence invented in troubled times, which party zeal propagated, and which, in many instances, were sanctioned by the forms, though not by the reality of justice, should be perpetuated even to this hour; and that a general mass of prejudice should have been created, requiring centuries to remove. The infant is taught, with his first accents, to impugn our faith; his education matures his early impressions, and he remains, through life, the creature of prejudice. Persons possessed of the most honourable feelings, and incapable of sanctioning injustice or deceit, are thus drawn in to become our opponents. WE beseech all such attentively to investigate, before they finally condemn. We invite all to the cool consideration of our principles; because we know that they will bear the test of the closest enquiry. If there be persons who barter principle for place, trade in our degradation, and encourage prejudices which they despise,—if such there be, they are not more *our* enemies than *yours*; and be it our mutual task to unveil them, that religion, the child of heaven, may not be disfigured by human passions, nor infidelity find an ally in our want of charity to each other.

Bearing equally with you, our fellow-subjects, the burthens of the country, and upholding equally its institutions, and its glory, we claim to be admitted to a full participation in all the rights of British subjects.—Every principle or practice, hostile, in the remotest degree, to those institutions, we most explicitly disclaim. Year after year, we repeat the humiliating task of disavowal; still we suffer the penalties of guilt. We ask you, is this to endure for ever? Are we always to remain the victims of misplaced suspicion? The doors of the constitution are shut against us, as long as we continue true to the dictates

of our consciences; but, if we abandon the faith of our fathers, resign every honourable feeling, and become perjured men and apostates, then are all our disqualifications removed; the sanctuary of the British constitution is thrown open to us; we become senators, privy-counselors, nay—guardians of the morals of the people, and dispensers of public justice. God forbid we should purchase such distinctions, however valuable, at the price of dishonour. In the hour of danger, when our country needs it, we mingle our blood with yours. We desire no ascendancy, religious or political.^(a) If our country falls, we ask to fall with her; if she prospers, we claim to share her prosperity.

The above address was read and adopted at the Annual General Meeting of the British Catholic Association, held on the 1st of June, 1826.

NORFOLK, E. M.	HENRY HOWARD, OF CORBY.
SURREY.	PHILIP HENRY HOWARD.
SHREWSBURY.	CHARLES TEMPEST.
KINNAIRD.	JOHN ROSSON.
STOURTON.	MICHAEL JOSEPH QUIN.
PETRE.	GEORGE MEYNELL.
STAFFORD.	W. K. AMHERST.
CLIFFORD.	CHARLES TURVILE.
CHARLES STOURTON.	JOHN WRIGHT.
H. V. JERNINGHAM.	CHARLES STONOR, LIEUT.-COL.
HUGH CHARLES CLIFFORD.	WM. CONSTABLE MAXWELL.
E. M. VAVASOUR.	MICHAEL JONES.
CHARLES LANGDALE.	WM. WITHAM.
PHILIP STOURTON.	JUSTIN FITZGERALD.
EDWARD PETRE.	JOHN STANTON.
CHARLES CLIFFORD.	JOSEPH IRELAND.
WM. GERARD, BART.	CHARLES COURTENAY.
HENRY JOSH. TICHBORNE, BART.	ROBERT THROCKMORTON.
GEORGE THROCKMORTON, BART.	JOHN GAGE.
EDWARD BLOUNT, BART.	JOSEPH FRANCIS TEMPEST.
HENRY WEBB, BART.	THOMAS STAPLETON, JUN.
RICHARD BEDINGFIELD, BART.	CHARLES BUTLER.
EDWARD SMYTHE, BART.	CHARLES EYSTON.
CLIFFORD CONSTABLE, BART.	WILLIAM BLOUNT.
FRANCIS CHOLMELEY.	EDWARD DOUGHTY.

(a) Declaration of the Catholic Bishops in Great Britain, sect. 9.

RALPH RIDDELL.
 EDWARD WIDDRINGTON RIDDELL.
 THOMAS RIDDELL.
 CHARLES CONOLLY.
 HENRY ROBINSON, JUN.
 WILLIAM PLOWDEN.
 GEORGE SILVERTOP.
 HENRY ENGLEFIELD.
 M. I. F. SIDNEY.
 PEREGRINE EDWARD TOWNELEY.
 JOHN JONES.
 WILLIAM JONES.

RICHARD HUDDLESTON.
 THOMAS STAPLETON.
 CHARLES GREGORY FAIRFAX.
 ROBERT BERKELEY, JUN.
 JOHN CLAVERING, OF CALLALY.
 THOMAS MOLYNEUX SEEL.
 THOMAS FITZHERBERT.
 ROBERT SELBY.
 HENRY ARUNDELL.
 RICHARD PURCELL.
 MILES STAPLETON.
 EDWARD BLOUNT.

APPENDIX.—No. XVII.

EXTRACTS FROM MR. SHEIL'S SPEECH, REPORTED TO
 HAVE BEEN DELIVERED AT THE KENT MEETING,
 (Oct. 24)*;—AND FROM THE SPEECH DELIVERED BY
 HIM AT THE CITY OF LONDON TAVERN, (Nov. 2.)

[*N. B.* These Extracts may be considered as forming a
 continuation of APPENDIX No. VI. p. 519.]

“.....ENGLISHMEN, I have not come here to enter into religious disputations with you:—but it is said by lord Winchelsea, that my religion is the religion of slavery. Now this, I admit, calls for an answer; and I deny, with a justifiable warmth, that there is any foundation for this charge. I admit that there have been many Catholic despots,—but I ask, with a retorting interrogatory, were there never any Protestant despots? Do I attribute a

* As much obloquy has been attached to this learned gentleman, relative to the delivery or non-delivery of the above speech, on the occasion in question, I shall only observe, that whether spoken or not, the arguments most essentially apply to the Question of Emancipation, and are quoted as such.

spirit of tyranny to your religion? No such thing; but I claim the same indulgence for my own; and I demand that you should not refer the atrocities of Catholics to their religion, when I do not refer the atrocities of Protestants to theirs. But come, let us go out of theories and speculations, and proceed to facts. One fact is worth a hundred arguments, and I have a host of facts upon my side. Come, my lord Winchelsea, let us open the pages of English history; where do you find the elements of your constitution? Alfred gave you the body of your common law; your judges, your magistrates, your sheriffs, (you hold your office, sir, and have called this great assembly by virtue of his institutions,) your courts of justice, your elective system, and the grand bulwark of your liberties—the best and most useful, as well as the most glorious of your rights—the shield of freedom—the trial by jury. He placed this great ægis in the temple of the constitution. Does the duke of Newcastle think that Alfred was a Protestant? or, that the barons of Runnede, with archbishop Langton at their head, were Protestants? But to touch upon a case that appertains more nearly to his Grace. Who was it that gave the people the power of self-taxation, and fixed, if he did not create, the representation of the people? Edward the First. Oh! my lord duke, there were no rotten boroughs then. The House of Commons was not returned by a set of nobles, who, talking about liberty, opposed all reform. There were no great men in those times of Catholic slavery who sent in ten members to the House of Commons, and, when a corrupt borough was cut off, contrived to get its still more rotten substitute into his pocket. The House of Commons was then a perfect mirror of the people, which was unstained by the breath of an oligarch. Give

up your ten members, my lord duke, and then you will talk of liberty with a better grace, if not to a more useful purpose. It was to the first Edward that England was indebted for her parliament, and her pecuniary controul over the crown; and the third Edward gave perfection to the system by holding annual parliaments. He, too, passed the great statute against constructive treason. Englishmen, with these facts before you, how can you listen to the men who tell you that Popery and slavery are necessarily allied? Englishmen, when you peruse the ancient chronicles of your glory, do not your hearts beat with a sense of exultation—are not your emotions deeply stirred—and are not your natures highly kindled? Where is the English boy, who reads the story of his own great island, whose pulse does not warmly beat at the contemplation of all the renowned names, and all the lofty incidents with which the early annals of his country are splendidly studded? Is there one of you all who hath not almost fallen down to adore the memory of Alfred? Have you not turned idolaters in the worship of the immortal Edwards?—who is there that hath not thrilled at the name of Runnemedé, and whose soul hath not swelled and dilated at the remembrance of the scene when Langton, with a Catholic mitre upon his head, extorted from a tyrant your mighty, and I trust in God, that it will prove your eternal, charter? Little did you think, (and yet how could you forget?) when you experienced, as you must, this generous national exultation—little did you think that it was at the altars of religion, which you are instructed to consider as the handmaid of oppression, that the great progenitors of liberty knelt down. You may write damnation upon every grave which bears date before the year 1521; but in the face of clear and indisputable evi-

dence—with Alfred and the Edwards—with trial by jury—
—with parliament and with Magna Charta before you—
do not denounce the religion of your forefathers as the
mother of slavery, and visit it with all the execration that
should pursue the parent of so detestable a child. Eng-
lishmen, I have spoken with warmth—I cannot help it
—but that warmth shall not carry me too far—it is enough
for me to defend my religion, without animadverting on
yours—but if I were disposed so to do, might I not turn
the leaves of history upon you, and after you had charged
my creed with its servile tendencies, might I not ask,
whether the cradle of the reformation was not rocked
with a bloody and an iron hand? Did not Henry VIII.
trample upon the forms of liberty, and did not his base par-
liament make him a voluntary release and surrender of
the constitution? Did liberty exist in the reign of that
precocious theologian, Edward VI., or under the auspices
of the virgin of the reformation, who took infant Protest-
antism under her maiden auspices? You might say to me,
that if I were sufficiently bold to press these considera-
tions, I should not refer to such remote events. There
is, however, one fact of so much importance, that with-
out meaning to offer you the slightest offence, I think
it only due to honesty to repeat to you, viz., that on the
day on which John Lord Russell, one of the martyrs
to liberty, perished on the scaffold,—on the very same
day, (it was a felicitous selection,) the university—the
Protestant university of Oxford—the seat of reformed
Christianity,—the throne of English orthodoxy—published
its infamous declaration in favour of passive obedience. I
pray you, when you are disposed to fling your projectiles
against the Catholic religion, to look round you, and con-
sider of how much glass your own house is built. But let

us travel a little out of England. Protestantism, it is said, is the inseparable companion of liberty—they are always found walking arm in arm together in their march for the improvement of mankind. If this be so, how does it happen that Prussia is a Protestant, and Prussia is a slave; and Sweden is a Protestant, and Sweden is a slave; and Denmark is a Protestant, and Denmark is a slave; and half the German states are Protestant, and are also slaves; and even Hanover, (hear it ye Brunswickers), is also a slave! Turn now to Catholic Europe. Look at Italy, not as she now is, but as she was long before the name of Luther was ever uttered—look at her when the Catholic was her entire religion, and liberty was her glorious practice. I call up her crowd of republics as witnesses in that cause which I am thus daring enough to plead before you. Venice, Catholic Venice, rises up from the ocean, with all her republican glory round about her. Venice fell at last into an oligarchy; but Venice was for five hundred years a noble and lofty democratic government. I next produce as witnesses in my favour, Genoa and Florence, and all the rest of those free states in which Popery, liberty, literature, and the arts, grew up and flourished together. You think, perhaps, that when Italy is exhausted you can bring Spain against me. Even there, before Ximenes trod upon the rights of Spaniards, the Catholic Cortes were a free assembly, and imposed upon the monarch an oath in which they told him that they were, individually, as good, and, taken altogether, far better than himself; and that his power was derived from the people.....But if you think that you can turn Spain against us, I bid you turn your eyes to France, and I ask of you, whether with her charter, with her trial by jury, and with her chamber of

deputies, she is not ascending into competition with yourselves? But no—I will not wound you with the comparison; I will not tell you that Catholic Frenchmen are your competitors in free institutions, but will bid you turn to a spectacle upon which every Englishman may well repose with a sort of parental pride. From the old I travel to the new world; and I produce to England her glorious pupils—the Catholic democracies of South America. Republic after republic is bursting forth at your bidding, through that almost immeasurable continent, and, from the summit of the Andes, Liberty may be said to “unfurl her standard over half the world.” It is false—utterly false—never was there calumny more destitute of foundation, and history aids out against it, that Catholicism and a genuine love of freedom cannot exist together. Have I not made out a case by evidence which cannot be overthrown; and is it not hard, is it not worse than hard, is it not most unjust and cruel to use such an argument, or rather, so baseless an assertion, as a ground for keeping seven millions of people in their degraded and exasperating condition?...Englishmen, look at Ireland—what do you behold?—A beautiful country with wonderful agricultural and commercial advantages—the link between America and Europe—the natural resting place of trade in its way to either hemispheres—and inhabited by a bold, intrepid, and, with all their faults, a generous and enthusiastic people. Such is natural Ireland—what is artificial Ireland? Such is Ireland as God made her—what is Ireland as England made her? For she is your colony, your dependent, and you are as answerable for her faults as a parent is for the education of a child. What, then, have you made Ireland?

Look at her again. This fine country is laden with a population the most miserable in Europe, and of whose wretchedness, if you are the authors, you are beginning to be the victims. Harvests, the most abundant, are reaped by men with starvation in their faces—famine covers a fertile soil, and disease inhales a pure atmosphere—all the great commercial facilities of the country are lost—the deep rivers that should circulate opulence, and turn the machinery of a thousand manufactures, flow on to the ocean without wafting a boat or turning a wheel—and the wave breaks in solitude in the silent magnificence of deserted and shipless harbours. In place of being a source of wealth and revenue to the empire, Ireland cannot defray its own expences, or pay a single tax; her discontents cost millions of money, and she hangs like a financial millstone round England's neck,—in place of being a bulwark and a fortress, she debilitates, exhausts, and endangers England, and offers an allurements to the speculators in universal ruin. The great mass of her enormous population are alienated and dissociated from the state—the influence of the constituted and legitimate authorities is gone—a strange, anomalous, and unexampled kind of government has sprung up from the public passions, and exercises a despotic sway over the great mass of the community, while the class, inferior in numbers, but accustomed to authority, and infuriated at its loss, are thrown into a formidable reaction—the most ferocious passions rage from one extremity of the country to the other—hundreds of thousands of men, arrayed with badges, gather in the south, and the smaller faction, with discipline and with arms, are marshalled in the north—the country is strewn with the materials of civil commotion,

and seems like one vast magazine of powder, which a spark might ignite into an explosion, which would shake the whole fabric of civil society into ruin, and of which England would not only feel, but perhaps never recover from the shock. And, gracious God! (for I cannot refrain from the exclamation,) is this horrid, this appalling, this accursed state of things, to be permitted to continue? It is only requisite to present the question, in order that all men should answer—something must be done. Well, then, what is to be done? Are you to re-enact the penal code? You were obliged to relax the penal code when the Catholics were only three millions, and now that they are seven, will you lay on their chains again? Are you to deprive the Catholics of their properties—shut up their schools—drive them from the bar—strip them of the elective franchise, and reduce them to a state of Egyptian bondage? It is easy for some visionary in oppression, in his dreams of tyranny, to imagine these things.....But you would not wish to have recourse to such a dreadful expedient as the extirpation of a whole people; and, therefore, I will take it as conceded that the former expedients for the pacification of Ireland will not be adopted. What then is to be done?.....Englishmen, when you consider what ought to be done in this emergency, you will not dismiss from your recollection that the greatest, the wisest, and the best statesmen and legislators who have, for the last fifty years, directed your councils and conducted the business of this mighty empire, all concurred in the opinion that, without a concession of the Catholic claims, nothing permanently useful and effectually sanative could be done for Ireland. Without going through the catalogue of splendid names which stand engaged in the cause of emancipation, I shall select

only three—Burke, and Pitt, and Fox ; they were all different in habit, in character, and in theory ; yet, on this question, their great minds met in a deep conflux. Burke, the foe to revolution—Fox, the asserter of popular right — Pitt, the stay and prop of the prerogative — the grand triumvirate of legislation, concurred in this single opinion. See to what a conclusion you must arrive, when you denounce the advocates of emancipation as the foes and the enemies of their country. To whom will your anathema reach? It will take in one half of Westminster Abbey — and is not the very dust in which the tongues and hearts of Pitt, and Burke, and Fox have mouldered, better than the living hearts and tongues of those who have survived them? Yes. I will put it to this test:— If you were to try the question by the venerable authorities of the illustrious dead, and by those voices which may be said to issue from the grave, how would you decide? If, instead of counting votes in St. Stephen's, you were to count the tombs in the mausoleum beside it, how would the division of the great departed stand? Enter the sacred aisles which contain the ashes of your greatest men, and ask yourselves as you pass, how they felt and spoke when they had motion, and had utterance in that senate where they can be heard no more? Write "EMANCIPATOR" on the grave of every great advocate, and its counter-epitaph on that of every opponent of the peace of Ireland, and will there not be a majority of sepulchres in our favour? But pass from authority, and consider how such a system as that of exclusion must necessarily work.... Can that be a wise and politic course of government, which creates not an aristocracy of opulence, and rank, and talent, but an aristocracy in religion ; and places seven millions of people at the feet of a few hundred thousand?

Try this fashion of government, by a very obvious test—and make the case your own—if a few hundred thousand Presbyterians stood towards you in the relation in which the Irish Protestants stand toward the Catholics, how would you endure it? How would you brook a system by which Episcopalians should be rendered incapable of holding seats in the House of Commons, by which the oldest nobility in the country should be turned by plebeian Presbyterians out of the House of Lords—should be excluded from sheriffships, and from corporate offices, and from the bench of justice, and from the higher offices in the administration of the law; and how would you like to pay for the building and repairing of Presbyterian churches and chapels, while you should be deprived of all voice in your own taxation? And how would you like, I pray you, Presbyterian tithes, and processes, and ecclesiastical courts? And how would you like to be tried by none but Presbyterian juries, flushed with the insolence of power, and infuriated with all the venom of passion? How would you like all this? And, more than this, how would you like the degradation which would arise from such a system; and the shame, and scorn, and contumelies, and disgrace which would flow from it? Englishmen, would you bear with all this? and above all, would you listen with patience to men who told you that there was no grievance in all this, that your complaints were groundless, and that your language was full of factious menaces, and that the very right of murmuring ought to be taken away from you? ... You are told that there is no national calamity in the exclusion of a few gentlemen from parliament, and a few lawyers from the bar. How heinous a view of the case is this? Don't you feel that this very exclusion throws degradation over the whole of the disfranchised community?

and that the spirit which is derived from that political dishonouring of a whole people, must run through all the departments of society, and must be baneful indeed? A brand is struck upon the forehead of the country, and it festers there. The nation is divided into two castes. The powerful and privileged few are patricians in religion, and oligarchs in creed, and trample upon and despise the plebeian Christianity of the millions who are laid prostrate at their feet. Every Protestant thinks himself a Catholic's better, and every Protestant feels himself the member of a privileged corporation, and as such must be protected; their judges, their sheriffs, their crown counsel, their crown attorneys, their juries, are Protestant to a man; what confidence can a Catholic have in the administration of public justice? We have the authority of an eminent Irish judge, the late Mr. Fletcher, who declared, that in the southern counties the Protestants guilty, were uniformly acquitted; and the Catholics innocent, were as undeviatingly condemned. A body of armed Orangemen fall upon and murder a set of defenceless Catholics—they are put upon their trial; and when they raise their eyes and look upon the jury, as they are commanded to do, they see twelve of their brethren in massacre impanelled for their trial; and after this, I shall be told that all the evil of Catholic disqualification is in the stuff gowns of lawyers, and the disappointed longing of some dozen gentlemen after the House of Commons. No; it is the disgrace, the ban, the stigma, the brand, the note of dishonour; and the scandalous partialities, the flagitious broils, the sacrilegious and perjured leanings, and the monstrous and hydra-headed injustice, that constitute the grand and essential evils of the country. And you think it very wonderful (you, forsooth, that cut off the head of a king for imposing an illegal tax upon

you) that we should be indignant at all this. You marvel, and are astonished, and think it prodigious, that we are hurried by a sense of these injuries into the use of rash and vehement phrases; for I won't deny that we, and that I myself in particular, have occasionally turned my burning emotions into language, the employment of which I may have had reason to regret. But are we the only individuals who have forgotten the dictates of temperance and of charity? and have our opponents been always distinguished by their meekness and forbearance? and have no exasperating expressions, and no galling taunts, and no fierce sarcasms, and no ferocious menaces, ever escaped from them?—Look, look, I pray you, to the Brunswick orgies of Ireland, and behold not merely the torturers of 98—who, like retired butchers, feel the want of their own occupation, and long for the political shambles again—but look to the ministers of the gospel, pouring out their votive libations to the Moloch of ascendancy, and cheering their demon with the promise of a hecatomb of blood.... But perhaps you will say, that while you are conscious that we have much to suffer, you owe it to your own safety to exclude us from power. Englishmen! we have power already—the power to do mischief; give us that of doing good. Disarray us, dissolve us, break up our confederacy, take from the law (for it is the great conspirator) its combining and organizing quality—make us equal, and we shall no longer be united by the bad chain of slavery with each other, but by the natural bonds of allegiance and of contentment with you. But you fear our influence in the House of Commons—don't you dread our actual influence out of it? We are only Catholics out of the House of Commons, we should be citizens within it. But you say that we are priest-ridden.....The priests

have great influence, you think, at elections—yes, when they run with the popular passions; but if they endeavour to controul them, the torrent sweeps them away. But, really, it is laughable to hear men talking of the influence of priests over Catholic members of the House of Commons, as if a Catholic gentleman, before he gave his vote, would be much more likely to listen to a whisper from a minister, or a shout from the people, than to the injunctions at the confessional, or the anathemas of the altar.—Why, good heavens! do you ever hear of the Catholic deputies of France or Belgium asking their ghostly fathers how they should vote? Or do the Catholic members of Congress ask the Pope how he would like to have a Popish establishment in the United States? Are they not as good citizens as any other members of the community; and do you ever hear one word about Popery and despotism being established in America? But, supposing that Catholics had the will, would they have the power, to overthrow the constitution? What, some twenty Catholics overwhelm the British House of Commons!.... You allege, however, that we Catholics would be anxious to raise our Church upon the ruins of yours, to strip your clergy of tithes, and to possess themselves of the gorgeous opulence of an anti-apostolic and anti-scriptural establishment. Never was there a more unfounded imputation. The whole body of the Irish Catholics look upon a wealthy priesthood with abhorrence. They not only do not desire that their bishops should be invested with pontifical gorgeousness and prelatie pomp, but when a bill was introduced, in order to make a small, and no more than a decent provision for the Catholic clergy, did they not themselves repudiate the offer, and prefer their honourable poverty, and the affections of the people, to the directions of the

crowns? And how did the people act? Although a provision for the priesthood would relieve them from a burden, did they not deprecate their adulterous connexion with power? The Catholics of Ireland well knew, that if their clergy were endowed with the wealth of the Establishment, they would become a corrupt and profligate corporation of lazy churchmen, bloated with insolence, pampered with luxury, swelling with sacerdotal pride, and presenting, in their lives and persons, a monstrous contrast with that simplicity and poverty, of which they are now as well the practisers as the teachers. They well know that, in place of being the pious, active, and indefatigable instructors of the peasantry; in place of being their consolers in affliction, their resource in calamity, their preceptors and models in religion, the trustees of their interests, their visitors in sickness, and their companions in their beds of death; they would be a vain, supercilious, reckless, heartless troop of abandoned profligates, equally insolent to the humble, and sycophantic to the great—flatterers at the noble's table, and grinders in the poor man's hovel—rapacious in extortion—slaves in politics, and tyrants in demeanour—who from the porticoes of palaces would give their instructions in humility—who, from the banquets of patricians, would prescribe their lessons in abstinency—who from mitred chariots would pronounce injunctions against the pride and pomp, and from the “primrose path of dalliance, would point to the steep and thorny way to heaven.” The Catholics of Ireland well know that this would be the character of their priesthood, if their Church was ever raised on the ruins of the Establishment; and, monstrous as the opulence of that Establishment now is, they would rather behold the wealth of Protestant bishops increased tenfold,

and another million of acres added to their episcopal territories, than behold their pure and simple priesthood degraded from their poverty into opulence, and sunk from their noble humility to that dishonourable and anti-Christian ostentation, which, if it were once established, would be sure to characterise their Church. Englishmen, I speak the sentiments of the whole body of my countrymen, when I speak this; and I solemnly and emphatically reiterate my asseveration, that there is nothing which the Roman Catholic body would regard with more abhorrence than the transfer of the enormous and corrupting revenues of the Establishment to a clergy who owe their virtues to their poverty, and the attachment of the people, to their dignified dependence upon the people for their support.I might enlarge upon the benefits that would result to Ireland if factions were reconciled, the substantial causes of animosity removed, and the fierce passions which agitate the country, laid at rest. English capital would, in all likelihood, flow in and fertilize Ireland; English habits would gradually arise; a confidence in the administration of justice would grow up; the people, instead of appealing to arms for redress, would look to the public tribunals as the only arbiters of right. The obstacles which now stand in the way of education would be removed; the fierceness of polemics would be superseded by that charity which a Christian extends to all mankind; a reciprocal sentiment of kindness would take place between the two islands; a real union, not depending upon Acts of Parliament, but upon mutual interest and affection, would be permanently established; the empire would be consolidated, and all dangers from the enemies of Great Britain would disappear for ever. I might also point out to you, what is obvious enough—that if Ireland

be allowed to remain as it now is, at no distant period, the natural foes of Great Britain may make that unfortunate country the field for some tremendous speculation. I might draw a picture of the dreadful consequences which would arise if an enormous population were to be roused into a concurrent and simultaneous movement. But I forbear from pressing such considerations upon you, because I had much rather rely upon your own magnanimity and lofty-mindedness, than upon any ground of possible evil and ostensible contingency. I, therefore, do put it to you, that independently of every consideration of expediency, it is unworthy of you to persevere in a system of practical religious intolerance which Roman Catholic states, who hold out to you a fine example, in this regard, at least, have abandoned. I have heard it said that the Catholic religion is a persecuting religion. To be sure it was—and so was every other religion that ever was invested with authority. I might retort on you the charge of persecution—I might remind you that the early reformers, who set up a claim to liberty of conscience for themselves, did not indulge any others in a similar luxury.....But I will not adopt this course of re-
crimination. The truth is, that both parties have, in the paroxysms of religious frenzy, committed the most execrable atrocities, and it might be difficult, if their misdeeds were to be weighed, to adjust the balance of atrocity between them. But both Catholics and Protestants have changed, and with the situation of times we ourselves have undergone a salutary reformation. In the streets where the massacre of St. Bartholomew took place, the Huguenot walks in friendship with the Catholic, and even in Rome itself, the simple ceremonies of your religion are undisturbed by Papal intrusion. Through the whole

Continent religious distinctions have begun to vanish, and freedom of conscience is almost universally established. How does it happen that England should be almost the only country where religious disqualifications are maintained? Protestants, who accuse the Catholic religion of intolerance, compare the conduct of Roman Catholics with your own. In France, where the religion of the state is that of Rome, all men are admissible to power, and no sort of sectarian distinction is instituted by the law. The third article of the French magna charta provides that the Catholic religion shall be the established one; but that every French citizen, no matter of what denomination, shall be capable of holding every office in the state. The chamber of deputies is filled with Protestants who are elected by Roman Catholics, and Protestants have held places in the cabinet of France. You charge our religion with intolerance. Encounter these notorious facts if you can—Look to other Catholic states.—In Hungary, in the year 1791, Protestants were placed by a Roman Catholic government on a perfect level with their fellow-citizens. In Catholic Bavaria the same principle of toleration was adopted. Thus the Catholics of Europe have given you a splendid example; and while they have refuted the imputation of intolerance, have held out to you a practical reproach. Away then with the charge that my religion is the patroness of oppression, and away with the idle boast of a tolerating and philosophical Christianity, in which you ever vauntingly indulge! You are behind almost every nation in Europe. Protestant Prussia has emancipated her Catholic subjects, and Silesia is free. In Germany the Churches are used indiscriminately by Protestants and Catholics—the Lutheran service in a

happy succession, follows the Catholic Mass; or the Catholic Mass, according to Lutheran or Catholic convenience, follows Lutheran service. Hanover itself, to which England owes an obligation—Protestant Hanover has made a proclamation of religious liberty, and the Hanoverian Catholic is free: and shall the Irish Catholic remain the branded and degraded wretch which your penal laws have made him, while the Hanoverian Catholic stands before his Elector without a chain? Is this just dealing towards Ireland? and how can our gracious Sovereign reconcile the tears which he gave to Ireland, with Irish oppression and with Hanoverian liberation? How can you reconcile with your own magnanimity this hard and cruel treatment of my unhappy country? And how can you consent to Hanoverian emancipation, and to the perpetuation of Irish thralldom? Will you, can you, with such glaring examples before you, bring yourselves to offer up a wanton invocation to the legislature to rivet the fetters of your Catholic fellow citizens? Englishmen, do not undertake so ungenerous an office. I do not call on you to petition for my liberty, but I implore you not to raise up your arms against it. This is all that I ask. Leave the legislature in the uncontrolled exercise of its discretion, and do not tell the Parliament that the fetters of your fellow-citizens must be more strongly bolted. On behalf of my country, on behalf of unfortunate Ireland, I conjure, I supplicate you, not to interfere for the low-hearted purposes of oppression. It is ungenerous; it is almost unmanly; it is unworthy of you. Men of Kent, you have never been conquered—yet you shall be conquered to-day; but the victory shall be obtained over yourselves. Conquer your prejudices, obtain a mastery over your antipathies; be victors of your passions,

vanquish your animosities, and put your antipathies to flight. Conquer yourselves—and conquer us. This—this is the way to subdue us—this is the way to obtain an empire over our affections; to fill us with gratitude, and to make our hearts your own.”

FROM MR SHEIL'S SPEECH, AT THE CITY OF LONDON
TAVERN, (*November 2.*)

“There is a topic in which I own that I think our Protestant advocates have not been sufficiently strenuous in our vindication, and that is, the imputation of seditious violence in our measures, and in our language. Now, sir, I will honestly tell you, that I consider our violence perfectly justifiable, and that facts bear us out. Before I call your attention to our specific proceedings, allow me to revert to antecedent events. Was it by a system of acquiescence and prostration, that anything was ever obtained by our body? In 1778, in 1782, and in 1793, Catholic committees—the precursors of the Catholic Association—having events, the most eloquent of all advocates, with them, succeeded in throwing upon the justice of their demands, the illustration which was supplied by their necessity. I stop, not to make any comment upon the fact, but it is enough to state, that the empire was, in every one of those periods, surrounded with difficulties and perils. In 1792, the Irish parliament refused the prayer of our petition by a vast majority.—The revolutionary trumpet sounded its blast, and in a few months after the minister came down to the House of Commons, and recommended concession to the Catholics. The Union succeeded. The Catholics were told by the agent of the King (and men are generally bound by the acts of their

agents,) that Emancipation should be the price of the independence of Ireland. They were deceived. They remained moderate. Their question was not discussed till 1805, and then it was lost by an immense majority. From 1805, what did the Catholics obtain? I traverse a long space of time, and pass to a remarkable epoch. The King resolved to visit Ireland.....[*For Mr. Sheil's spirited observations on this subject, see above, page 465.*] What became of the pledge then given, that something should be done for the pacification of Ireland? We had been humble, prostrate, almost servile—there was no violence, no Association, no Catholic rent, no revolt of landlord against tenant, no incendiaries—Well! what was begotten out of all this state of pacific felicity? We tarried long and in vain. The imposture was carried on until at length it became too gross for the purposes of further delusion, and the Catholics of Ireland, mocked and derided as they had been, began to bethink themselves of another course of policy, and out of the wrongs and the disappointment of seven millions of people, the Association sprung up.—What is the Association?—You will tell me that you all know—I scarcely think that you do. You imagine, perhaps, that it is composed of a band of men affiliated by oaths and declarations, bound to certain ordinances, and with the incidents and accompaniments of confederacy,—no such thing. Whoever thinks proper to pay a small sum of money towards the advancement of the Catholic cause, becomes at once a member of that body, which has no rules, no secrecy, only one officer, who acts as a secretary;—which is without pomp, form, or ceremony,—and which, as it owes its first existence to the feelings of the people, owes to nothing else its growth and consolidation. Now, I ask any fair-minded English-

man, whether, in the institution of this assembly, there was anything very culpable? And, after having tried all other means—after having been as yielding, and as submissive, and almost as crouching, as ascendancy could desire that we should be, and, in return for our prostration, after having received new contumelies and opprobrium—let me ask, whether we could be blamed for having thus rallied the power of the people, marshalled their energies, instructed them in their strength, and pointed to them their high and glorious duties? Were we not justified in so doing? and what, after all, did we do? Did we swear in the people?—did we go from cottage to cottage, to enlist the peasantry?—did we use any artificial expedients to enrol them in our ranks? No such thing: they became organised. But who organised them? The law of the land. It furnished the principle of union and of cohesion, without any effort on our part. The pre-existent community of feeling produced an universal co-operation, and seven millions of the people were attracted into one solid and inseparable mass. What is the Catholic Association? It is the engine, but the public discontent is the steam. It is not a mere society of active and inflammatory men—not a club, a confederacy, or a band—No, sir, it is nothing more or less than the Catholic people, with the gentry, the priesthood, and the intellect of the body, at their head. Was such an institution (if it so can be called,) a crime? But let us see what it has done and said, for in its doings or in its sayings, its violence must needs consist. First, with regard to measures—Mr. O'Connell (for to him the praise of that bold enterprise is due,) instituted the Catholic rent. Will any man say that we were not justified in applying our own money (for the money was our own,) to our own po-

litical concerns? It is said, that we impose a tax upon the people—No; the people imposed a tax upon themselves; and the generous promptitude, or, rather, the enthusiastic emulation, with which they vied in making their humble contributions to the national treasury, evinced the profound interest which they felt in the measure to which, it is alleged, that they were indifferent. And how was the public money used by the trustees in whose hands it was vested? Was it applied to the purposes of turbulence and of riot? Was it used in instigating the people to insubordination? Were arms and ammunition purchased, after the manner in which the Orange rent is applied? No, sir; it was laid out in the protection of the lower orders from tyrannical magistrates, in bringing rustic despots to justice, and in saving the bold and undaunted peasantry from the ignoble vengeance of their proud and infuriated landlords. The public accounts of the Association are open to every body's inspection; a registry is kept of the expenditure of every groat of the precious fund, and I defy any man to place his finger on a single item in which either corruption or practical sedition can be detected. The next charge against us is, that we instructed the people to rise, in elective insurrection, against their proprietors, and that we have hurled the Beresfords from Waterford, a cabinet minister from Clare, and three Orangemen from Westmeath and Monaghan and Louth. The charge against us is, that we told the peasantry that the franchise in their hands would, by its proper exercise, achieve the liberty of Ireland; and I have no doubt, that if we keep down the public passions, and prevent a physical collision, we shall, with that great engine, batter the bulwarks of intolerance. Let them rail at us as they will, we will show them at the next election of what mettle we

are made; we will fight them, but the hustings shall be the scene of our victory; and (if I may so say) we shall conquer them by dint of peace—and who will tell me that we were not justified in this great and unexampled achievement? Who will say that we violated a single rule of law, or one principle of the Constitution?.....But it is insisted that our language has been violent and intemperate. Words with us are things; and in the absence of seditious actions, hasty phrases and over ardent expressions are laid hold of, and pressed as grounds of imputation against us. I will not deny that there have been instances in which our feelings have been allowed to break out in ebullitions of vehemence—I will not deny that in the heat of passion our feelings have occasionally boiled over, and that our language has not been as felicitously measured as it were desirable it should have been. But give me leave to ask you whether, when we have been thus betrayed into the use of strenuous diction, and have turned our hearts into words, whether we had no wrongs to complain of; and if we had, will you not make allowance for any unhappy intemperance of expression? An Athenian citizen one day entered the study of a celebrated advocate—he seemed to be calm and unmoved. ‘What is your concern with me?’ said the orator. ‘I come to employ you as my counsel. I was struck in the public way by my enemy, and I seek redress.’ ‘I do not believe you,’ said the advocate. ‘Not believe me! Why, I tell you,’ cried the client, ‘that my enemy met me in the public way, threw me to the earth, smote, and trampled upon me.’ ‘Hold, hold,’ exclaimed Demosthenes, ‘your eye is on fire, your lip begins to quiver, you speak like a man who had sustained a wrong.’ (*loud and continued cheers.*) And are we to speak like men who had sustained no wrong? Do you ask me what

the wrong is that we have sustained? Shall I answer you in a soft and well-modulated intonation, and with a graceful cadence of body, and a gentleness and suavity of aspect—‘ In sooth, good Englishmen, we are in a disagreeable condition in Ireland. It is rather unpleasant to see Roman Catholics murdered, and their assassins tried and acquitted by their Orange confederates. We don’t quite like the way in which justice is administered; for the judges are all Protestant, and the crown counsel are all Protestant, and the jurors are all Protestant; neither do we find it very delectable to see all the important offices in the state, and all places of emolument and distinction occupied by a small body of men; and, though we have been long used to be treated as inferiors, yet the treatment which we experience from our Protestant betters, is not the most amiable that can be conceived.’ Well, if we addressed you thus, what would you say? I tell you what you would say—what Lord Grenville once said (and Burke has quoted the passage in his Letters to Dr. Laurence)—that the humble tone of the Catholics showed that they had no real grievance to complain of. But have we no real grievance to complain of? I will tell you what we have to complain of; and I will tell you of it as befits a man, who, in demanding his liberty, ought not to use the language of a slave. I tell you that it is monstrous, and scarcely endurable, that a small minority should have all the power, the influence, the patronage of the state, of the army, of the law, and of the church, condensed and concentrated in one mass of enormous monopoly. I tell you that it is a disgrace to your system that seven millions of the people should be trampled on by a few hundred thousand Protestants; and I tell you that they are so trodden down—I tell you that we are ground

to the earth by Protestant cesses, and Protestant vestries, and Protestant tithes, and all the multifarious shapes which a baneful ascendancy assumes. I tell you, that a Catholic in a party case has no chance before an Orange jury; and if it be detestable in other countries that justice should be sold, it is not the less infamous that our jury boxes should be the seats of ferocious and execrable passion; and that I would rather be tried by avarice and rapacity, than by faction and intolerance. I tell you that a Catholic in the north of Ireland may be murdered with impunity—and I tell you, that, independently of all the specific instances of wrong, a general system of opprobrium and of oppression prevails; and that in the ordinary business of life, in the common intercourse of society, every Roman Catholic feels himself disgraced, and spurned, and branded. Away with the allegation, that it is a question of boroughs and of silk gowns, and of seats for lawyers in the courts, and for gentlemen in the House of Commons. It is a question whether common justice shall be done in our public tribunals—whether Orangemen shall murder Catholics with impunity—whether blood shall be shed in the common day without retribution, and the whole body of the people shall be trodden down and trampled upon, and five hundred thousand men shall keep their feet upon the necks of seven millions. That is the question. Those are our wrongs; and let me ask you, whether, with such wrongs, and while our hearts are bursting in our bosoms at their endurance, you expect that we should speak in soft and mellifluous phrases—and that, instead of heaving upon the rack on which she is stretched, Ireland should breathe her complaints in gentle murmurings, and that her petitions should be as soft as her national music, to which every spinster in your drawing rooms lends the en-

chantment of her dulcet intonations. No, sir; the groans of a people are not to be turned into a set of parliamentary melodies; and in demanding redress, we do but follow the promptings of human nature, by putting before you the full extent of wrong; and see after what fashion, and with what bearing, our Irish antagonists demean themselves, and then consider whether it be very wonderful that we should break out into the exuberance of indignant expression. Have you, who marvel at what is designated as our violence, ever reflected upon the language which is employed in our regard? Have you read the speeches delivered in Orange orgies, in which the massacre of a whole nation is proposed as a thesis for discussion—in which the facilities of extirpation are made matter of debate—in which the canons of assassination are propounded, and the ethics of murder are deliberately laid down?....

....Englishmen, I have told you what is the provocation given to us: and although I do not wish to defend all that has ever been done or uttered, in moments of excitation, in our own body, I appeal to your own knowledge of human nature, and I ask whether—however you may blame us for imprudence—you will not be disposed to make allowance for the errors into which, under peculiar provocation, we may be unhappily betrayed? I have, perhaps, dwelt too long upon this charge of violence—and yet it is one upon which it is right that the public should be disabused; and therefore, I will venture, in speaking upon this head, to press another consideration upon you. It is much more reasonable to judge of men by their actions than by their words; and having already pointed out what may be considered as the violent measures of the Catholic leaders, let me direct your attention to proceedings of a very different character. Have we

not uniformly endeavoured to repress outrage and insurrection in Ireland? Has not Mr. O'Connell reconciled the factions of Tipperary, and done more than justice, after brandishing her drawn sword for years of ineffectual terrorism, could accomplish? Did we not, in a recent instance, anticipate the government, and disperse the immense multitudes who were gathered in Tipperary? Look at the last assizes of Ireland—the scaffold was almost unstained with blood. Look at the general habits of the people—drunkenness is a crime against the Association; and the people have become almost miraculously sober. And yet we are called the instigators of atrocity—the fermenters of outrage—and the patrons of conflagration....”

Speaking of the error likely to have been committed by the proposed cession of the forty-shilling freeholders, Mr. Sheil observes :—

“ The truth is, that we did not then know the public virtues of the peasantry of Ireland—we did not believe that they were possessed of that nobleness of heart, and that lofty and martyr-like intrepidity, by which they astonished not only the people of this country, but those who had contributed to produce those qualities amongst them, to ennoble their moral nature, and make them worthy of the privilege which they have thus gloriously employed. But while you condemn us for our erroneous appreciation of the people, I pray you at the same time to do us this justice. If they are brave, if they are determined, if this village *Hampdenism* has sprung up in the midst of hovels, let me ask, who are the men who have made the people what they are? A few years ago they were driven like domestic swine to the hustings, and now they turn like lions upon the hunter;—a few years ago they were the mere serfs transferred with the soil of which

they form a part, and now they are the equals of their masters in spirit, and their superiors in public virtue. How has this change been effected? The Catholic Association has accomplished this marvellous alteration in the habits of the people, and revolutionized their character. We—aye I repeat it, and I make a vaunt of it—we, by what is called our inflammatory language, and our demagogic vituperation, and our seditious philippics, awoke the spirit of the nation, and made it capable of the great things which it has accomplished. Would you have ever heard of Louth, and Monaghan, and Waterford, and Westmeath, and of Clare, but for our dauntless energy and indefatigable exertions, our zeal, our systematic and fearless determination? Was not the Association the great furnace in which the whole mass of the national mind was heated to intensity, and then made susceptible of the great impressions which have been struck upon it?.....Englishmen, be sure of this, that the Association has changed, and, let me call it, *Anglified* the genius of the people. The Irish peasant is every day, under our tuition, acquiring your own habits of English independence. Wakefield, the English traveller, gives an instance of the manner in which the lower orders were formerly treated; he says, that at a race course he saw a gentleman, whose horse was accidentally touched by a peasant, lay open his cheek with his whip; and on asking the slave how he could bear it? the slave replied, "Sure his honour is a justice of peace!" If such an incident were now to happen, and a gentleman smote a peasant, it might cost him his life. The looks, the bearing, the whole aspect of the people are altered, and a wretch clad in rags, and without enough of earth to cover him if he were dead, and to lie down upon in sleep, looks his landlord in the face, and beholds in him his fellow-

man.—Generous, intrepid, and fine-hearted people! what might ye not be made of, if England would only do ye justice, and raise ye to a level with herself!.....It was the Catholic Association, I repeat it, that achieved the wonders (for they deserve the name) which were accomplished at the late elections; and it is most erroneous to imagine that it is to the priesthood and their intimidations that those events should be referred. The priests did certainly interfere as citizens, but who imparted that spirit of citizenship to them? If the lamp of patriotism burned bright upon the altar, it was at the torch which we waved that the fire was lighted up. Nor did the clergy appeal to the people upon the ground of religious duty, so much as upon that of political right. I speak in the presence of the Member for Louth, and he will tell you, that, during his election, the voice of controversy was lost in the shout of patriotism—and in the cause of Ireland, that of Rome was forgotten. The priests addressed the people as Irishmen, and not as Catholics, and put their title to redress upon the broad principle of religious liberty throughout the world. We saw priests indeed at every window, and at every corner; but what did they say?—They cried out ‘Vote for Ireland!’ and, thank God, their invocation was obeyed.....You think the Irish people priest-ridden. I won’t deny that the priest has influence—why should he not? How does he obtain it? He lives with the people—he consorts with them—he is their teacher in religion—their consoler in sorrow—their mild and paternal friend. They depend on him for instruction, for comfort, for hope—and he depends on them (and it is an honourable reciprocity) for his livelihood. The bread which he breaks is eaten in the remembrance of the poor. A knock is heard in the dead of the winter’s

night at the door of his humble habitation—he is told that one of his parishioners is on the point of death, and implores his assistance. The storm howls about him—the wind and sleet beat against his face—yet he goes forth, hurries to the hovel of the expiring wretch, and taking his station at the bed of pestilential straw, bends to receive the broken whisper in which the heart unloads itself of its guilt, though the lips of the sinner should be tainted with disease, and he should inhale mortality in his breath. Shall I then say that such a man has no influence with the people? God forbid that I should—but it is not from superstition that his influence is derived. It is not from fanaticism, but from deep and thrilling thankfulness; and as long as there is gratitude or affection in the breast of an Irish peasant, never let an influence derived from such sources pass away. Oh! the Parsons are welcome to become their rivals if they please, if offices of charity and of benevolence are to be the instruments of their competition. But do not imagine that the reverence for the sacerdotal character is so profound, that where a Priest violates his public duty the people are disposed to obey him.....It is also alleged, that the Irish Catholics are enemies to English connexion, and desire a separation. This is a gross and infamous calumny. If England would only give Ireland leave, she would be her devoted and enthusiastic adherent; and I trust that England will perceive, at last, how much her own interest as well as her own honour is concerned in the great work of conciliation; and that she will, by becoming the benefactress of Ireland, confer a blessing upon herself.....”

After deprecating the conduct of Englishmen towards Ireland, Mr. Sheil thus concludes: “But do I mean to tell you that all Englishmen feel and act thus? Oh, my

friends (for such I have a right to call you), do not mistake me. I do not confound you with the faction that deals thus hardly with my country. I well know that you feel almost as much indignation as I do myself at the manner in which we are treated; and I further know, that all the intelligence, all the worth, and all the generosity and lofty-mindedness of England are on our side. The feelings that are manifested in this assembly are diffused through an immense mass of the population of this country, and you represent a vast body of your fellow-citizens.....”

APPENDIX.—No. XVIII.

A LIST OF CONTROVERSIAL WORKS.

- BAINES' *Defence of the Catholic Religion.*
BERINGTON'S *Faith of Catholics, confirmed by Scripture
and attested by the Fathers of the first five centuries.*
BERGIER'S *Dictionnaire de Théologie.*
BOSSUET'S *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic
Church in matters of Controversy.*
BRUNSWICK'S (*Duke of*) *Fifty Reasons, &c.*
BUTLER'S *Book of the Church.*
CHALLONER'S *Catholic Christian instructed.*
COOMBES' *Essence of Religious Controversy.*
FLETCHER'S *Reflections on the Spirit of Controversy.*
————— *Comparative View of the Grounds of the
Catholic and Protestant Churches.*
GOTHER'S *Papist Misrepresented and Represented.*
HOWARD'S (HENRY, Esq.) *Remarks on the Erroneous
Notions entertained respecting the Catholic Religion.*
J. K. L. *Reply to the Most Rev. Dr. Magee.*
LINGARD'S *History of the Anglo-Saxon Church.*
————— *Tracts.*
MACHALE'S *Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic
Church.*
[A most comprehensive, interesting, and eloquent work.]
MILNER'S *History of Winchester.*

MILNER'S *Letters to a Prebendary.*

————— *End of Religious Controversy.*

[An admirable work.]

POYNTER'S *Christianity; or, the Evidences and Characters of the Christian Religion.*

TREVERN'S (NOW BISHOP OF STRASBOURG) *Amicable Discussion*, translated from the French by the REV. W. RICHMOND.

————— *Answer to FABER'S Difficulties of Romanism*, translated by the REV. F. C. HUSENBETH.

[A most triumphant Book!]

Protestants' Trial by the Word.

Protestant Apology for the Roman Catholic Religion; and numerous other Works, to be had of all Catholic Booksellers.

N.B. COBBETT'S *History of the Reformation* gives a clearer insight into the principles and conduct of the Reformers in this country, than any work that has ever been published.

**HOME USE
CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
MAIN LIBRARY**

This book is due on the last date stamped below.
1-month loans may be renewed by calling 642-3405.
6-month loans may be recharged by bringing books
to Circulation Desk.

Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior
to due date.

**ALL BOOKS ARE SUBJECT TO RECALL 7 DAYS
AFTER DATE CHECKED OUT.**

JUN 1 - 1975 3 9

REC. CIR. MAY 14 '75

LD21—A—40m—12,'74
(S2700L)

**General Library
University of California
Berkeley**



