

A REPLY

BY

J. K. L.

TO

THE LATE CHARGE

OF THE

MOST REV. DOCTOR MAGEE,

PROTESTANT ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN,

SUBMITTED,

MOST RESPECTFULLY, TO THOSE TO WHOM

THE ABOVE CHARGE WAS ADDRESSED.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY RICHARD COYNE,

4, CAPEL-STREET.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY J. BOOKER, 61, NEW BOND-STREET, AND SOLD BY
J. RIDGWAY, PICADILLY.

1827.

A REPLY,

&c. &c.

MEN BRETHREN,

A CHARGE, breathing discord and proclaiming dissension, has been lately addressed to you, by the most dignified Ecclesiastic of the Established Church in your province. This Prelate has assured you, that you are competent to judge all things. I think differently; but, I am satisfied that you are competent to decide upon the merits of his Charge, and it is upon those merits that I appeal to your judgment. For many of you, individually, I entertain sentiments of the highest respect; to you all I am bound as a fellow-christian, by ties of charity—ties, which never have been, and I hope never will be, severed. When, therefore, in the sequel of the observations which I am about to address to you, the vices of heresy and schism are reprov'd, and the conduct of some furious men treated with severity—bear in mind, I beseech you, the following sentiments of St. Augustin, addressed by him to a numerous portion, clergy and people, of the Donatists,—sentiments, which in your regard, I fully and unequivocally adopt.

“The Apostle Paul,” writes this Holy Father, in his 162d 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. Unless I believed you to be such, perhaps I should not address any letters to you.” Thus far proceeds this learned and charitable Bishop, who, separating the well meaning from the perverse amongst those who were not of his communion, discusses with an energy and freedom quite apostolical, the causes of that separation which he deplored. This spirit of charity and zeal excited him to exclaim in another letter upon the same subject, *non debet tot tantorumque populorum salutem furiosus error hominum impedire paucorum.* “The furious error of a few men should not be suffered to prevent the salvation of so many,—of so numerous a people. Ep. 61. ad Dulcitium.” Thus Augustin, whilst he looks with an eye of charity to the multitudes seduced into the ways of error, expresses himself with peculiar energy when his thoughts are directed to the authors, the fomentors, the preachers of religious dissension.

I wish earnestly, that I were enabled, in addressing you, to put on the spirit of this great man, but if at any time, the oppression and injustice under which, as an Irish Catholic, I labour, extort from me strong expressions, they are to be received, as in truth they are directed,

not against the multitude of my Protestant fellow-subjects and fellow-christians, but against the vices or insanity of a few furious men;—men who either have originated and established in these countries religious error with its attendants, schisms and dissensions; or who still labour to perpetuate division, to strengthen discord, and prevent, by every means in their power, not only the peace and happiness of Ireland, but also the salvation of a numerous and most deserving people.

The principal object, however, which at present I have in view, is not to examine or detail the causes or effects of existing divisions—divisions which are, perhaps, too old and too inveterate to be healed: No, my object is to repel injury, not to inflict wounds—to reply to an impassioned philippic, which the voice of the country must condemn, and to defend an injured community from the unprovoked and now reiterated attacks of a Christian Bishop, who claims to discharge an embassy for Christ.

I had hoped that this most Reverend Prelate, embarrassed as he was by the occurrences in which he has been involved since his elevation to the See of Dublin, would have said with the Psalmist, in the bitterness of his soul, “It is good for me (O Lord) that thou hast humbled me, that I may learn the ways of thy justice,” and that in the silence of retirement he would have labored to efface from his literary character and public life, those stains which a forgetfulness of his own infirmity, and an unwarrantable disrespect for other men, had imprinted on them. But whether it be a peculiarity of understanding, or a pride not be subdued, which animates him, he appears resolved still to exhibit

himself from his high station as a rallying point to the insane bigots who infest this country, and as a subject of censure to those who, were he less obtruding, would willingly pass him by unheeded. But the sympathies which the world generally bestows, even upon well merited distress, can no longer be collected about his Grace; and what the public should deplore is, (to recur to the language of Augustin,) that by him and a few other restless enthusiasts, the salvation of many is endangered, and the peace and comfort of society incessantly disturbed. To men of this description "*who will, not to know the truth, that they might act rightly,*" I do not address myself; my appeal is directed principally to those who, however prepossessed by early habits of thought, or influenced by alienated feelings, are yet inclined to listen to the accused pleading in his own defence, and disposed to judge impartially between man and man.

To analyse the entire Charge of the Most Reverend Archbishop, would be a tedious and a useless labor,—irrelevant to my purpose, and uninteresting to those whom I address. I shall therefore select, with as much accuracy as I can, out of the mass of words in which they are involved, those positions of his Grace which impugn the religion, or social principles of Catholics, and apply to them such observations as will occur to me, and as they seem to merit.

But, before I proceed to this ungrateful task, it may be useful, if not necessary, to premise some general reflections upon that Church Authority which it is the scope and purpose of this Archbishop to decry, and upon that special right of individuals to judge definitely in all matters of

religious belief and practice, which it is his Grace's object to amplify.

'Tis true that he places a limit to this right, and casts out among the Heathens, the Arian, the Socinian, the Unitarian; the reason why he does so, is, because those denominations of Christians are not pleased to understand certain texts of Scripture as he does himself; because they refuse to submit to that Church Authority which he discards, and are guided in their interpretation of Scripture by that very private judgment whose prerogatives he exalts, and whose unrestrained exercise he recommends. This is no doubt a gross, a palpable contradiction in the system of his Grace. I have only noticed it, however, in this place, as I may again advert to it in those preliminary observations to which I now proceed.

And first, what is the Church of the living God whose authority is assailed? It is, 1 Tim. 3, v. 15, the pillar and the ground of truth, against which the gates of hell will not prevail, Math. 16, v. 18; and which, if any one do not hear and follow, he is, by the sentence of Christ himself, to be held as a Heathen and a Publican. To deny the supreme authority of this Church in what concerns the religion of Christ is, according to St. Augustin, *Lib. de Util: credend. cap. 17*, "truly the fruit of impiety or of the most headlong arrogance:" so that this holy and learned Doctor does not hesitate to say, *Lib. contra Ep. Fundam: ch. 5*, that he would not believe the Gospel, if the authority of the Church did not compel him thereto.

So St. Jerome, disputing with the followers of Lucifer, *de Cagliari tom. 4, par. 2, p. 306*, says "I might dry up all the rivulets of your propositions by the sun alone of the

Church; but whereas we have already argued at length, and the tediousness of our disputations has wearied our hearers, I shall express to you the strong and clear conviction of my mind, to wit, men should remain in that Church, which, founded by the Apostles, continues to the present day;" of this Church, writing to Pope Damasus, he speaks again, saying, "I am united to your holiness, that is, to the chair of Peter; on that rock I know the Church was built, whosoever does not gather with you scatters, that is, whosoever is not of Christ is of Antichrist." Thus it was, that this learned Father thought of Church Authority and of the successor of Peter, whom he considered as the keystone of the building, outside of which, all was profane.

This authority was not only considered supreme, but of such necessity, that the poor and illiterate, to whom, above all others, Christ came to preach, and who in all times were destined to form the bulk of the heirs of his kingdom, could not by any other visible means have their faith secured, or even come to the knowledge of true religion. This is so obvious a truth, as not to require proof; for, no person who surveys in his mind, the past, or even the present state of the world, will venture gravely to assert that every man called to the religion of Christ, or one in every ten thousand of them, could acquire a knowledge of religion, or ascertain the right sense of divine Revelation, otherwise than through the ministry and authority of the Church. "The rude and ignorant, says Tert: Lib. de Praescrip. cap. 14, whom faith has saved, not the searching of the Scriptures, *non exercitatio scripturarum*. To believe on authority is a short way, and no labour."

This truth is admitted in practice alike by all sects, for

they all have a creed, or symbolic books, or articles of religion, or a confession of faith, which the parents and pastors explain and inculcate, and which the Church, or Kirk, or Conventicle, or Meeting, enforces by the exercise of authority and the infliction of censure, even to the expulsion of the refractory or unbeliever, from the body to which he had till then belonged.

This is the authority, sacred, divine, and indispensable, which all innovators, whilst they seek to avail themselves of its advantages, yet labour incessantly to decry. They do so with a view to palliate their own original sin of separation. They became Sectaries only when they rebelled against this authority. When stricken by its censures, and writhing under such just punishment of their own revolt, they indeed blasphemed the hand that smote them, but even whilst they did so, they endeavoured by human efforts to erect a Church or Churches, and to invest them with an authority similar to that which they had just rejected! They could not, 'tis true, erect their Church or Churches on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, the chief corner stone being Jesus Christ, for from this foundation they had separated themselves; but, like the followers of Jeroboam, having deserted Sion, they sought to build a conventicle on some mountain of Gerazim!

These Sectaries all exclaim "will you hear men rather than God, human errors rather than the Sacred Scriptures?" These appeals, however, are like the cries of a felon, who caught in the act of stealing, would have the ministers of justice to believe that he had a just claim to the property which he had stolen, and presumes even to call on the right owner to produce his title deeds before his right would be recognized.

These Sectaries always affect to forget that the law of the Gospel is a *real law* given by God to man, as a rule of conduct; that when he gave the law he also instituted Ministers to teach it and judges to administer it; vesting them with power to enforce the authority confided to them by means of censures, and engaging to assist them in their teaching and judging, all days, even to the end of the world;—that the judge is (to use a phrase of the civil law) *lex loquens*, “the law speaking,” and the law itself *Prætor non loquens*, “the judge not speaking.” The Sectaries affect to forget all this, and whilst each of them distorts or mangles the law to suit his own caprice, or favor his own pride or passion, he contemns the judge, and exclaims, “to the law and to the testimony,—to the law and to the testimony.”

In the long catalogue of human errors there is not perhaps one more glaringly absurd, than that which substitutes the private judgment of every individual Christian for the authority of the Church, in deciding religious controversies; it has no warrant in Scripture; it is opposed to the plainest maxims of reason, to the legal institutions of every civilized society; it is, itself, the very essence of all division and separation; and, as far as it extends, produces the same disorganization in the Church of God, as a revolution does in a Commonwealth.

These Sectaries, to palliate their defection or revolt, say, “Reason is the judge of Controversy.”

Supposing that Reason, which in its exercise is as various as are the faces of men, were capable of deciding controversy; who is bound to submit in such matters to the reason of any man or number of men? If the Pastors of the Church had not their commission and promise of support from Christ, we might respect their opinion, but would we

always bow to their judgment? Moreover, of what account is it that reason in any person is clear or strong, whereas, whatever it is, it is not the judge appointed by Christ. Religion is his free and gracious institution; it was *He* and not *we* who “gave some Pastors and Doctors for the perfecting of the Saints, for the works of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ, (the Church) until we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man—that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive. Eph. c. 4, 11, 14.” These Pastors and Doctors then, and not Reason, were appointed to interpret the law of Christ, and administer it in his kingdom.

Again, it is said, the Scripture itself can decide controversies. This is another error, more gross, if possible, than the foregoing—for if Scripture could decide controversy, a dumb letter could speak, and a folio Bible give judgment;—the leaves of books could cite witnesses, hear evidence, acquit innocence, and condemn guilt. If this absurdity were to be endured, then each and every Sect which has plundered the Catholic Church of the Scriptures, might compare notes, and agree upon some one error to be professed by them all; or, as truth is one and indivisible, they would all discover it, and we would again return to the Apostolic times, when all the believers had but one heart, one mind, and one faith, as they had but one Lord and one Baptism.

Again, they say, that the Holy Ghost, if properly invoked, decides for each person upon all doubts. This

opinion is not only absurd but exceedingly impious, for it supposes that the Holy Ghost abides outside that Church which he was sent to enlighten, direct, enrich, and govern, and that he diffuses his light and grace to men who blaspheme or venerate, as their judgment dictates, the same truth. That He, who is charity itself, dwells with heresy, which is impiety; that He, who is the uniting love of the Father and the Son, teaches the most discordant opinions; that He, who is the God of peace and unity, warrants by his inspiration, strife and discord; that he taught Calvin to condemn what he instructed Luther to dogmatize, and inspired Luther to curse what he had taught Calvin and Zuinglius to preach; that he instructed Cranmer to adopt half a dozen different formularies of faith, and Latimer to disregard both truth and duty. The unction of the Spirit teaches interiorly, it is true, the children of the Church, not to decide on Controversy, (which the Pastors whom he has placed to rule her are commissioned to do) but he teaches them those heavenly truths which he conceals often from the prudent and the wise, and reveals to the simple and the poor—that sublime knowledge of the Saints, known only to the perfect, which, whilst it increases the desire of heaven, is itself a foretaste of that bliss to be enjoyed by those who will see God face to face, and know him even as we are known to him.

But the truth is, that in matters of fact which depend only on God revealing his will, it is not on a silly hypothesis, nor on human reason, but on a divinely established authority that the mind of man ought or can repose. “Blessed are you, says Christ, Math. 26, 17, Simon, son of Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to you, but my Father who is in heaven, and I say unto you, that thou art a rock, and on this rock I will build my Church,

and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her." Here Reason is excluded, the confession of Christ's Divinity is attributed to the special inspiration of God, and an exercise of the same divine power, fixes for ever, the destiny of the Church. The whole constitution of it is divine, and, as Paul observes, 2 Cor. 10, 4, *the arms of her warfare are not carnal*, more than the foundation on which she rests, but spiritual, *powerful of God to the pulling down of strong holds, destroying counsels and every height lifting itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every understanding to the obedience of Christ*, or of the law which he promulged." Thus we see how little human wisdom is permitted to interfere with an institution positive in its nature, divine in its origin, and having its authority vested in those who were commissioned to propagate and watch over it in this world. "The weakness of Reason," says St. Augustin, Lib. de mor. Eccl. cap. 2, "may appear from this, that whenever it is adduced, it seeks for some authority wherewith it may be confirmed," so incompetent is it to decide upon religious controversy, if not united to an authority established by God and enlightened by his Spirit.

So with the Scriptures themselves, in which we are told, and a sad experience but too well verifies what is so told us, that there "are many things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unsteady wrest to their own perdition, 2 Pet. ch. 3. v. 16." In place of deciding controversies in religion, Augustin, Lib. 7, de Gen. ad lit. ch. 9, judiciously observes, "do not all the heretics read the Catholic Scriptures, nor are they heretics for any other reason than that not understanding them rightly, they obstinately assert their own opinions contrary to their (the Scriptures) truth." So Vincent of Lerins, in his Charge

cap. 2. gives a melancholy picture of the manner in which the heretics in his time abused the Sacred Scriptures, and wrested them each to support his own opinion.

In those days, as in our own, Sectaries could not agree even as to what books were inspired or what were not; Tertullian in his day seems to describe the contentions which once prevailed in the 16th century on this subject, between the Sectaries in Germany, Geneva, and England, an epitome of which is now observable amongst the members of the Bible Society. He says, "this heresy does not receive certain scriptures, and if it receives some, it does not admit them entire; it fits them by additions and subtractions to its own purpose; and if it admit any entire, yet, inventing divers expositions, it changes them; so an adulterated meaning vitiates them as much as the corrupted text, *Corruptor Stylus*." The just conclusion which he draws is, therefore, "that in disputes, the appeal should not be made to the Scriptures, nor the contest made to depend on them."

Saint Augustin also observes, Lib. 1, Contra Crescon. cap. 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 Scriptures 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. That it is from such misunderstanding of the Sacred Scriptures all heresies arise, the Holy Doctor, Tract 18, in Johan. cap. 5. expressly asserts, 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 asserted."

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 controuling 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 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 universe, 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," is the Church then so composed, the kingdom of Christ, of whom David said, ps. 73, "and his house is *in peace*?" Are those contending sectaries the "men of good will" to whom the angels announced at Bethlehem, Luc. 2, 14, that Christ came to give *peace*? Are they who contend one with the other 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 10, 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 were dispersed, John 17, 11, should assemble them only to contend with one another? Is it for an assemblage of discordant sects that Christ prayed, saying, John 17, "Holy Father keep them in thy name whom thou has given to me, that they may be ONE as you and I are one?" Was it for such assemblage he invoked the Spirit of peace, saying to his Apostles, John 20, 21, 22, "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?"

It was inquired of the Sectaries, whether contending sects were contemplated by St. Paul, when he so graphically described the unity of the church in the following passage, 1 Cor. 12, 12, "As the body is ONE and hath many members, but all the members of the body, though they be many, yet are *one* body: so also Christ: for in *one* spirit we are all baptized into ONE?" Is this unity, this indivisible conjunction of the members with each other and with the head verified in the tumultuary and contradictory congregations of sects and heresies? Can they be the persons

addressed by the Apostle, Eph : 4, 3, saying, "be careful to preserve the unity of spirit in the bond of peace;" for 1 Cor. 12, 21, "the eye cannot say to the hand, I want not your labour, nor again, the hand to the feet you are not necessary for me;" as if he said, whosoever thinks that he needs not the assistance of his brethren in the church, but can himself by his own powers, act and think independant of them, he cannot be a member of Christ's body, nor receive life from the spirit of Christ—whereas he breaks the bond of peace which links together all the members or brethren. "One body and one spirit," he says again, writing to the Ephesians, "as you are called in one hope," and to the Hebrews, ch. 10, 24, let us consider one another to provoke unto charity and good works, not forsaking our assembly as some are accustomed. ONE GOD he exclaims, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM; and 1 Cor. 12, 15, "and God hath tempered the body, that there might be no schism in the body, but the members mutually careful one for the other," because, as he says to the Hebrews, 10, 39, "we are not the sons of withdrawing (or of separating ourselves) unto perdition."

These Sectaries were told, that by congregating Schismatics and Heretics within the Church of God, they were subverting the faith and morality of the Christian religion. The crime of schism was exhibited to them as it had been painted by St. Paul, Phil. 3, 2, "beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the *concision*" the cutting up—the separation of the body, which is the work of the evil doers—of the dogs who devour the body of Christ, which is the Church—of those as Jude observes, 19 v. "who separate themselves, sensual men, having not the spirit." The Sectaries were told, that to admit such persons within the Church, was to repeal the decree of God, which

excluded schisms and heresies, as works of the flesh, from his kingdom.

The authority of the early fathers on this subject was exhibited to them; of Augustin, Ep. 109 ad Felic: who says, "God commanded to us union; to himself he reserved separation." "Do they," the Schismatics, says St. Cyprian, de Unit. Eccles: "do they imagine that Christ is with them when they are gathered together outside the Church;" from such persons though they were killed in the confession of his (Christ's) name, that stain is not washed away, even by their blood, whereas the great and unpardonable sin of discord, will not be expiated, even by the suffering of death. "He cannot be a martyr, who is not in the Church." "The sacrilege of schism, says Augustin, Lib. 1, contra Ep. Parm: cap. 3, which surpasses all crimes, &c." and again, contra Donat: Lib. 1, ch. 8, "those whom they (the Donatists) baptize, they heal of the wound of idolatry or infidelity, but they strike them with the *deeper* wound of schism"—they have not the charity of God, who do not love the unity of the Church, Lib. 3, cap. 16.

The Sectaries, appalled at the contemplation of those truths, and of their own crimes, sought for refuge in a new theory. They said to the Catholics, you upbraid us unjustly with a desire of dissolving the body of Christ, and including within the Church, all sects and heresies; we seek only to justify those who believe in the divinity of Christ, we acknowledge that such as do not hold this tenet, are the sons of perdition.

Vain subterfuge, replied the Catholic, by which you seek to escape the guilt of schism, and the condemnation

of it by the Lord and his apostle. It is not of this error or that blasphemy, of this schism or that other revolt, that we have been treating, we have directed your attention to the guilt of breaking unity, a crime, as Augustin observes, which no necessity can justify. We charged you with separating the members of the body of Christ, of setting up altar against altar, of violating charity, which is the bond of perfection. We charged you with *separating yourselves*, with disobeying the Church which God commanded you to hear, with despising the ministry, and through them despising Christ and the Father who sent him. You speak of the divinity of our Lord—of essential and not essential truths; we speak of unity and peace; these you have violated, whilst every page of the Scriptures to which you appeal commands them, and commands them as the primary, the essential virtues to be observed by every child of God. Where do you find from the beginning, either in the Revelation given to us, or in the Canons, Decrees, or conduct of our Fathers, any such distinction as you would now introduce? Where is it written that one doctrine is essential and that another is not? By what authority have you drawn a line of demarcation between one object of faith and another, or why do you presume by your judgment, weak and fallible as it is, to prescribe articles of faith to the judgment of another, or to say to him “believe thus, or thou shalt be condemned.” Has not Peter affirmed the saying of an ancient prophet, “whosoever will call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved,” and Paul repeated it in his letters to the Romans? and if since the handwriting of the decree which was against us was taken down and fastened to the cross, any one should understand that saying in its utmost latitude, by what authority can you convince him of error, or oblige him to believe as

you do yourself? When the Redeemer says, "this is eternal life, that they know you, the only true God, and him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ," by what authority do you compel the judgment of any person to believe more than that there is a God, who will reward those who love him, and a Mediator between him and men, the man Christ Jesus? If Calvin, who almost lighted the pile which burned Servetus for following in his own footsteps, interpreted, as he did, the words of Christ, "I and the Father are one," to signify only a moral union of will and love between the Father and Son, and blamed the Nicene Fathers for understanding them otherwise;—if many of Calvin's followers understand the words of our Lord, "before Abraham was, I am" as a metaphorical expression, having reference to the decree of God, why, for what cause, or by what authority, do you condemn the Arian or Socinian or Unitarian, because they understand those texts and such others as prove the eternity and divinity of the Son of God, in a sense different from what you assign 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 an 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.

It is not so that we Catholics have learned Christ. With

us it is as the law and the prophets; it is *essential* in the first degree with us, that we love God, which the heretic, who separates himself, and resists the authority founded by Christ, does not; and that we love the brotherhood, which the schismatic does not; who, as Augustin observes, by an impious concision, or rending, breaks the bond of union, for the doing of which, there never can be a just necessity, *præscindendæ unitatis nulla potest esse justa necessitas*. It is this heresy, which consists not in the degree of error, but in a man choosing a religion or a religious opinion different from that which is held and professed by the Church, and maintaining such religion or opinion obstinately, and in defiance of her authority;—it is this heresy which is condemned in the Sacred Scriptures, and which the Church has always condemned: one error against faith may be more impious than another, but whatever its quality or malice may be, it is heresy to uphold it with obstinacy, as it is schism to separate from the unity of the Church for whatsoever cause.

And, upon this important subject, let us listen for a moment, not to the voice of our own passions, or speculations, or interests, but let us hear the voice of the Church herself, expressed by those pastors and doctors given by God for the building up of the body of Christ, that instructed by them we may all meet in the unity of faith—in charity. If they all consider under the name of “the Church,” not a congregation of all imaginable sects, but *one* only assembly or communion of Christians, outside of which, and not within, are placed all heretics and schismatics, then it will appear whether the new system of congregating heretics within the Church, a system more visionary than those of Malebranche or Berkely in Metaphysics, is to be admitted by Christians interested about their eternal Salvation.

And first, St. Irenæus, a man of the apostolic times, Lib. 3, cap. 3 & 4, adv. Her. after saying that the truth, which it is easy to find in the Church, is not to be sought for in the sects of heretics, and after stating that Marcion, who often came to the Church, was at length ejected from it, then mentions, that of this Church, the much calumniated Church of Rome was the centre, to which on account of her chief principality it was necessary that every Church, that is the faithful every where dispersed, should come in accord, *omnem convenire ecclesiam*. And why? not only on account of her preeminence, but also as the depository of the apostolic tradition or doctrine, for as he observes, Lib. 1, cap. 10, though in the world there are different tongues or languages, yet the virtue or truth of the tradition or doctrine is one and the same, nor do the Churches founded in Germany, nor in the West, nor the East, in Egypt, in Africa, nor in the centre of the world, think differently one from the other. Thus the unity of faith and communion with the Church of Rome were the touchstone of orthodoxy with Irenæus. So Tertullian, Lib. de Prescrip. cap. 4, says, "that every doctrine is to be considered false which does not agree with the Apostolic Churches," amongst which Churches he assigns the first place to that of Rome. This learned man knew nothing of our modern distinctions of essential, and non-essential doctrines. St. Clement of Alexandria, Lib. 7, Strom. says, "the Church is of one nature or kind, the which being one, heresies seek to divide her, but she being ancient and Catholic is *one* on account of the unity of her faith." *Propter unitatem fidei*. Origen on Job says, that "*all the sects and heresies*," he makes no distinction, "*fight against the Church*." St. Hilary, Lib. 7, de Trin. says precisely the same, but adds, that whilst they conquer each other they gain no advantage, whereas a victory if gained by any of them is the triumph of the Church;

for, whilst one heresy assails in another what the Church condemns, they prove our faith or doctrine in opposing one another." It would appear that he described the contentions of the Lutherans and Calvinists with respect to the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, or the essay of Bishop Bull, of Oxford, arguing against the Socinians.

St. Jerome. Dial. cont. Lucif. calls the different sects of Marcionites, Valentinians, Montanists, Novatians (whose errors were as different as their names,) not the Church of Christ, but the synagogue of Antichrist. Such is the doctrine which prevails universally amongst the ancient doctors of the Church on this subject. To quote St. Augustin fully it would be necessary to transcribe his entire work on the unity of the Church, as well as his several books against the Donatists: suffice it to say, that with him a unity of belief, or the same faith, and a participation of the same Sacraments, are essentially requisite to constitute any person a member of God's Church, and that all sects and heresies, without distinction, condemned by her are condemned by God himself.

Then, as to the doctrine maintained on this subject by the several Councils from the earliest age:—that of Nice, in the formula of faith or creed which it published, uses the word Church in the same sense as Catholics still do, that is, as comprising persons of the same communion only, and excluding all sects, whatever may be their errors. This Council anathematizes or excludes from the Catholic and Apostolic Church all those who do not believe that the Son is of the same substance with the Father; and, again, in its 8th Canon, where it treats of the *Novatians wishing to return to the Catholic Church*, it considers them as excluded from it, for otherwise how could they return to it?

Again, the first Council of Constantinople, held shortly afterwards, cap. 7, after prescribing the mode according to which the Arians, the Macedonians, the Sabbatists, the Novations, the Quartodecimans, the Apollinarists were to be admitted to the communion of the Catholic Church, it requires that they sign a *written profession* of faith, wherein, amongst other things, they declare that they *anathematize every heresy which dissents from the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of God.*

The Council of Sardis, held in this age, in the letter preserved by St. Athanasius in his 2d Apology, which the Fathers addressed to all the Bishops of the world, considers the separation from the Church the same as an exclusion from the Christian name or profession. St. Celestin in his letter to Nestorius, referred to in the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, admonishes that Heresiarch that he would be separated from the communion of the Catholic and Universal Church, if he did not embrace the doctrine taught in the Churches of Alexandria and Rome. So the African Bishops in the case of Seporius, tom. 2, conc. p. 1683, require of him as the condition of his pardon, that he profess to receive and hold what the *Ordo Ecclesiæ*, the ministry or rule of the Church received and held. But perhaps the most explicit declaration of the sense of antiquity on this subject is the following, found in the 6th Canon of that Council of Constantinople before mentioned, and which designates as heretics, all “who are cast out and anathematized by the Church, and who, pretending to profess the sound faith, are torn off and separated, and hold assemblies in opposition to the canonical bishops.”

Now those doctors of antiquity, those councils to which I have referred, wrote or published what is cited from

them about three or four hundred years after the birth of Christ, a period of time little more than equal to that which has elapsed since the defection of what Lubnitz calls the Slavonic nations from the Latin Church. Could they have mistaken the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, or the sense in which the writings of the latter, and the church discipline, established by them, were understood? was such ignorance or error on their part possible, leaving out of consideration all special aid from God? But before we answer this question to our own consciences, let us consider that these bishops and writers were men of great learning, of unimpeachable virtue, conversant practically with what they wrote, and living in times which may justly be called enlightened. Let us, to assist our judgment, take a parallel case:—suppose the bishops of Italy, Spain, France, Germany, England, and Ireland, together with the most learned and distinguished ecclesiastics and civilians to be found in those countries, were now, whether dispersed or collected together, called upon to testify as to the faith and church discipline of their respective countries in the time of Philip the Fifth, Francis the First, Leo the Tenth, and Henry the Eighth, would it be possible that they could not so testify it to the satisfaction of every unbiassed mind? and if they could, no reason can be assigned why the doctors and pastors whom I have quoted should not afford equal satisfaction to every candid inquirer as to the Christian doctrine in the days of the Apostles. They should also *necessarily* testify what the universal sentiment and belief of the Christian world was in their own time, as to the unity of the Church, and the description of persons who were supposed to belong to it. I, therefore, refer with the utmost confidence to every sensible man, the evidence which I have adduced, and if it be found compatible with the amalgamation of all sects and heresies, or with

the commixture of such of them as believe the divinity of Christ, whatever their notions upon other points of doctrine may be, then do I willingly resign all my notions of church unity, as well as of the nature of heresy and schism. Jurieu pressed by this evidence could not withstand it; he would not, however, yield his assent, such are the effects of human pride, but in the perverseness of his senseless obstinacy exclaimed, that all antiquity had erred on this point. It is, however, too obvious, that to condemn, as guilty of error, all antiquity, including the earliest times, is to arraign the Apostles and Christ himself; it is to say that the Church never had been founded, or, that founded, she had passed away like a shadow.

But again, why should we condemn those who deny the divinity of the Son of God more than any others, who, following their own judgment, are led into error? Are not many of our modern Arians and Socinians learned and honest men? are they not sincere in their searches after truth? far be it from me to say they are not; and whilst I consider their error as heresy, God forbid that I should judge between them and their Creator. He made them for himself, and I hope and pray that from amongst them he may, by the infusion of his light and love, save many. It was only of Judas, that treacherous, cruel, avaricious wretch, that the Lord said, "it would be better for him he had not been born," and in his mercy he has told us that a sin against himself would be forgiven, but that he who sinned against the Holy Ghost—he who despaired of mercy—who assigned the works of God to Satan, or wilfully opposed the known truth (for such the ancients considered sins against the holy Ghost,) would not be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the next. It is difficult to determine whether the sins in which the understanding of man,

clouded with ignorance on account of Adam's fall, is chiefly concerned, or those in which the *will*, infected from the same source with passion, acts most prominently; be the more grievous; but, without doubt, whether we attend to the catalogue of vices which the Apostle enumerates as excluding from the kingdom of God, or to the sentence to be pronounced by the Lord himself upon the just and the reprobate on the last day, we are induced to think, that though without a right faith it is impossible to please God, yet that they are the sins which proceed from the heart or will, rather than those which emanate principally from the mind which will fix the eternal fate of man. It was a question 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 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 mistake for faith, break down all the charities of human life, sow dissensions amongst brethren, and forget totally the divine command of doing to others what they would that others should do unto 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 that 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 would 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 to beseech men in all patience and doctrine to adhere to truth and virtue, and 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 mens 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 those sentiments. They are the dictates 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.

But the observations hitherto made on the unity of the Church, and the criterion by which she always regulated admission to her communion naturally suggests the following inquiry:—how was this unity of faith so strict and rigorous in its nature, preserved amongst so many nations as composed at all times the Catholic Church? To answer this inquiry we must travel once more over the same ground through which we have already passed. We must revert to the constitution of the Church, to its order and government as presented to us in the Gospel, in the acts and letters of the Apostles, in the councils of the primitive times, and in the writings of those early pastors and doctors whom Christ gave to his people.

The Redeemer himself established a conserving principle of unity, without which it could not have continued, and he did so by appointing Peter the chief, or supreme head on earth of the whole Church, and by continuing to his successors this singular and necessary privilege. This supremacy and the cause of its creation are beautifully expressed by St. Jerome, when he says *inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut, Capite constituto, Schismatis tollatur occasio*—from amongst the twelve one is chosen, that a head being appointed the occasion of schism might be taken away." Yet, notwithstanding this supremacy, Paul says "here-

sies must be"—*oportet hereses esse*, but without it, considering the jealousies, the piques, the interests, the passions of nations and individuals, it would be totally impossible to preserve even a semblance of unity throughout the vast empire of Christ; for men are by nature so fond of novelty, that even admitting the influence of divine grace, they require the strong bond of authority to keep them united. But let us briefly examine the origin and nature of this supremacy as it is testified to us by the Scriptures and antiquity. In the 16th chapter of the gospel according to St. Matthew, a profession of his faith in the divinity and mission of our Lord is related, as made by Peter, saying, thou art the Christ or the Messias promised to us, the Son of the living God. In reply, the Christ assures him that his faith was not the fruit of earthly wisdom but of divine grace, imparted to him by the Father of Mercies; and the Redeemer finding him as it were thus selected and gifted by Almighty God, adds to this first grace a new one, not of election to the faith or to the apostleship, which had been given to him, but the grace or gift of election to the place of head or chief of that society, or kingdom, or church, which after his own ascension and the descent of the Holy Ghost, was to be founded by him on the earth. "The Father has selected you." We may suppose the Redeemer to address him thus:—"above all others, not only to believe in your heart to your justification, but also to profess your belief openly with your tongue, and in addition to this gift of the Father, who has drawn you to me, I, the Son, who do all things that he doth, say to you, thou art a rock—strong and immovable in your faith, and upon this rock, that is, upon you professing this faith which my Father has inspired into you, I will build my Church: you shall, after myself, and when I will have ascended to my Father and to your Father, to my God

and to your God, be made the foundation, the corner stone, the firm and lasting support of that Church, which through your ministry and that of your colleagues, the apostles and prophets, the pastors and doctors who will be given to labour with you, (I myself being the chief builder, the sovereign head and immovable foundation), shall be established by me upon the earth. Against this Church which I will raise on you, the gates or force of hell shall not prevail; fear not, even hell, for I will conquer the prince of this world and cast him out. He will indeed seek to grind you all like wheat, and notwithstanding my grace, he will prevail over many of your colleagues; but Simon, Simon, I have prayed for you, that though you be shaken for a moment, that though your passions or infirmity become the allies of Satan, and cast you down from your steadfastness, yet fear not, I have prayed for you, that thy faith, imparted to you by a special privilege of God, fail not; be sober and watch, be careful that recovering from your weakness and resuming your former station, you confirm your brethren who may waver in the faith."

I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, under which name I have, as you know, so often designated my future Church, and as keys are the symbol of power, the mark of rightful possession, and the emblem of chief authority, I shall give to you, with them, this power, this possession, this authority; you shall hold them for ever undisputed and undivided in my kingdom, which is the Church. All other power, all other authority which I may impart to your colleagues shall be subordinate to yours, that all things in my peaceful kingdom may be done according to order. You are the foundation, and to you the keys are given, the chief, the prince whom all my subjects will be found to reverence

and obey. Whatever you bind, whilst justly executing my law in the city of God, over which you are to be placed, shall be bound in heaven by my Father and by me, and whatever you loose on earth, in the just exercise of your power shall be loosed also by us in heaven. This prerogative or principality which was thus promised by the Son of God to Peter as to the head of the Church, representing her unity in the singleness of his own person, as St. Augustin well observes, was afterwards imparted to him, when, after the resurrection of our Redeemer, his charity was proved like as his faith had been, and, being found full, was rewarded with the entire confidence of his Divine Master, and the communication of that unequalled power which had been promised to him. But let us cite the entire passage from the 21st chapter of St. John:—"So when they had dined, Jesus said to Simon Peter, Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these? he saith to him, yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him, feed my lambs. He saith to him again, Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? He saith to him, yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him; feed my lambs. He saith to him the third time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because he said to him the third time, lovest thou me? and he said to him, Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee. He said to him, feed my sheep." Christ then foretells to him his future martyrdom, and by what manner of death he was to glorify God, and with the recital of these things the Evangelist closes his gospel.

To a candid man it should be unnecessary to argue upon those passages of the divine revelation. How can it be necessary to observe to a reasonable and unprejudiced mind, that the selection of Peter, the promise

made to him, and the fulfilment of that promise by Christ, are distinct from every thing else narrated by the evangelists? I am at a loss to conceive how it ever was denied that Peter was selected by Christ, as the chief of the future Church, vested with a singular and preeminent power for its benefit, and charged with a sovereign care of all its members. When Christ, in the 18th chapter of St. Matthew, orders the erring christian to be reproved, and if found obstinate, denounced to the Church, he promises to each and all the apostles, that whatever they would bind on earth would be bound in heaven, and whatsoever they would loose on earth would be also loosed in heaven, and thus gives to them a promise of that apostolic authority, without which they would not be rulers of the Church in their own right and by divine appointment, but mere subalterns or deputies of Peter. But he does not promise to them, as he did to him, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the emblem of supreme authority, and the type of universal jurisdiction; he did not pray for them singly, and as he did for Peter; he did not charge any of them with the duty of confirming their brethren, though they should all reprove each other when necessary; but above all he did not say to any one, or to all of them, "feed my lambs," and a second time, "feed my lambs," and a third time, "feed my sheep," the entire fold which I will gather from the nations. All his gifts are without repentance; that is, when bestowed he does not withdraw them, unless we cast them away, and such gifts as he imparted for the sake of his Church, which he espoused to himself by an everlasting covenant—which he washed in his own blood—which he loves as being bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh, and which he will preserve in his love until he presents her without spot or wrinkle before the face of his Father; whatever gifts or graces he imparted on account of this Church to

Peter or to his apostles as necessary for her are truly without repentance, he never will, he never can withdraw them.

If, therefore, in the 16th of Matthew, he promised to Peter any privilege connected with the foundation and preservation of this Church, it must continue, and be always distinct from the power and privileges granted in common to the apostles. He promised to them all united a power to rule the Church, and to this day we say in the language of St. Cyprian, *Episcopatus unus est cujus in solidum pars a singulis tenetur*—"the episcopacy is one, a portion of the entire of which is held by each bishop;" but how does this interfere with the supremacy of the head, or rather how could it exist in order, or be carried on without that supremacy? he sent them all to teach and to baptize all nations, and to command those nations to observe what he had given in command for them, to be published by the Apostles. But how does this interfere with the prerogative of Peter, which keeps the teachers themselves firm in the faith, zealous and correct in their labours, uniform in their doctrine, so that they all say the same thing, and that there be no schisms among them? or rather how could those advantages be, by any possibility, secured if Peter's jurisdiction were not universal and supreme? He made them all partakers of his own priesthood, saying to them, "do this in commemoration of me;" he imparted to them all the Holy Spirit, when having breathed on them, he said, "receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosoever sins you shall forgive they are forgiven, and whosoever sins you shall retain they are retained;" but how do these exalted and superhuman powers interfere with the charge of Peter to feed the lambs, and feed the sheep of the great bishop of our souls? No, I say confidently, it is impossible that an intelligent and honest

man, who searches for truth as he seeks for gold, and who cooperating faithfully with the grace of God, esteems all things as dung that he may gain Christ, would seriously deny the spiritual prerogative and special jurisdiction of St. Peter. The disciples and evangelists all recognised them; they name Peter the first, the *πρωτος*, or as it might justly be translated the primate, "they present" him as the first of the disciples, to whom our Lord after his resurrection appeared—the first who after the descent of the Holy Ghost preached the gospel—underwent persecution for the faith—who first experienced the divine protection when in prison—the first who wrought miracles in the name of Jesus—who founded the Church amongst the seed of Abraham—who confirmed the converts made by others—who was first commissioned to call the Gentiles in the person of Cornelius to the faith; it was he, who having founded the Church at Jerusalem, established it next at Antioch, and afterwards passing to Rome, the Babylon of the world in that age, laid the foundation of that Church to which perfidy or apostacy, as Cyprian has observed, never had access, and whose faith, even in Paul's time, as in our own, was spoken of and increased throughout the entire world. It was Peter, who by the hand of Mark, sowed the gospel seed at Alexandria, and thus establishing the four great Patriarchates which embraced the Christian world, verified even in his own person, and in his own day, the promise of his master, saying, "thou art a rock, and upon this rock I will build my Church." Why, after witnessing, those things should we refer to his acting at all times and places, whether in the temple, before the sanhedrim, at the election of an apostle or of deacons, or at the council in Jerusalem, as the head, the chief, the mouthpiece, to use a term of St. Chrysostom, of the apostles?

But, it will be said that certain doctors of antiquity understood the text: Simon, son of Jona, "thou art a rock, and upon this rock I will build my Church;" as if the Lord had said, "thou art a rock, and upon this faith in my divinity professed by thee, I will build my Church," and I have no objection whatever to such mystical and edifying exposition of the text, provided that no person be so senseless, whilst he admits this signification, as to exclude the other, which is plain, natural, and obvious, for I scarcely know a text of Scripture which commentators have not explained in a mystical or metaphorical, as well as a natural and obvious sense. All I require is, that when one signification is set forth, it be not supposed that the other is excluded; for my part, I see nothing more obvious than that Christ contemplated Peter as inspired by his Heavenly Father with a pure and lively faith, and that contemplating the man filled with this faith and professing it, he immediately selected him to be the head and chief of his Church or Kingdom. How justly, with such a view of the question, would any person commenting on the passage, treat, indifferently of the faith professed, or of the person professing that faith, and assign to either, without excluding the other, whereas both were indivisibly conjoined, the promise of Christ? But that Peter was the living acting subject to whom the promise was directed, and on whom the benediction fell, no man in his senses should deny. I find St. Hilary, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Augustin, to treat this question as I have just set it forth; at one time representing Christ as contemplating Peter, at another as contemplating the faith which he professed, or admitting that either may be understood, whilst the greater number of the fathers confine themselves to the natural, obvious, and plain signification of that portion of the text.

But where 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.

Origen, Hom. 2. de die., calls St. Peter the supreme head or summit of the apostles ; and, commenting on the 6th of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans, says, that " the sovereign care of feeding the sheep was given to Peter, and that upon him, as upon a rock, the Church was founded." Eusebius, hist. lib. 2, cap. 14, calls Peter " the most powerful and greatest among the apostles, and on account of his virtue, the prince and protector of all the others." St. Cyril of Jerusalem, catech. 2 and 11, designates him as " prince and chief ;" S. Basil Proœmio de jud. dei., says. " that blessed Peter, preferred to all the apostles, to whom singly greater testimonies or assurances were given than to any other ; he who was called *blessed*, to whom the keys of the heavens were entrusted." St. Greg. Naz. orat. 26, showing there that in disputations order is to be observed by all, takes an argument to prove that position from the apostles, who though all great, yet had one placed over the others : " see," he observes, " how from among the disciples of Christ, all, without doubt, great and excellent and worthy of election, one is called a rock, and received the foundation or chief place of the Church ; another is peculiarly beloved, and reclines on

the bosom of Jesus, and the other disciples, without murmuring, see them thus preferred."

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, lib. 12, in Joh. speaking of Peter, says, "he appears eminent above the others, he the head and prince of them." St. Chrysostom, hom. 5, in Math. hom. 87, in Joh. and hom. 3, in acta app., as also orat. 8, in jud. employs the following language to designate the supremacy of Peter, or his superiority as compared with the other apostles:—"a man ignoble and a fisherman, is the head and pastor of the Church, the mouth or tongue, the prince and supreme head of the apostles; the prince of the apostolic band, who every where, and first of all, begins to speak; Peter so washed away that denial (of his master) that he even was made or constituted the first or chief of the apostles."

These are the sentiments of the ancient Greek Church, expressed through her doctors. Let the Latin Church now profess her doctrine:—

Tertullian de prescript. cap. 22, refuting those heretics who charged the apostles with ignorance or negligence, says: "Was Peter then ignorant of something? he who was called the rock on which the Church was to be built, and who obtained the keys of the kingdom of heaven." He repeats in various forms, and in different parts of his works, that Peter represented the Church, and that what the Lord conceded to her, he conceded it through Peter. St. Cyprian, ep. 55, says: "Peter, on whom this same Church was founded by the Lord, speaking alone for all, and answering in the name of the Church;" and ep. 71, this father showing the moderation with which persons the most exalted should use authority, observes, that when Peter was reproved by Paul, "he did not insolently

and arrogantly assume any thing, or appeal to his primacy, or complain, saying, that obedience, not reproof, was due to him by new people, and those who came after him," as Paul did. It is thus that Cyprian inculcates the necessity of feeding the flock of God, not by violence, but freely, not as lording it over God's inheritance, but with good will, whilst he admits the authority which might have been abused. But in his book on the unity of the Church, not far from the beginning, where he touches this matter, not indirectly, but treats of it expressly, his sentiments are more clear and full. "On him (Peter) alone," he says, "Christ built his Church, and to him he committed his sheep to be fed, and though after his resurrection he bestowed an equal authority on all the apostles, and said, "as my Father sent me so I send you; receive ye the Holy Ghost, &c., yet to render unity manifest, he instituted one chair, and regulated by his own authority the source of that same unity, taking its rise from ONE.* Thus Cyprian accurately defines that

* There is a passage in the above quotation from St. Cyprian which I omitted, in order to avoid cavil, though my own opinion is that the passage is genuine—*exordium ab unitate proficiscitur et Primatus Petro datur*. "The beginning (of the apostolic authority) proceeds from unity and the primacy is given to Peter."

Rigault, as also Doctor Fell, in his edition of Cyprian's works, reject the above passage as not found in the editions of Spire, or admitted by Rembold, by Erasmus, Gryphius, Gravius, and some others, and as wanted in many manuscript copies. But the passage is found in many and most ancient manuscript copies, as in that of the Vatican referred to by Manutius, that mentioned by Onuphrius Panvinus in his treatise *de Primatu Petri*, in that of Cambray, in a second of the Vatican, in that of St. Saviours at Bologna, in four in England, mentioned by Fell; besides that it was quoted in the sixth century by Marcellus the Second, writing to the bishops of Istria; in fine, in place of being a tautology, if admitted, as Rigault thinks, it accords perfectly with

apostolic power, one and indivisible in its nature, equal in each, and first given to the college of the apostles, and still continued to the unbroken and undivided body of the episcopacy, whilst with equal accuracy he marks the primacy of Peter, and points out the end, to wit, the preservation of unity, for which it had been instituted by the authority of Christ himself.

S. Optatus, lib. 2, contra Parmens, says to his opponent, "you cannot deny what you know, that the episcopal chair (signifying here, as in all places, doctrine and authority,) was first fixed in the city of Rome by Peter, in which Peter himself, the head of all the apostles, sat, whence (that is from his headship,) also he was called Caephas; in which one chair unity would be preserved by all, that each of the other apostles might not claim one for himself—*ne ceteri apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent*, and so become a schismatic and a sinner, who, against the *one* chair, would set up another." St. Ambrose, in cap. 12, Ep. 2, ad Cor. says briefly, but forcibly, "it was not Andrew, (he was the eldest), but Peter, who received the primacy."

St. Augustin, lib. 2, de Bapt. cap. 1, says of Peter, "in whom the primacy among the apostles is seen exalted by so excellent a grace." He repeatedly observes, that "Peter, on account of his primacy, represented the Church." In his thirteenth sermon, *de verbis domini*, he says "Peter was first in the rank of the apostles:" "he

the style and manner of Cyprian, as well as with his doctrine throughout that entire book, as when he says, "that on Peter alone the Church was built," that one chair was appointed," and that "unity had its origin from one," that is from Peter, &c. &c.

was the type of the *one* Church;" "he alone answered for all;" "he was named Peter from a rock;" "he represented the Church;" "he bore the primacy of the apostolic office."

St. Leo, ser. 3, de assump. sua ad Pontif. says, "Peter is elected alone from the entire world; he is preferred to all the nations—to all the apostles—to all the fathers of the Church, so that though there be many priests among the people of God, yet they are immediately ruled by Peter, he being principally ruled also by Christ."

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. The austere virtues of the gospel, such as continency, chastity, fasting, watching, prayer, repentance, joined to external mortification, which virtues were religion's best support, have long since been discarded from amongst the pious practices of a christian life, and descending gradually from one abyss to another, men now adapt their religious theories to the taste of the age, as Sheridan or Molière did their comedies. 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 prophesy is required to foresee how lamentable are the results which press upon us. To bring back 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, shows 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 super-structure 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 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 fanatic cried out to the agents of the law and of 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 honor 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 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 amphyctionic 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 show 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 re-proved—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 preeminence asserted by him, and for him, and admitted with acclamation by all the orthodox, whether in council or dispersed, and never disputed unless 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 decide 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 dependance, the well regulated obedience, the singleness of faith, the uniformity of discipline, the brotherhood 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. The second schism at Antioch, in the time of Clement, the heresy of Paul of

Somosata in the East, the errors of the Montanists in Africa, the question of the day on which the christian passover should be celebrated, the other relating to the validity of baptism when administered by heretics or persons not within the Church, each of these subjects excited the zeal, or called forth the exercise of the authority vested in the bishop of Rome as successor of St. Peter: but it was not until the persecution ceased, and that the Arian controversy troubled the Church, that this authority became unshackled and conspicuous. Pope Sylvester, who, as Eusebius mentions, was too enfeebled by age to leave his See, sent his legates to preside at the councils held at Arles, at Alexandria, &c. but particularly at the great, and always to be celebrated, general council of Nice.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine what number of canons were enacted at this council; in the sixth, however, which is quoted in the 16th action of the council of Chalcedon, either the words of the canon or of the title of the canon are "*Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum*—"the Roman Church always possessed the primacy;" and then the canon proceeds to recite and settle the other patriarchal churches with their dependencies. Volumes have been written to prove that the above words were, or were not, a part of the canon, yet the question, in truth, did not deserve more than the attention of critics or antiquarians, who love to dispute about manuscripts rather than about what they record. Pope Nicholas the First, writing to the Emperor Michael, lit. 8, explains the truth as to the meaning of this short sentence wheresoever it might have been originally placed: he says, "if the decrees of the Nicene synod be carefully examined, truly it will be found how that synod conferred no increase (of jurisdiction or authority), on

the Roman Church, but rather took an example from its form or its custom as to what it (the council) assigned specially to the church of Alexandria." The Pope not only asserts the prerogative of his See, as established anteriorly to any council, but he also shows that the council of Nice, in giving the second place to the See of Alexandria among the patriarchal churches, only copied and confirmed that usage or regulation of order amongst them, which the See of Rome had previously made.

The council of Constantinople, held in the same century, whilst it seeks to change the order of precedence among the patriarchal churches, leaves untouched, and formally recognises the undisputed prerogative of Rome: this council says, "let the bishop of Constantinople have the honor of primacy after the bishop of Rome." So does the council of Aquileia, in the same century. And now we come to the two great councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon in the following century, which not only show the primacy of the See of Rome, but also the *cause, the origin, the source* of that primacy; that it was not an appendage derived from the imperial city, as some innovators would pretend, but a real and divine prerogative, derived from Christ, through St. Peter, the founder of that See.

At the opening of the council of Ephesus, or in the first session, sentence of deposition was passed against Nestorius, in the following terms:—"compelled by the sacred canons, and by the letter of our most holy father and fellow minister, Celestin, bishop of the Roman Church, and shedding tears, we necessarily have come to this decision against him (Nestorius)." In the letter here referred to, and produced at length in the second Action or Session, Celestin states: "We have directed, according to our solicitude, our brothers and fellow

priests, most approved men, and of one mind with us, to wit, Arcadius and Projectus, bishops, and Philip our priest, to be present at the proceedings, and to carry into effect what has been already decreed by us." The matter decreed by the Pope, and mentioned here, was the deposition of Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, if he did not, within ten days from the notification of the papal decree, abjure his error, and promise thereafter to preach the faith of the Catholic Church. The Pope further commissions St. Cyril of Alexandria, to whom this decree was entrusted for execution, to provide a successor to Nestorius, in the church of C. P., if that Heresiarch continued obstinate.

In this same session, we find the legate, Philip, above mentioned, shewing cause why his master exercised so high a jurisdiction. He required that the proceedings of the synod, had, previous to the arrival of the legates, should be submitted anew to himself and colleagues, and in doing so, uses the following words:—"Your Holiness is aware that the blessed Peter is the head of the entire faith (or Church) or even of the Apostles, *wherefore*, we pray that you expose to us whatever was done in this holy synod, previous to our arrival, that we also confirm the proceedings, agreeably to the judgment of our holy Pope, and of this present assembly."

In the third session, this same legate, again urges the authority of the Pope, as derived from St. Peter; his words are: "*It is undoubted, nay, it is known to all ages*, that the holy and most blessed Peter, prince and head of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith, and the foundation of the Catholic Church, received from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of man, the keys of the kingdom, and that the power of binding

and of loosing was given to him, who still lives, and exercises judgment *to the present time, and at all times, in his successors.*"

It is not surprising, then, that the fathers of this council with one voice, when passing sentence on the unhappy Nestorius, cried out, "compelled by the sacred canons, and by the letter of our most holy father, Celestin, bishop of the Roman Church, we suffused in tears, have necessarily come to this melancholy judgment against him." Nor can any person reading those proceedings, doubt but the faith of the council of Ephesus, respecting the papal jurisdiction, was the same as ours at the present day;—that the decree of Celestin directed to one patriarch, to be put into execution against another, and he, the bishop of New Rome, was an act of authority as high and as strong as could well be exercised;—that the recognition of this authority by one of the greatest and most revered councils ever held in the Church, was most explicit, and that the ground upon which this authority, as well as all the proceedings of the Pope's legates in the council, rested, was expressly stated to be the authority given by Christ to Peter, and transmitted to his successors.

But the acts of the council of Chalcedon, held in 451, are yet to be examined.

At the opening of this council, Paschasinus, one of the legates, thus addresses the fathers assembled:—"We hold in our hands the commands of the most blessed and apostolic man, the Pope of the city of Rome, which is the head of all the churches, by which his apostleship hath vouchsafed to command that Dioscorus (the patriarch of Alexandria,) should not take his seat in the council, but be introduced for the purpose of being heard. It is

necessary to observe either let him withdraw or we shall depart." Lucentius, the vicar of the apostolic see, said "he (Dioscorus) must necessarily shew cause why he judged, whereas when he had not a right to judge, he presumed to do so, and dared to hold a council without the authority of the apostolic see, which was never lawful—which never has been done."

In the second session, the letter of S. Leo Pope was read, and according to the acts of the council, "the most reverend bishops cried out, this is the faith of the fathers; this the faith of the Apostles, we all believe thus, so the orthodox believe; whosoever does not believe so, let him be anathema, *Peter hath spoken by Leo*; so the Apostles taught."

In the third session, Paschasinus and the other legates said, "Leo, the most holy, and most blessed bishop of the great and older Rome, by us, and by the present holy synod, together with the most blessed, and always most praise-worthy Peter the Apostle, who is the rock and the oracle of the Catholic Church, and the foundation of the true faith, hath stripped him (Dioscorus) of the dignity of the episcopacy, and excluded him from all sacerdotal functions."

In the fourth session, all the most reverend bishops cried out, "why do not they (the Egyptian bishops,) anathematize the Dogma of Eutyches? let them subscribe to the letter of Leo, anathematizing Eutyches and his opinions."

In the fifth session, when some partizans of Eutyches had created a faction in the city, and hesitated to subscribe to his condemnation, the legates use the following lan-

guage, "they who oppose and do not subscribe, let them walk away (or to Rome) whereas we have consented to the decrees, and have not in any thing opposed them. And the most reverend Bishops of Illyricum said, they who contradict, let them appear openly; they who do so, let them go to Rome."

When the council had terminated its labours, and it had been declared, among other things, that *all primacy* and chief honor belonged to the bishop of Rome, the fathers entreat of Pope Leo, in the following words, to confirm and perfect their proceedings by his decree and consent, "we pray you (Leo) therefore, that you honor our judgment by your decrees, and as we have agreed with our head in what was good, so in like manner let your supremacy complete for your children what is becoming, *sic et summitas tua filiis quod decet adimpleat.*"

I have selected those 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 more closely still 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, through 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 occasion 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. Ireneus, Dennis of Alexandria, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, of Throderet, all Greeks :—and of the Latins, Tertullian, SS. Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Optatus, Augustin, Fulgent ; of Vincent of Lerins, and the others up to St. Bernard inclusive, may be read, in any of our books of theoloy ; 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 Irenæus, all the faithful, wheresoever dispersed, should come in christian harmony and with one accord. Nor can we more appropriately

conclude those 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, observes, “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 foundation of religion and truth.’* 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, loose the anchor of 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.’† 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 Dominis*, whilst they all rejected what the Lord had said. He foresaw that these sects, turbulent and licentious, known, and scarcely known, by

* John, ch. 14. v. 16, 17. Matth. 16. v. 18. 1 Tim. ch. 3. v. 15.

† Ez. ch. 13. v. 6.

the names of their founders, would break the unity of his mystic body, which is the Church, and 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 the faithful, whilst the Holy Ghost dictated her decision; 'it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.' *

"Where can this Church be found, if it be not she 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!

* Acts, ch. 15. v. 8.

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

“ In this Church, dearly beloved brethern, 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.* 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 steadfastness, be constant in the faith ; repel with meekness, but with the zeal of God, all the assaults of those who 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.* 1 Cor. ch. 16. v. 13.”

* Luc. 10. v. 16.

We have at length come to "The Charge." I shall break it up into propositions and refute them as I proceed. The order of my proceeding will not be exactly the same as that adopted by the Archbishop. I shall commence with those propositions of his Grace which are seemingly most important; the first of which is,

"The doctrine of Infallibility shuts out doubt and extinguishes enquiry."

This proposition is not true in the sense in which it is announced. The doctrine of Infallibility does shut out doubt, but not until due investigation and enquiry have been made; then it shuts out doubt, and so it ought, for otherwise, the faithful, *tossed about by every wind of doctrine*, would never, all of them, *say the same thing*. *There would be schisms among them*, contrary to the command of the Apostle. If doubt were not excluded, the belief of the Christian would not be immoveable as it ought to be, nor would faith be, as St. Paul defines it, *the foundation or substance of things hoped for*—the argument—the proof—the immoveable certainty of those things which do not appear. When the Apostles assembled at Jerusalem, issued their decree respecting the non-necessity of the Jewish rites, and did so, saying, "it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us" were not doubts excluded? even the Archbishop will admit that they were, or should have been, yet the same text informs us, that this decision was not come to until after "a great enquiry had been made." Hence, it appears clearly, and by a precedent not to be questioned, that there may be an infallible tribunal—a tribunal whose decision excludes all doubt, and yet the decision be perfectly compatible, not only with enquiry, but with "great enquiry."

The question here is not whether the successors of the Apostles enjoy a power to judge in matters disputed on in the Church, as their predecessors did; we do not here enquire, whether those pastors whom the Holy Ghost appointed and appoints to rule the Church—to keep the people from being tossed about by every wind of doctrine—the victims of that cunning craftiness which lies in wait to deceive them,—we do not now examine whether Christ be with those pastors, teaching till the end of the world, or whether the Holy Ghost abides with them when they vindicate the truth, and eject the obstinate sinner from the Church; no, the only enquiry which “the Charge” forces upon us is, whether there can be an infallible tribunal, whether such tribunal ought, or ought not, to “shut out doubt,” and whether the shutting out of doubt by a regular decision, “extinguishes all enquiry.” This is the question; and, in reply, a case is made out, in which, even Doctor Magee will admit, that Infallibility and enquiry are found united.

There can be no peace in any community, no order preserved in any church or state, unless there be tribunals established to which existing differences may be referred for decision; and if those differences relate to the truths which compose the Christian religion, it is quite impossible to put an end to them, or quiet the minds of the disputants, unless the decision be exempt from error. Faith is not faith if the believers hesitate in doubt, for he who doubts is already an unbeliever. It therefore, obviously and necessarily follows, that if God willed that we should believe what he has revealed, he should either reveal his will so clearly, as that no doubts could arise with regard to its meaning, which he has not done; or he should only require of us to adopt such meaning of it as appeared to us most probable—a supposition incompatible with the

nature of faith; or, lastly, he should give us a tribunal authorised to decide—so as not only to put an end to disputes and preserve order in the Church, but also which, by its decision, would exclude all doubt, *whereas doubt cannot co-exist with faith*. The existence then of an infallible authority in the Church is not a matter of secondary import, or one on which different opinions may be entertained; it is so necessary, that without it, revelation being such as it is, the Church could not exist, nor faith continue on the earth. Without this authority, the Christian religion, from its very commencement, would have degenerated into a system of human philosophy, and private opinion would have taken the place of divine faith in the minds of men. This is the result of the rejection of Church authority throughout the Protestant Churches of France, Switzerland, Germany, Sweden, and Denmark. (See Appendix, No. I.)

It is most afflicting, therefore, to find a Christian bishop denounce to the world the great and only stay of Christianity as a supernatural religion, and appeal to the pride of the human heart, to the fondest and strongest prejudices of our nature, against the mysterious but wise economy of our faith. If the wisdom of this world were not folly with God, if he had not rejected the prudence of the prudent, and the wisdom of the wise, in order to save men by the folly of the cross, then it might be reasonable to appeal to human pride, to awake the passions, and rally them in opposition to the authority established by the Redeemer.

Who, says the writer of the Charge, will submit himself to authority? Let every creature, says St. Paul, be subject to the higher powers. Who, says this Archbishop, will relinquish the right of private judgment? The arms of our warfare, cries out an Apostle, are not carnal, but

powerful of God, unto the pulling down of every strong hold—destroying counsels and every heighth that exalteth itself agaidst the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every understanding to the obedience of Christ. Who, says his Grace of Dublin, will submit to the decisions of fallible men? “As my Father sent me, says Christ, so I send you; going, therefore, teach all nations, and lo, I am with you *all days*, even to the consummation of the world; whosoever hears you hears me, and whosoever despises you, despises me and the Father who sent me.”

Shall the high-minded and enlightened people of this country submit to the decrees of any Church, says this Christian prelate. If any one do not hear the Church says Christ, let him be to thee as an heathen and a publican, for that Church is founded on a rock; or, as St. Paul describes her, she is the pillar and immoveable ground or foundation of truth.

How can fallible men, exclaims the author of the Charge, arrogate to themselves the prerogative of infallibility. Fear not little flock, says Christ, because it hath pleased your Father to give to you a kingdom. I will send unto you the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, he will teach you all truth, and will suggest unto you all things whatsoever I will have said to you.

Follow our Church, says this Protestant bishop; and here we recognise the language of Manes, Valentinian, &c. as mentioned by Tertullian. But his Grace says, follow our Church, which leaves you at liberty to think on religion as you please, and speak as you think. Shun those, says an Apostle, who promise you liberty, but who are themselves the slaves of corruption. Choose your own religion, exclaims Doctor Magee. An heretical man,

or a chooser of his own religion, says St. Paul, after a first and second admonition, shun, knowing that such a man is subverted or cast down from the rock of faith, that he sins and is condemned by his own judgment. Who is the pope or council, exclaims this learned prelate, that we Protestants should regard them? "Know also, says St. Paul, that in the last days shall come on dangerous times—men shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, haughty, proud, blasphemers, without peace, slanderers, having an appearance of godliness, but denying the power thereof; now these avoid, as Jannes and Mambres resisted Moses, so these also resist the truth. Be mindful, says another Apostle, of the words which have been spoken before by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, who told you that in the last times, there should come mockers walking according to their own desires in ungodlines: THESE ARE THEY WHICH SEPARATE THEMSELVES. But you, my beloved, building yourselves upon your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, waiting for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto life everlasting." These latter words are the words constantly addressed to the Catholics of Ireland by their pastors.

These repeated appeals which I have noticed to the passions and pride of the world, are opposed to the spirit and essence of the Christian religion, every principle on which the author of them builds, is expressly denounced as vicious and antichristian by our Lord and his Apostles. He who employs them, assails in common with the wild enthusiasts who infest this country, the authority established in the gospel for the government of God's people, and passing by the terms of the new covenant, he endeavours to mould and fashion the Christian religion, not according to the original shewn to us in the gospel, but according to the model presented to his view by some of the worst men who ever

disgraced the church of God. The Archbishop has, in the exhibition of his system, played upon the passions and prejudices which prevail in this country—he has left unnoticed the nature and form of the Christian dispensation, the divine authority given to Peter, the Apostles, and their successors for ever—he has rejected all the precedents which the condemnation of heresy for eighteen hundred years, presented to him—he has substituted opinion for faith—he has annulled as far as in him lay, the three creeds, and set at nought that article of two of them which teaches every Christian to believe in the Church, to believe that she exists, that she administers rightly the ordinances of Christ, and teaches his truths without error. He has done all this, and why? that he might vent his spleen upon an unoffending people—that he might perpetuate dissensions amongst brethern—that he might sustain a character, and justify that volume of incoherent contradictory and discreditable testimony, which he once delivered against the creed and the rights of his countrymen. He did all this to uphold a religious system, which is supported beyond its deserts, by private interest and public law, but which, in itself, is incoherent and inconsistent.

Yes, for what can merit those epithets better than that system, the fruit of necessity and error, 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 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. The “furious error” of those few men who founded such a Church, and founded her as they did, after separating themselves from the whole world, is one of those appalling judgments of Almighty God, whereby he shews the utter

impotence of human wisdom and power, and the absolute necessity of his own heavenly grace. It is this "furious error," supported by a few men, corrupted in mind, and having their consciences seared as with a hot iron, which drives the multitude into infidelity or enthusiasm. It is for this multitude, thus deceived and abused, that I lament; a multitude which seeks for bread, and finds no one to break it to them, whilst infected with error from their very infancy, they are taught to blaspheme what they do not know, and to resist that authority which they should love and revere. In all question of private right, or public interest, men almost instinctively enquire, reason, discuss; the judge or the legislative body, wheresoever it resides, examines, with a care and attention proportioned to the magnitude or difficulty of the matter before them, whatever can contribute to assist them in framing a wise law or pronouncing an equitable decision; but the law once enacted, the final judgment once pronounced, does any rational man refuse obedience to the one, or submission to the other? If then the impulse of our nature, the plainest dictate of reason, teach us in society how disputes are to be terminated, order preserved, and the public interests promoted, or secured,—whence the fatuity or blindness of the "furious men," who say that in the city or house of God there is to be no tribunal, competent to decide definitively? that in the kingdom of Christ there is to be no legislative power which Christians would be bound to obey?

Experience may indeed shew that the law of the state was not wise, or that it was susceptible of improvement, and then a new law is enacted, or the former amended or repealed. This also is precisely what occurs in the Church with regard to all things in it which are susceptible of improvement or liable to change. But as to what regards that portion of the sacred deposit which the Church cannot alter, diminish,

or encrease—that faith which was committed to her pastors, that they might guard and preserve, but not alter it:—when questions or disputes touching this faith arise, the pastors of the Church, like all other judges, enquire, investigate, and then decide; their decisions, like the decisions of all tribunals, must be as numerous as the cases in which judgment is required of them: hence, new decisions, new expositions of the law; hence new, more full, clear, comprehensive and explicit definitions of the one unchangeable and unchangeable faith. Thus we find the creed called of the Apostles explained at Nice, that framed at Nice, amplified at Constantinople, that of Constantinople, rendered after the lapse of ages, more explicit, by the adoption of the word *filioque*. But these explanations are not variations, the fruit of unfixity, as has been insinuated, but they are, as St. Basil, and Vincent of Lérins describes them, the unfolding of the same seed of faith, the developement of the same unvarying truth.

In framing laws of discipline, or any other laws which do not affect the deposit of faith, those pastors whom the Holy Ghost appointed to rule the Church, act agreeably to what nature and reason prescribe to be done in every well ordered community, by those who are charged with the rule or government of it; but when disputes which regard the faith arise, they who are commissioned to teach all nations, who are the authorized ministers of Christ, proceed, as all other judges in the last resort, do;—they decide upon the law, and declare its sense, and thus put an end to litigation. If these pastors be charged, as they are untruly and unjustly charged, with excluding all enquiry, they have only to refer, in their own justification, to the numberless councils held in the Church, wherein her laws have been altered, amended or repealed. If they be asked, why they presume to give judgment on the

disputes which arise amongst those who are to learn the law from their lips, as the prophet expresses it, their only answer is:—that they have been appointed by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church, to heal divisions, to preserve order, to promote peace, to keep the subjects of Christ's kingdom united in one body, having one heart and one mind,—in order that all who are of that body may say the same thing, and that no schisms or heresies (vices which exclude from heaven) may exist among them. If the nature or extent of the authority which they exercise be enquired of them, they reply:—that it is commensurate with the kingdom of Christ, that it is totally and entirely independant of earthly power, that it is proportioned to the nature and importance of the subjects about which it is exercised, and that the commission containing it is written in the Gospel, recorded in the councils, secured by immemorial possession, published by all history, and never disputed or denied, unless by the blind or the disobedient—by those men who either walk in the darkness of infidelity and the shade of death, or who, separating themselves, and condemned by their own judgment, have refused to hear it, and been therefore cast out among the heathens and publicans. If it be enquired why they, weak and fallible men, pretend that their decisions are exempt from error, their answer is;—we are weak and ignorant, and insufficient to think any thing of ourselves, as if from ourselves; but all our sufficiency is from God. Let men consider us, when assembled in the name of Christ, as his ministers, discharging an embassy for him, as if God exhorted or instructed his people through us. As the potter out of the same clay can make one vessel to honor, and another to shame, so the Almighty hath been pleased to take from the common mass of human infirmity, the weak and infirm of this world, and by them to confound the

wise and the strong, that no flesh might glory in his sight; he took the taxgatherer and the humble fishermen, and gave to them the power of establishing the Church—of teaching all nations, promising to be with them all days, even till the end of time; he selected one of these and made him the foundation after himself, on which his Church should be raised; he confided to him, as the just reward of his extraordinary faith and love, the care of his entire flock; he gave to him the power of binding and loosing on the earth; he prayed for him that his faith, however shaken, might not fail, but that, did he happen to fall, he should again arise, and confirm his brethren. Against the Church to be formed by those men he engaged, that all the powers of darkness—the powers of earth or hell should not prevail, until he would return to separate the just from the wicked, and complete the work for which he had first descended to the earth.

We, in union with our Head, are the successors of those men; for eighteen hundred years, we exhibit a regular and uninterrupted succession; during that time we have preached the Gospel throughout every tongue almost, and people, and nation upon the earth; we have stood together, whilst the earth has been moved and shaken, empire transferred from nation to nation, and thrones crumbled in the dust. We have been assailed by dangers from abroad, and terrors from within; our own children have often raised their heel against us, and in the midst of peace, our bitterness has often been most bitter. The calumnies and persecutions which beset our Divine Master, have ever been employed against the entire or some portion of our body; those who should support us have often deserted or defamed us, but, he who first sent us, has remained with us, and supported us in every tribulation. We pretend to nought that has not been given to us, we were entrusted

with the care of that divine faith which is one and indivisible, without which it is impossible to please God, and by which the just man liveth; to preach and to preserve this faith is our office and duty:—the code, in which the doctrines which express this faith is contained, has been confided to us; about the meaning of this code, and of the truths contained in it, Christians often differ and dispute; we are appointed to settle those disputes, because we are appointed to instruct and to rule the Church, and to give an account to God, of the souls of those who are called to believe in Christ. Were our decisions not final, we would not be competent to fulfil the duties imposed on us by our Heavenly Master, to punish the refractory, to reject the heretic, to preserve the unity of the Church. Were our decisions regarding the doctrines of faith not exempt from error, there could be scarcely any faith remaining on the earth; for there is no doctrine touching it revealed by Christ, which the malice or folly of men has not assailed. Were our decisions not conclusive, what could put an end to doubts, to anxieties and distrust? or, how would any doctrine from that which Paul of Somosata, or Arius assailed, down to the most seemingly unimportant which has ever been disputed in the Church, be finally and irrevocably determined? and, if not finally and irrevocably determined, how could the belief in any such doctrine, so brought into doubt, or discussion, ever be held on any other ground than that of individual judgment or opinion?

But if the belief of, or faith in any doctrine expressed in the code of revelation, rested on individual judgment, it would no longer rest on the authority of God; for he who thinks that he finds the divinity of Christ revealed in the Scripture, may not be wiser in the knowledge of this world, than he who thinks that no such truth is there expressed. The

opinion, therefore, which the one and the other of those two persons is supposed to hold, is only an *opinion*, the fruit of their respective judgments exercised upon the law. Such an opinion in the one or the other is not that Christian faith, without which, it is impossible to please God, and by which the just man liveth. This faith, according to the Apostle, is a gift of God, given to the believer for the sake of Christ; it is the substance or foundation of things hoped for, infused or placed in the soul of man, by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, and often, as in infants, without his active concurrence. It is again, as St. Paul repeats it, *the argument or proof of those things which do not appear* in this life—an argument or proof, not derived from our judgment, but emanating from that heavenly light and wisdom, which the spirit of God imparts. Whosoever, therefore, believes any truth of the Gospel, by the *mere* force or power of his own judgment exercised upon the law, he may have an opinion or a conviction of such truth, but such opinion or conviction is not that *divine faith*, which is the root of all justification, and without which, no man can please God, nor be a living member of Jesus Christ.

Not so in the Catholic Church, where, with baptism, the gift of faith is infused by God into the soul, and when the law, or revelation, or doctrines, expressive of this faith, and explanatory of the objects or truths which it regards, are presented to the Catholic by the testimony and authority of the Church, he assents to them as to the very word of God, and he assents to them, not by the mere power of his own will or judgment examining and approving of them, but by the power of the Holy Ghost, enlightening his understanding and guiding his will, which, through faith, worketh in him—his belief and his assent are, therefore, altogether divine.

Supposing, that afterwards, any of those truths or doctrines which he thus believes by a supernatural faith, is through his own infirmity or malice, or through the infirmity or malice of others, brought into doubt, he goes up to the place which the Lord hath chosen, and to those judges, who for the time being expound the divine revelation or doctrines of faith, he receives their testimony and judgment on the true meaning of the law; his doubt ceases, and he believes, as he first believed, in virtue of the faith infused into him by the Holy Ghost. The Church, whose authority is altogether divine, and which authority is vested in these appointed to teach and rule the people of God, exercises, in giving her judgment, no power over the law; her only business in such cases, is to declare with authority its true meaning, and, if necessary, to enforce her own rightful decision, by excluding such as would not submit to it from all participation in her communion. She expels them from within her pale, and places them without amongst the unbelievers. In deciding the doubts of her children, she will, if necessary, make great enquiry amongst the wise and the learned, and throughout all the churches; for such is the will of God, who disposes all things sweetly, and such is the precedent established by the Apostles, and followed in all past ages; but having made this enquiry, she hesitates no longer, she decides and decides irrevocably, knowing that the spirit of truth is abiding with her, and that Christ himself is assisting her pastors, guarding his own gifts, and protecting his own doctrine.

The Catholic who receives her decision on the meaning of the law, leans not upon his own nor upon any other human judgment; he believes the word revealed by God, he believes it not by the deceitful light which his own reason may shed upon it, but by the faith or gift infused into him by the Holy Ghost, and he lays aside the doubts which

malice or infirmity suggested to him, because the Church, which cannot fail, has borne testimony and pronounced her judgment for him as to the true meaning of the law. His faith is uniform, pure, unmixed with human pride or self-sufficiency, whilst the unhappy beings who confide in their own judgment are lost in their own inventions, always learning, as the Apostle says, but never coming to the knowledge of the truth. They continue tossed about by every wind of doctrine, until, having suffered shipwreck as to the faith, they sink into infidelity or are lost in enthusiasm. They may call their opinions *faith*, and their morality by the name of *religion*, but that faith which is the gift of the Holy Ghost, has departed from them from the moment that private judgment became the ground of their belief, whilst their virtues are no longer those living works which are to be rewarded with eternal life.

Such is the account we give of our authority—such is the nature of our office—such the indefeasable right we possess to give judgment in questions of religion, to preserve the deposit of the faith, and to secure against all doubt and error the people of God, and the religion of our Redeemer upon the earth. Let no man despise our weakness, for it is not we who teach or determine, but the grace of God with us. Let no man upbraid us with the infirmity of a few of our brethren, for though they had been but as the Scribes and Pharisees who sat upon the chair of Moses, yet were they of the body commissioned to teach all nations and to rule the church of God which he acquired with his blood. If worldly power or a spirit of ambition sometimes infected the sanctuary, there was always within it a holy fire capable of purifying it from all corruption. If they who were commissioned to rule and teach in a kingdom not of this world, were often led by events to accept of or assume authority in states or kingdoms not their own, impute the fault or the misfortune to

human passion or interest, to ignorance, want or necessity, but do not charge it to the account of a divine institution, the only stay and safeguard of the Church of Christ. Let the legislator or the judge who exceeded his power or authority, be acquitted or condemned by the voice of his fellow-men, but let not the power with which he was vested or the authority which he abused be annulled or rejected. If our predecessors have enacted laws or given judgment conjointly with others, in matters which were for ages mixed together, but now are no longer confounded, do not impute to the pastor the act of the baron, or to the successor of Peter the proceedings of the arbiter of empires. Above all, be careful to discern the laws of church discipline, which are always mutable or changing, from decisions which regard only the unalterable deposit of the faith, nor again suffer the opinions or doctrines freely maintained or rejected by individuals or bodies amongst Catholics, to be taken as the doctrines or opinions of the Church. Whatever is contrary to the faith or morality of the gospel, the Church of Christ *does not, believes not, suffers not* ; but unity being preserved in what is defined, and charity prevailing throughout her members, she leaves to all the liberty of discussing what is doubtful, and of investigating whatever is hidden or obscure.

If infallibility then shuts out doubt, such was the will of the Redeemer, such is the necessary effect of the authority which he established, such is the prerogative required to exist on earth if faith is to be preserved, schisms prevented, and heresies condemned ; such in fine is the result necessarily flowing from the promises made and the commission given by Jesus Christ. If enquiry be excluded, it is only after the final decision is pronounced, and if not then excluded, there would not be unity, nor peace, nor charity, nor humility, nor obedience, nor order, nor har-

mony in the Church. The kingdom of Christ would be like the congregations of sectaries throughout the earth, concurring only in their opposition to the truth, and hatred of the authority which condemns them all, but dissenting from each other, anathematizing each other, asserting and denying, condemning and pardoning, speaking with the tongues of Babel, and verifying by their whole lives and opinions, all that has been foretold of sects and heresies by the Apostle.

But, to proceed with the Charge; "whilst from the belief that out of the particular communion there is no salvation, not only is the adherent of that faith bound to cling to it with a blind and desperate fidelity, but if he be influenced by an ardent love of his fellow-creatures, he is impelled by humanity itself to force others by whatever means within its pale." In this sentence or paragraph, there are two propositions—the first designates, in the language of Grattan, (strangely perverted by the learned prelate) as blind and desperate the fidelity with which the Catholic preserves the faith once delivered to the saints. The second insinuates clearly enough that the Catholic must, in proportion to the goodness of his nature and the ardour of his charity, be a persecutor of all who differ from him in religious belief. This latter idea is again a second time introduced; for he who conceived it, filled with antipopish zeal, hesitates not at a superfluity of language or repetition of thought. He says, speaking of the great variety of sects which have grown up beneath the shelter or protection of the established church, "that they are an evil which the coercive system opposed to protestantism is able by a very summary process effectually to correct."

And first, in reply to those most harsh imputations, permit me to observe, that the fidelity of the Catholic to

his faith, so far from being blind, unless it be so through the ignorance or incapacity of the individual, is the most enlightened and best secured that can well be conceived—for this reason, that the Catholic possesses the most public, the most certain, the most clear data on which to rest his mind in all questions of religion.

In place of ascertaining the genuineness and divine inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, the fidelity and accuracy of them in translations, in place of comparing the old Testament with the new, and justifying to himself whatever in the former might clash with his notions of justice, truth and sanctity,—in place of turning over huge folios of commentaries, in order to ascertain the sense of what, with all mankind, is the subject of dispute,—of what the Spirit of God designates as “hard to be understood,” and again not to be “of private interpretation,” in place of deciding between Marcion and Valentinian, between Arius and Manes, between Luther and Beza, between Cranmer and Hoadly, between Swift and Milton, between Doctor Carpenter, a learned doctor of that name at Bristol, and Doctor Magee—in place of doing all those difficult, or impossible things, the Catholic has only to look out for ONE, HOLY, CATHOLIC, and APOSTOLIC CHURCH, which the whole world combines to tell him is the depositary of Christian truth, and, when he has discovered her, to hear her doctrine and obey her voice. I am of opinion that in religious enquiry, there is no process by which the mind can arrive at certainty, so short, so simple, so plain, as when its reasoning is founded on facts of public notoriety. The simplicity or brevity of a demonstration does not certainly diminish its force, or obscure the evidence which springs from it; and if, therefore, the Catholic by seeing, with one glance, that the Church, in which *all* christians confess the truth to reside, is that with which he holds

communion, his fidelity to her doctrines should be great, in proportion to the value he sets on his salvation, and his adhesion to them, so far from being blind, is, in truth, the most enlightened, founded, as it is, on the most simple and brief demonstration. The Catholic but laughs at the man, whatever may be his *station*, who seeks to cushion the name of his sect, or endeavours to confound one of the branches lopped off in the sixteenth century, with the great and illustrious tree from which it fell : he feels the same pity or contempt for the first swarm of sectaries as for the second, or as he does for all and each of those that followed them.

The followers of Luther or Calvin are precisely the same in his eyes 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 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.

The Catholic, whilst he pities the delusion of his fellow-men, and laments, with Augustin, that the salvation of such multitudes should be placed in jeopardy by the pride, obstinacy, or fanaticism of a few furious men ; whether these few be clothed in purple, and faring sumptuously

every day, or whether they be as senseless or hypocritical as the roving fanatics of our own time, the Catholic, whilst his mind is thus occupied, has no doubt or hesitation as to the wisdom and propriety of his own conduct. He finds all the world declare that there is a Church, the faithful depository on the earth, of the doctrines and sacraments of Christ; that this Church is One Holy Catholic and Apostolic, and that all are bound to hear her voice. He turns over, if he will, the records of antiquity, and finds the history of this One Church marked as distinctly as that of the empire of Persia, Greece, or Rome; he traces on the map of the world the states or peoples who compose her—his eye discovers, at a glance, the provinces which have rebelled against her, the period of their rebellion, and he discovers with equal facility the authors and abettors of their revolt; whilst the great empire of Christ, notwithstanding the defection of some portions of her subjects, continues to fill the earth, and to comprehend within her pale, tribes, and tongues, and peoples, and nations, extending from the rising to the setting sun.

He finds all those nations varying in climate, in interest, in language, laws, and customs, yet speaking with one tongue, all holding the same gospel, all saying the same thing—exempt from divisions, offering the same sacrifice, frequenting the same sacraments, all professing the same doctrine, all ruled by the same pastors, all subject to the same head—He thinks on the life of Christ, his obedience, humility, chastity, his voluntary poverty, his prayer, fasting, his zeal, his ardour and charity, his signs and wonders in the propagation of the gospel, and he finds all those virtues and graces eminently conspicuous in that GREAT Church, and in her alone, whose very name, like to that of the God who founded her, is uncommunicable to every other. If any sect or sectary approach to seduce him, he

says, who are you, where did you come from? from what heaven have you fallen? what earth produced you? have you not been born of flesh and all its lusts, as was Luther, Cranmer, and Henry; or of the will or presumption of man, like Arius, Socinus, or Rousseau, surely you were not born of God as the Church which was washed in the blood of the Lamb must have been. You say, come to me and possess the truth; but did not Manes say the same, and Simon, and Paul of Samosata, and Nestorius, and Bucer, and Beza, and Cranmer, and all the others, even to the present time.

Shew me the origin of your churches—shew how they were founded by the Apostles, or by those who persevered with them, and never separated themselves from them or the body who succeeded to them. I can number the days you have been upon the earth—I know the authors of your misfortune *who separated themselves*; the Lord warned his disciples to reject such as you; the Apostles foretold your coming, your *novelty* and *dissensions*. The impiety of your origin, your pride and obstinacy, your lies and uncharitableness designate you as men subverted as to the faith, and condemned by your own judgment. There is no unity amongst you, for you do not preach the same doctrine, worship at the same altar, participate of the same sacrament, or obey the same pastors.

You have no holiness which was not equally found in the times of heathenism—You have discarded penance and all mortification of the senses—your pride of understanding extinguishes all humility—disobedience is your original sin, which, were you washed in nitre, would continue. Wedded to this world, a spirit of poverty is unknown to you. You have scoffed at chastity, though practised and commended by Christ and his Apostles.

Signs and wonders, though promised by the Redeemer to the Church, and testified by the voice of mankind, are, with an unparalleled effrontery and disregard for all evidence, utterly denied by you. You cannot by any possibility be the people of God. Where, in what times, or countries are you found why you should be esteemed a universal people—filling the whole earth throughout all ages, from the days of the Apostles? or how can you, who came later into the world than the art of printing, pretend to any connection with the Apostles or the apostolic times. Have you not the impiety to assert, that Christ had violated his promise, deserted the church which he acquired with his own blood, delivered the beloved of his soul to idolatry, permitted error to overwhelm truth, and the powers of hell to break in pieces the rock on which he built his church? Depart, exclaims the Catholic, you are a stranger, having no share in the inheritance; a deserter, who has forfeited his honor, violated his faith, and betrayed the sacred interests once entrusted to his fidelity!

Such would be the indignant reply of the well informed Catholic to the writer of "The Charge," or to any other of a similar character or name. The Catholic not versed in language, but rich in the simplicity of his faith, feels, as it were, within him, the possession of the faith; he knows, as well as the most learned, though incapable of expressing his thoughts, that he is an heir to the inheritance promised to the children of the Church; the elements of Christian knowledge communicated to him by his pastor, his mother, or his nurse, teach him all that is necessary to be known. The Creed, the Decalogue, the Sacrifice and Sacraments which he frequents; the virtues and vices which he is obliged to practice or avoid; all these he understands, and feeling his own infirmity, he venerates the Church as the pillar and ground of truth; her lessons to him are brief,

her authority, which inculcates them, is sacred. She, herself, stands before him as a beacon on a high hill, to light his way; as a city on the mountain top, which cannot be concealed; as a great empire, standing in the midst of the earth, beautiful as the moon, chosen as the sun, terrible as an army set in battle array—extending her dominion from sea to sea, and to the utmost boundaries of the earth—sending forth her ministers to publish the Gospel of her God—to confound the wise, to humble the high minded, and, above all, to preach to the poor, and heal the broken-hearted. The simple child of this Church, turns with horror from all who would invade his faith, or lay waste his inheritance—whatever is new to him in religion is false—whatever is not Catholic, is schismatical, heretical, an evil to be avoided at the expense of his fame, his fortune, or his life.

So much for the fidelity with which the Catholic adheres to his faith, and now, as to the persecuting spirit imputed to us in “The Charge.”

Certainly, this insinuation or imputation, comes with a peculiarly bad grace from a man who, nurtured in the school of Calvin, and bred in that of Cranmer, Somerset, or Elizabeth, for I know not which of the creeds of parliament his Grace professes; but such a Charge is most unbecoming a man, who, bred up in principles of the most unrelenting persecution, (see Appendix No. II.) had, himself, done more to disturb the peace of society in Ireland, to propagate bigotry, to provoke retorts, to awaken a spirit of religious dissension, than any other individual in the country—yes, I should think the man who penned the passages quoted above by me, must have mistaken altogether, or forgotten the history of the past and later times. He could not have reflected on the persecutions suffered by the Catholics, from

the Jews and Gentiles, from the Arians, Nestorians, Iconoclasts, and from the swarms of iusurgent sects in the 16th century.

But leaving his recollection of those sad events out of view, it may be safely affirmed, that the Duke of Alva was not half so lost to the feelings of nature and decency, as Cranmer and Henry; or that the cruel assassins of St. Barthelemi were not more wicked, more heartless, more cruel, than the bloody satellites of Elizabeth or Cromwell in England and Ireland; that Mary was incomparably less a persecutor than her sister—that the proceedings of Knox and the covenanters in Scotland—of the parliaments, protectors, and viceroys in this country, surpass, beyond measure, all that was ever done, not by Catholics, but by Nero, Tiberius, Domitian throughout the Roman empire, or by Pharaoh himself in Egypt. No, all the fiends of Milton, if let loose upon the earth, could not exceed in cruelty, impiety, and injustice, the persecutors of the Irish people. With all the records of antiquity before this Archbishop—with the shade of Browne before his face, and the walls of the temple in which he spoke encompassing him round about;—when he stood, as it were, on a tripod, and invoked the spirit of dissension, I should not be surprised if fear fell upon him and made all his bones to shake, or that a voice came forth and said, *“there will be a time for all things, and the just and the wicked shall be judged.”*

When a presumptuous man provoked the late Doctor Milner, a man whose wisdom and virtue will live for many generations; or when a man whose bigotry has outlived his genius, induced the gentle and learned Charles Butler to place in parrallel lines the persecutions exercised, all of them unjustly, in these countries, could not this

Protestant Prelate have seen how much more extended *his* were, than *ours*? and when the account thus stood against him,—when the scale was no longer poised, and that no person could mistake the side on which the excess lay, why did he return to the subject and expose himself to reproach? But a fatality seems to attend him, that he may exemplify the Gospel truth caustically expressed by Swift, “dead or alive pride will get a fall.”

But his Grace alleges, that in proportion to the goodness of our hearts, and the ardour of our charity we must be impelled to *force others* by whatsoever means within the pale of our Church, and that we, by a very summary process, alluding, no doubt, to *autos da fe*, prevent the growth of those sects and heresies which the established Church shelters and protects. The Church of which his Grace speaks, must no doubt be some Church different from the Protestant Church of Ireland in 1634, which subjected to excommunication, “all authors of schism and “maintainers of conventicles, cutting them off rightly “from the unity of the Church, so as that they be taken “of the whole multitude of the faithful, as heathens and “publicans.” This is no doubt, a very peculiar mode of affording to them, shelter and protection; precisely and identically the same as the Catholic Church affords to schismatics and heretics. The established Church was, and is as intolerant as any other, but the parliament which has swallowed her up, only to have its bowels embittered and its heart vexed by her, this parliament is tolerant to authors of schism and maintainers of conventicles, and and does not permit the established Church to exercise her wrath upon them. This parliament indeed delivers over the Catholics, the descendants of their own fathers, the framers of their own constitution, the authors of all that is great and good in the civil, municipal, or ecclesiastical

institutions of the country—the parliament by some hidden judgment of God, delivers over those Catholics, now consisting of several millions of their subjects, to be cast out, reviled, insulted, and oppressed by the bishops, and ministers, by the proctors, and surrogates, and sextons, and grave-diggers, of the established Church.

Doubtless, this established Church, in excommunicating “schismatics and maintainers of conventicles,” is very inconsistent and absurd, for she excommunicates them for doing what she herself has done; she calls them heathens, because they, in the exercise of their judgment, reject her creed and frame one for themselves, whilst she proclaims to them that in doing so, they act agreeably to the will of God—that she can give them no assurance that her own doctrine is a whit preferable to theirs, and that Christ and herself have given them a license to think on religion as it listeth them, and speak in their conventicles as they think. This, no doubt, is excessively inconsistent and absurd in the established Church; but she is rich and powerful, and therefore entitled to indulge in all the luxury of absurdity and error.

If any one upbraid her, she orders out her proctors to decimate his corn, potatoes, and cabbages,—his lambs, his fleeces, his mint, and milk. If any one dispute with her, she compels him to build for her a new church, to fill it with stoves and pews, to furnish it with linen, surplices, bread and wine; with songsters and choristers, with clerks and beadles, with sextons and grave-diggers, and for all arrears due to her for Christmas offerings or Easter dues, she cites the heathen before her surrogate, *and, judging in her own cause*, gives to him the full benefit of fees, decrees and costs.

If her absurdities be hinted at, she points to her long lawn sleeves, her gilded palaces, her trains of equipages, her millions of acres, her tenths of two kingdoms, and, in the language of a bloated epicure, says, "You vulgar cynic, how can I be wrong?" Should he laugh, as I am sometimes obliged to do, at her ignorance, her insolence, her pomp and pride, she opens her armoury, more stowed with weapons than a star-chamber or inquisition—more ill-savoured than a lady's dressing-room, and lets loose upon him a whole legion of her satellites, having one hand armed with calumny and sophistry, the other filled with newspapers, tracts, pamphlets, reviews, replies, rejoinders, charges, sermons, speeches! With these the heathen or publican is at once oppressed, and if he learns not to revere the wisdom, and respect the power of the Church, he will at least learn to protect his own person, and to preserve, by silence and submission, under whatsoever injustice or wrong, any property which he may be suffered to possess.

But then, nature and grace impel the Catholic to persecute! They who say so, know not the spirit in which Catholics are called, and it is because they know it not, that they cannot judge of its nature or estimate its influence. Could not the Redeemer, by an irresistible grace, by an infringement on the liberty of human will, or by arming millions of men and angels in his cause, propagate at once his religion, and preserve it by similar means against all trial and temptation? But no; he disposed all things sweetly, so that he left to abide in darkness and the shadow of death, such as would not be saved by preaching, accompanied by signs and the folly of the cross; this was the plan of redemption by him who came to repair the ravages of sin, but not to alter or infringe on the works of the Creator.

So that God, who instituted the Jewish commonwealth,

and commissioned the high-priest or judge to punish with death certain violations of his law,—when *that* covenant was abolished by him, and another instituted in a kingdom not of this world, he might, if he had pleased, have given similar power to its rulers; but he did not do so: he gave to them a new spirit—a spirit, not of fear or force, but of humility, long suffering, and love;—he sent his ministers of this new law to preach and to baptize, to forgive or to retain the sins committed against heaven; he taught them, by word and example, to leave human institutions undisturbed, to submit to every constituted authority, not to resist injury, to overcome evil by good, and to receive, with the kiss of peace, even those who would traffic in their blood. He shewed to them but too clearly, that the times of violence and revenge had ended; he pointed out the only just and lawful means of making converts to his faith, and, foreseeing that *heresies should come*, he described their malice, but desired that those guilty of them, should be left bound in their own miseries, and subject to the only punishment of being placed without the Church. Thus were his Apostles instructed; thus was the spirit of their calling left to operate; in this manner did the Church always act and ordain. Even when an unholy alliance had bound her to the earth by associating her with thrones and empires, her pastors never forgot that meekness and mercy were the attributes of their religion, and that punishment, not of a spiritual kind, was reserved for the power of this world. If then, the feelings, the zeal, the charity of Christ, or of his Apostles, or of those holy men who walked in their footsteps, did not impel *them* to seek for the conversion of their fellow-creatures, by any other means than those of preaching, of prayer, of signs and wonders; if the only punishment resorted to by them was, that of exclusion from the communion of the Church, there is no reason why the author of

“the Charge” should assert, that we, who profess their doctrine and glory in following their example, should, like the Pharisees, go over land and sea to make proselytes by the violation of every right human and divine; or punish those who separate themselves, and form conventicles apart, by what his Grace intimates under cover of the words, “*whatsoever means.*” Were our notions of brotherly love, and the impulses of our nature such as malevolence suggests them to our opponents, surely it would be impossible to account for the conduct of those Catholic states, which in all parts of America and Europe, (to the disgrace of England be it recorded,) cherish all their subjects alike, without distinction of worship, or of creed. What was it but the genius of the Catholic religion, always allied to sound policy, and the charity by which we love our neighbour, whether Jew or Gentile, which operated with the Catholics of Maryland, of Bavaria, of Hungary, of Austria, of France, of Switzerland, to abolish the barbarous system of disfranchisement on account of religious belief? 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!!

Doctor Magee quotes Tertullian, whilst yet a Catholic, where he says, *non est religionis religionem cogere.* “It becomes not religion to constrain belief.” This was the maxim of Ambrose and St. Martin, who refused to hold communion with some Spanish ecclesiastics who had concurred to inflict punishment on the Priscillianists, a race of wicked enthusiasts in Spain. It was the maxim of

Augustin, in his endeavours to protect the Donatists from the fury of the satellites of the Emperor, who, like the Orangemen of our days, deluged their native country with the blood of those whom they robbed and oppressed under the pretext of religious zeal. But Tertullian, rigorous and austere in his nature, became scandalized at the patience and mercy of the Church; he upbraided a Pope with his excessive clemency in admitting sinners to be reconciled through penance; he proceeded to deny, that all sins could be remitted, even to him, who with a contrite and troubled spirit, offered his whole heart to God; he became a Montanist, because he would not, in the true spirit of catholicity, be merciful to his fellow-man. Strange to find this Tertullian, quoted by Doctor Magee, where this prelate speaks of the intolerance of the Catholic Church; but so it happens, that wisdom is justified of her own ungrateful children, that iniquity often lies to itself, and that our enemies, like Balaam, are made to bless us or plead in our justification.

Persecution, truly, then, is no portion of our creed; we assail errors, but we spare the victims of delusion. We arraign vice, but we pardon and embrace the sinner; the arms of our warfare are not carnal but spiritual from God, and when after the example of Christ, of his Apostles, of Cyril, Jerome, Gregory, and Augustine, we expose the hypocrite, and denounce the furious incendiary, we pity even their misfortune, whilst we feel nought but the most tender charity for the multitude of men, whom they often, alas, too successfully labour to delude. For these we hope, for these we unceasingly offer up our prayers to the throne of grace, that the Father of lights, from whom every good gift descends, may illuminate their darkness, correct their errors, dispel their illusion, pardon their trespasses, and bring them to the possession of his everlasting rest. If

there be one class of my countrymen whom I love more than another, they are they, who, in addition to the heavy yoke of human misery which we all bear, are kept in ignorance of the truth, by those furious men who, themselves not satisfied with erring, are, in the language of the Apostle, constantly driving others into error.

It is upon the ground of intolerance, and the persecuting spirit falsely attributed to Catholics, that this Archbishop invokes the Prince and the Legislature to continue the oppression of his fellow-subjects; and here I recognise in his voice, the voice of Ursacius and Valens, two Arian bishops who opposed the faith of Nice. Two "furious men," who instructed the emperors, sons of Constantine, that they were entitled to judge in matters of faith, to prescribe a creed for their subjects, and to persecute by unjust and cruel laws, all those who adhered to the Catholic and Apostolic faith. The empire was deluged with blood, its strength and energy were wasted, its enemies acquired confidence, its provinces shortly afterwards revolted, and the whole fabric of its power and greatness gradually fell to decay. Ursacius and Valens died, and left after them an ignominious name. The princes who were duped by their counsels, forfeited the glory acquired by their father, and by themselves in their youthful days—they left after them a government in disorder, an empire wasted by dissensions, a human church which perished after them, whilst that which they oppressed, was preserved by the divine protection, and transmitted their names and their errors, with her own sufferings, and her final delivery, through fifteen centuries, even to our own days. Had the emperors disregarded the counsels of a few, vain, ambitious, and furious men, had they not put their hand to the censor, an office which the Almighty had not pleased to assign them, had they permitted truth and falsehood to contend alone,

and only laboured to promote equally the happiness of all their subjects—had they done this, unity and strength would have dwelt in their empire, victory would have followed their standard, and they, or their children, would not have witnessed the miseries of their people, nor the coming ruin of the Roman name.

History has been written for our instruction; we should profit of its lessons, and in place of traversing a whole province, as Dr. Magee has lately done, with the torch of religious discord flaming in his hand, casting brands of fire through an inflammable population, we should attend to the duty of preaching peace and good will, and, when going about, endeavour to imitate the example of him, “who, as St. Peter beautifully tells us, went about doing good.”

Were I an archbishop entitled to visit the dioceses of suffragans, I would consider the end for which such visitations were originally instituted and ordained by the Church. In her ordinal I would discover, that among other duties of a spiritual kind, it behoved me “to enquire and ascertain how the churches within my jurisdiction were regulated and conducted, both as to their temporal and spiritual concerns—that the buildings and ornaments belonging to them were kept in good and sufficient repair, that the sacraments were administered, and the Gospel preached. I should ascertain what was the conduct and morality of the ministers and people, whether the laws and constitutions of the Church were observed—whether public offences against order or good morals prevailed, and when this was done, and that I had explained and enforced the duties of all concerned, and applied such corrections or remedies to existing evils as I was enabled to apply, then would I consider myself obliged to expound, even briefly,

the law of God, and teach the clergy and people, as the ordinal expressly requires, that “they were bound to turn away from evil and do good, to fly from vice and follow after virtue, *and not to do to another, what they would not that another would do unto them.*” These are a short summary of the duties which a bishop or an archbishop should discharge upon his visitation. Were dissensions, heresies or superstitions found to prevail, he should labour to restore union, to expound the faith in charity—not reviling nor blaspheming; and to remove superstitions,—those noxious excrescences—by displaying the beauty, usefulness, and simplicity of true religion. Such was the manner in which bishops and archbishops proceeded in those times, when they went about doing good, encompassed with the love of their people, covered with their benedictions, and blessing them in return; such was their practice in those times of simplicity, piety, and peace, when those mouldering cathedrals, wherein the bat and owl now contend for possession with the bishop established by law, were first raised and consecrated to the service of the living God,—those mouldering cathedrals, which when one visits now, and hears a prelate bellowing polemics, and breathing war, he involuntarily heaves a sigh to heaven, and, in silence ejaculates, *O domus antiqua quam dispari dominaris Domino.*

We should all take lessons, from the times that have gone before us; for what is there, as Solomon observes, but what has been, or what will be, but what has already happened.

That philosopher of Florence, whose name is odious, but whose maxims and rules seem to be adopted by the generality of states-men, and by none more carefully than by those who have so successfully divided, and thereby

ruled Ireland with ease and rigour—this philosopher observes, and most justly, that there are times when men in power should revert to first principles, and rebuild upon the first foundation. There never has been a period, when the adoption of this maxim by the legislature of this country would be more useful, if not necessary, than the present. Did they but revert to the first principles of policy, and, in conformity with one of those principles, let their subjects, without fear or favour, exercise their own judgment in the selection of their religion, did they but permit one man to think, that by preferring the judgment of the Church on rules of faith to his own, he might best arrive at truth—and allow another to abound in his own sense, unrestricted by all authority,—did the legislature but adopt one of the first and plainest principles of human and divine right, they would put an end to many bitter contentions, they would silence many “furious men,” they would secure the confidence and affection of all their subjects; for those subjects would see in them, not the tools or partizans of party in the state, but the legislators, the protectors, the impartial arbiters of the entire people. Under a legislature so ruling, there would be union and strength, a national feeling, a national interest, and a national pride. A society so governed would, if its abuses in other respects were not gross and incorrigible, be a mass of amalgamated power, which all the force of this world could not break down.

The writer of “the Charge” proceeds to combat the error of a sovereign, who would ally the Catholic Church with the state.

Would to heaven that no such alliance ever had been formed!

If any danger existed, that such an alliance would

ever be revived in these countries, I would most cordially combine with the writer in denouncing it as one of the heaviest calamities (except, indeed, one other now existing,) which could befall the empire. For I am not so eaten up with the pride and prejudices of a high churchman, as to prefer the aggrandizement of what is called "Church and State," to the freedom and happiness of the people; nor am I again, so bad a christian, (whatever Doctor Magee may think to the contrary) as to desire to see Catholic bishops clothed in purple, faring sumptuously every day, the *Assentatores* of the great, the *Cubicularii* of the palace, the intriguers of the court, the pest of the senate. I should be tempted to remove the cross, and set up the crescent, if I saw the chief ministers of my religion, derive their commission to preach the word, to administer the sacraments, to rule the Church, from any source that was not pointed out and established by Christ; if I saw them receive the rule of faith from the hands or the tongue of any king or minister, or other, to whom it had not been originally confided by the Redeemer.—I should desert them as wolves in sheep's clothing, if I saw them devour the pittance of the widow and the orphan—if I heard them denounce peace, and preach dissension—if I observed them involved in unceasing contradictions between their practise and profession—reviling the most exalted virtues practised by Christ, and recommended by his apostles—heartless to the poor, insolent to the oppressed, slaves to power, and buried in all the surfeitings of a worldly life.

All these evils, at least in some degree, I would apprehend to follow in those degenerate days, when the charity of many has waxed cold, if by an alliance with the state, the pastors of the Catholic Church were exposed to temptation. No! were a spirit of proselytism stronger in my

mind than a love of country, I should say to the present established union of Church and State, *esto perpetua*, and pray to God, that the Catholic priesthood and people might continue just exempt from tyranny, but excluded from all places of power, emolument, and corruption.

I bear about me, however, much stronger feelings as an Irishman, than as a man addicted to a certain profession; and, though I “believe in the infallibility of the Church,” and bear “my intellect enslaved,” and “wallow in the slough of a slavish superstition,” yet, am I so profane, and so free in will and thought, as to desire, that all religions were alike protected by the state, that she respected them all, and favoured none, that she left them to the exercise of their own energies and zeal, and remained perfectly regardless of their respective excellence.

If ever the maxim of the Stuart, “no bishop, no king,” had any foundation in truth, and I believe it had not, it is not true at present, nor can it be true in any country where the legislature holds its sittings before the eyes of the nation, where the judicial authority is independent of the throne—where the tribunals of all description are open to the public praise or censure, and, where a press, unshackled by censors, disseminates knowledge, and gives power and effect to the general sentiment and will. In such a country, no union of Church and State is necessary, no combination of artificial power is required, no juggling of ascendancy—no corporate monopoly—no unhallowed commixture of what is human with what is divine. The liberties and happiness of all the people should be the basis of such a state, the administration should be pure, and always directed to the public good, and the king of such a country, encompassed with

the affections, guarded by the glory and interest of his people, would not require the aid of any bishop to support his throne. Bishops, indeed, would be useful to him, as would the soldier, the merchant, the mechanic, the labourer in the garden or the field; all would be useful, because each would be labouring in his own department, enjoying security of person and property, under the protection and guardianship of the common king. In such a state, the Catholic Church, and every other church or sect might hold its assemblies, preach the Gospel, and minister its rules in peace; they might exclude from their respective temples, and place abroad among the heathens and publicans, if you will, all those who dissented from their doctrine, or disbelieved their creed. But the prince and the legislature, whilst it yielded them protection, should see that they troubled not the public peace, and, in place of arming them with earthly power, to inflict vengeance on dissent, or to oppress with temporal penalties, the brother who might disobey—it should teach them all that the kingdom consigned to their care was not of this world, and that the loyal and industrious heretic was as acceptable to the state as the most orthodox of any, even the most exalted communion. In a community so governed, every religionist would be attached to the throne, the Catholic and Protestant churches would be alike harmless or useful, neither the one nor the other could ever encroach on the state, and if any sect or church exalted herself beyond her sphere, the public censure, independant of all other power, would strip her of her arrogance, and compel her to recede. I verily believe, that his Grace of Dublin, corroded with fruitless care, occupied with strong prejudices, and removed, as he has been, from a little literary eminence, on which an abused public had placed him, I think his Grace, thus circumstanced, can scarcely esti-

mate the few truths I have here submitted to my readers, and that he will continue all his life to speak or write confused essays on the excellence of the established Church, and to tremble before the bugbear of popery. But, I hope, that there is enough of sound sense and deliberate wisdom remaining, even in Ireland, to estimate his efforts as they deserve.

“The monarch,” he says, “cannot prescribe in favour of an intolerant religion.” I say, he has allied to his throne, a religion as intolerant as any in Europe; as a proof, see her creeds, her articles, or the bill of indemnity by which these are neutralised; I do not refer to the popery laws, all of which are the fruit of her spirit.

All religions are intolerant to a certain degree, and must be so; but as their intolerance, if not adopted by the State, consists in excluding dissenters from their communion; it can do no injury to a prince who honors religion, and secures to each of his subjects the right of worshipping the Almighty as his conscience or caprice happens to dictate. What injury does the king sustain from the “Religious Society of Friends,” who sometimes exclude a member from their communion, because his hat is not of due dimensions, or his coat fashioned after the costume of William Penn? Is “the Friend,” when cast out among the publicans, a less useful or loyal subject than he was before?

“The prince cannot prescribe in favor of a religion, which denies the right of private judgment, and that exercises (thereby) a dominion over conscience.” The Catholic Church does not, cannot, prevent any man from exercising his right of private judgment in the choice of his religion; but when any man professes to be of her communion, she

retains him within her fold, only on the condition of preferring her common creed and liturgy to any other which his fancy might desire. Should he form a sect or maintain a conventicle apart, she places him where he has placed himself, that is, abroad among the heathens. She *can* do, she *attempts* to do no more.

If a man do not subscribe to the thirty-nine articles of religion in the established Church, or if assumed to office or place of trust, he do not swear certain oaths, and subscribe to certain declarations, which, in the most august assemblies, in my own hearing, and by some of the most exalted characters in the country, have been designated as LIES; he is not only liable to be placed among the heathens, but he is disgraced and injured in all his wordly interests and pursuits. The Bill of Indemnity comes to his relief if he be not a papist, but this bill is the act of the parliament, not of the church. 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; 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.

I fully agree with the most reverend writer of "the Charge," that the prince ought not to wed his throne, or his office, or his laws, to any church; but that observing the religion which he thinks most acceptable to God, he leave all the Churches to travel towards heaven, restrained in their excesses, but at the same time, protected in the exercise of their ministry, by the laws.

"The prince," says this writer, "being bound to employ a free judgment upon the written word of God, in order to ascertain that what he proposes for the instruction of his people, is not inconsistent with that word, he cannot deny to them the same freedom of enquiry."

This sentence has within it an absurdity, to wit, that the prince has a right to determine for his subjects, what is, or is not, inconsistent with the written word of God, and that this right of his to exclude or propose any particular religion to his people, is the same which each of the people is supposed to have to choose his own religion. It is, I say, absurd to assert, that the prince has a right to exclude a religion which he supposes to be inconsistent with the word of God, and that each of his subjects, at the same time, has a right to choose his own religion. For what would follow, if the subject thought proper to select for himself that Catholic religion which Doctor Magee would wish the prince to exclude as inconsistent with the word of God? Where in that case is the right of the subject? Again; when the prince is vested with a power to exclude certain forms of religion, has he?—will he?—has he ever stopped at that point? Will he not propose his own creed,

whatever it may be, though it were as absurd as that of Cromwell, to his people ?

But all this paragraph is silly, and the produce, not of reason or revelation, but of antipopish zeal and a devouring religious prejudice.

The king of a Christian state has no right to prescribe a religion either negatively or positively to his people, though he may be empowered to protect that which the people themselves have chosen. His kingdom is of this world. He received no commission from Christ to teach or define tenets of religion. He has got power to rule all estates within his realm, (if, as formerly, but not at present in this country, the laws did not exempt a certain class from his jurisdiction;) and to restrain with the civil sword, the stubborn and evil doer, whether he be lay or ecclesiastic. This is the power, the *just* power of the prince. No power to prescribe a religion to his subjects, or to judge in matters of faith, can by any possibility be attached to the kingly sceptre. Whenever the prince attempts to do so, he usurps the right of others and exercises a tyranny over conscience.

The principle then upon which Doctor Magee rests his argument being unsound and fallacious, the consequences deduced from it deserve no attention. The tyranny of Henry the Eighth must be defended, the murder of Moore and Fisher must be justified, all the cruelties of Elizabeth must have been acts of justice, the refusal of Charles to permit the Scotch to select their own religion must have been sound policy, the establishment of the Kirk in that country by William, the alteration consequent thereon in the oath of supremacy, all these acts and proceedings, as well as the discontinuance of the test laws, and the annual enact-

ment of the bill of indemnity, must be opposed to the right and duty of the sovereign, to the religion of Christ, and the public interests, if the learned prelate's position be just or true. Not only that, but if his positions be true, the despotic power of kings is of divine right, passive obedience an indispensable duty of subjects, and bodily and mental slavery the inheritance of the people of those realms. Yes, for what despotism can be more perfect than that wherein the monarch can prescribe a religion for his subjects and enforce it with the civil sword? What obedience more unqualified or passive, than that whereby a right to resist the violation of his conscience is denied to the subject? What mental or bodily thralldom more consummate than that of the man who is obliged to receive his creed from the executive power in the state, and that executive power residing in the same person, who has also the chief share of the legislative authority?

Montesquien observes, that in Spain, since the time of Philip the Second, the only barrier to perfect despotism, existed in the partial independence of the church; and that in the Ottoman empire, the Mufti alone could oppose any stay to the absolute will of the sovereign. If in our country there was no stay to despotism, no guardian of liberty but a church whose creed and discipline the monarch could prescribe and regulate, we should enjoy all the blessings of a monarchy as absolute as that of Ferdinand, or of an empire as despotic as that of the sublime executioner of the Greeks. The civil liberty and the true religion of a country are greatly impaired by any union of the church with the state, but when the chief magistrate is vested with a power of framing creeds and forming churches, then true religion can only be preserved by a special interposition of providence; and civil liberty, if it survive, can only be continued by some power or powers in the state, counteracting the power of the prince.

It is not, therefore, the degree of authority claimed by any church in her decisions upon religious controversy, nor the width, nor the narrowness of her road to the kingdom of heaven, which can in any manner or degree affect the liberties of a people or the rights of a sovereign, but it is the union of any church with the supreme civil power, which augments that power, and also detracts from and endangers the liberties of a people. But if a church not only be united to the supreme power, but that the depository of that power can suppress her councils, annul her convocations, alter her creed and discipline, then she is enslaved, and though she may, like the whisperer who stands behind his master's chair, and poisons his ear with slander, effect much mischief, yet is she totally incapacitated from effecting good, otherwise than as the mere menial of the state.

But then, as to the attributes or characters which Doctor Magee assigns to the established Church. He says, she is Protestant, and so she is, nor do I know that any person has ever questioned her right to that appellation. To deny that she is Protestant, would be just as senseless as to deny by circumlocutions the catholicity of that great and universal Church from which the established Church separated herself, and against which she has vainly been protesting for three hundred years.

The Reverend Prelate continues, "This is the primary character of the established Church."—In this we are fully agreed!

"Maintaining the paramount authority of the Scriptures."

No; for she admits that the parliament has a power to alter the religion of the land; it is the Catholic Church

which maintains the paramount authority of the sacred Scriptures, declaring that no power on earth, either church or parliament, can interfere with the religion revealed in them. The next difference between her and the established Church on this subject is, that when doubts arise on passages of the Scripture, difficult and hard to be understood, the Catholic Church decides the meaning of them by the judgment of the Catholic world, to use a phrase of St. Augustin, expressed by her chief pastors, whilst the established Church leaves such doubts to be decided by the private opinion of each individual.

“Maintaining the right of private judgment.”

The Catholic Church assists and directs this judgment; the Protestant leaves it to be tossed about by every wind of doctrine, or to be led into error or absurdity by those frantic enthusiasts, or those wily crafty-men, who lie always in wait to deceive the unwary.

“Maintaining the supremacy of the sovereign.”

Is it that spiritual supremacy which, until the oath was changed in the time of William, all were obliged to swear that he possessed—that supremacy which Cranmer assigned to Edward the Sixth, whereby he made the crown the source of all the powers of a bishop, as much as it was the source of the powers of a sheriff or of a general of division? If so, no Catholic could maintain such an impiety. Or is it that supremacy whereby the Sovereign is entitled to rule all degrees and estates within this realm, and to punish with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers? if this be the supremacy which the Charge assigns to him, and that it be fairly and liberally understood, I see no reason why any person should withhold it; but if it be augmented into a

right to interfere with the freedom of the Catholic Church, or the essential and inalienable rights of the bishops and clergy in union with their head, to rule that church over which the Holy Ghost placed them, as Paul testifies, by their preaching the gospel, by their administering the sacraments, and exercising, when necessary, the power of excommunication, then do we differ from all those who would assign it to the sovereign.

“Maintaining the supremacy of the sovereign in opposition to the Church of Rome, which held and imposed tenets in direct opposition to all; it abjured the fundamental errors and despotism of that Church, and with them the multiplied corruptions and abuses which they had engendered.”

This is the language of a man accustomed to repeat the most offensive calumnies, without attempting either to uphold them by argument or to justify them by even a plausible misrepresentation.

“And so having purified them from the dross of superstition, and having restored religion to the true and ancient Catholic standard.”

Religion clearly could not have departed from the church, nor from the true and Catholic standard, whatever the learned prelate may understand by that “standard,” unless the spirit of truth departed from the earth, or that Christ failed in his promise of being with his Apostles in the persons of their successors, ALL DAYS, even to the consummation of the world.”

“It (the Protestant Church,) became worthy of adoption by a government that had the valour, &c.”

What then? Does the archbishop take to the account of the Church, the cruel, the bloody, the disgraceful, the horrid scenes in which she was made to act so conspicuous a part in the times of Henry, Somerset and Elizabeth?

Was the denial of the pope's supremacy the act of the Church? was the divorce of Queen Catherine the act of the Church? was the bastardizing of Mary, the lawfulness of Anne Boylen's marriage, with all the subsequent divorces and marriages of the monster Henry, were these the acts of the Church? or if they were, was the reconciliation with the Pope through Cardinal Pole, or the subsequent recantation of it under Elizabeth, the acts of the Church? were the several creeds of Cranmer, whether under Henry or Edward, acts of the Church? were the backslidings of the bishops in the time of Charles, acts of the Church? or was it only in the days of his profligate son that she proved worthy of adoption by the government?

It is truly astonishing to find men in those times, hazarding before the public, assertions which must prove them either profoundly ignorant of past events, or totally reckless of their own literary character, as well as of the character of that Church, which, like a man of low or questionable birth or descent, is best protected by silence and forbearance.

There is no person in this country who knows any thing of past times, who does not know that the despotic Tudors changed the religion of the country, remodeled the Church, prescribed to her a creed and discipline, and made her the very hand-maid of the state. The feeble efforts which mark her place of servitude under the Stuarts were the effect, not of any virtue or independence which she retained as a Church, but of those feelings and passions, (many

of them laudable,) which at that period animated the bulk of the nation, and from which even the churchmen were not exempt.

“The Established Church is loyal,” who doubts it? where is the *pampered slave* who is not attached to his master; whosoever has a servant under his orders, says to him, go, and he goeth, come, and he cometh, and if he know the will of his master and doeth it not, he will be beaten with many stripes; yet, when he has done all that was assigned to him, he is still but an unprofitable servant.

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 chearfully; in every country, and under whatsoever circumstances, she offers up, as is prescribed by St. Paul, prayers and petitions for the king, and 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 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.

I shall never again condescend to argue this subject. Let the man who has read history, and observed the conduct of the Catholic clergy and people in the different states of Europe for the last three centuries, and yet harbour this opinion, remain in his prejudice. Let him, if he will be the foe of our civil liberties on this ground. Whilst he retained such an opinion, I should hesitate to receive any favour at his hands, for if I did, I should receive it from the hand I scorned.

But to such a man I would say, not that the allegiance of the Catholic is undivided, but that should the Irish ever violate their allegiance, they will do so, not as Catholics, but as men driven by a cruel and protracted tyranny to take refuge in despair. Some individual of them, stripped of his property, banished from his home, his religion scoffed at, his sufferings reviled—some such man may wrest the child of his heart from the hands of the proselytizer, or the embrace of her persecutor—he may take her to the forum, plunge a dagger in her heart, and set a nation on fire by the sprinkling of her blood. In such a case conscience is silenced, the duty of allegiance is erased from the heart, and he who but just before was a good christian and a loyal subject, now agitated by revenge, becomes savage as the tiger; he despises life, scoffs at danger and at death, and slaking his thirst with human blood, exclaims with Cato:

A day, an hour, of virtuous liberty,
Is worth a whole eternity of bondage.

To this terrific consummation this devoted country may be driven, if such opinions and principles as are promulgated by Doctor Magee, become rules of thought and conduct with those who should consult her peace. And those men who are now reviled, because they endeavour to direct the storm, which already blows too strongly, will be praised by posterity for their efforts, however fruitless, to save a sinking state. Whosoever, in times to come, will walk across the solitude into which this country may be turned, whilst he sighs over the fate of its past inhabitants, will join the voice of their blood in crying to heaven for vengeance on those heartless, ruthless men, whose continued and implacable injustice, had arrayed brother against brother, and *settled* their native country by converting it into a heap of ruins.

The observations of Doctor Magee, with regard to the difference of the christian doctrine as taught in the Catholic Church, and in the Protestant Established Church of the united kingdom, are not, probably, a fit subject of animadversion by me. The Archbishop has thought proper to hold forth to the public, the writer of a letter to Mr. Robertson on that subject, as a person who acted "insiduously," who "misrepresented the truth through interested motives," and did I undertake to repel such charges, I would seem to confess that they were credible, and that deceit, or a wish to misrepresent the truth could possibly find a place in that writer's breast. I might, did I dwell on this subject, also appear to vindicate the private opinion of an individual, rather than to refute the misrepresentations of the common creed and principles of Catholics which abound in "the Charge;" but individual selfishness has not, thanks to God, so far prevailed over my sense of duty, as to induce me to mix up the personal concerns of any person with the public interests. I shall, therefore,

leave this question to the cool and discriminating mind of Doctor Lawrence, who is treated by his brother, on this subject, with much less courtesy than his virtues or his station seemed to demand.

His Grace of Cashel has indeed, when treating of this subject on a late occasion in Limerick, endeavoured to make his opinions acceptable to a certain class, by noticing with less than his usual candour, a passage in a book quoted by his Grace as written by me. I say with less than his usual candour, for when adverting to the progress which infidelity had made during the last century, and contrasting for his purpose the state of a Catholic university on the continent, with that of the public seminaries in these countries, it should not have escaped his Grace, that lords Herbert and Boulingbroke—Blount, Collins, Hobbes, Shaftsbury, all English Protestants; Spinoza, Bayle, Rousseau, and, as I believe, also Helvetius, French or Dutch Calvinists, were the authors or importers of infidelity on the continent;—that all the Protestant seminaries there, without even an exception known to me, became, and *continue to this day*, infected with the principles alluded to, and that if those principles were not permitted to find a resting place in these countries, their exclusion was much more due to the eloquence of Burke, the vigour of Pitt, the jealousy and hatred of French domination, under the mask of liberty and equality, than to the genius of the Protestant religion, or the dispositions of a great portion of the then population of the empire. But however I may differ in opinion from Archbishop Lawrence—however I may lament, that in the House of Lords, his Grace of Cashel has been more influenced by his connexions than by the native impulse of his heart—however J. K. L. may have designated his latitude of belief, I shall always respect his talents, venerate his humane, benevolent, and pacific disposition, and though

he be a member of a new religion, I shall always say of his Grace, as Protestants were accustomed to write of S. S. Bernard and Xavier, *utinam cum talis sis noster esses*. His Grace is too well informed to look upon it as degrading to have the

Nova superstitio veterum ignorata deorum.—VIRGIL.

restored to the rank and dignity of an integral portion of the Universal Church; and however impracticable such a restoration may appear to his Grace, without doubt, he must consider it as one of those beautiful speculations eminently good and supremely desirable, though not, in his opinion, compatible with the infirmity or perverseness of this world in which we dwell. His Grace may not see a difference which could not be remedied between the rules of faith in two Churches, *one* of which declares such rule to be the word of God as proposed to the judgment of each individual, by the Church; the *other* presenting it as the word of God interpreted by each individual, but subject to the authority of the Church, she being authorized to excommunicate whomsoever dissents from her interpretation of it. About what is, or what is not the word of God, there may be an essential difference between the Churches, but as to human traditions being added to the revelation of God, or erected above it, as is set forth in "the Charge," his Grace knows that such assertions are unfounded, nay, that they flow only from minds in which the passions have established their empire.

It is equally well known to his Grace, that of all the doctrines of both Churches, said by Doctor Magee to be opposed to each other, there are several, to say the least, rendered so by the distorting comments of furious men, rather than by the spirit of union and of peace.

A singular instance of the nature and tendency of such comments may be seen in a pamphlet, signed N. and written by some very grave personage, as a comment upon the late Charge of his Grace of Cashel.

In this pamphlet the doctrine of Catholics, regarding original sin, justification by Christ, the nature of good works, is grossly misrepresented. No man of learning, however, or of equity can be imposed on by such fictions; and as to the multitude who are deceived by them, and so kept not only estranged from their brethern, but in a state of accrimonious hostility towards them, they must be objects of compassion to Doctor Lawrence, and to every good man who believes that the God of the christians is a God not of dissension but of peace. Doctor Magee may declaim against the "numerous and deadly errors of the Church of Rome," but declamation or bold assertion is not proof; and every man of sense will question the veracity or justice of censures so severe, until he finds that they are sustained by authority or proved by argument. I not only deny that there are "numerous and deadly errors" taught by the Church of Rome, or by any Church in communion with her; BUT I ASSERT, THAT, IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO PROVE FROM THE SACRED SCRIPTURE THAT ANY ONE ARTICLE BELIEVED OR TAUGHT BY HER OR THEM, IS FORBIDDEN BY, OR CONTRARY TO THE REVEALED WILL OF GOD: Nay, more, I assert, that there is not one article or doctrine of the Creed of the Protestant Church, which can be proved by the sacred Scriptures, *in that respect, or in that sense*, in which it differs from, or is opposed to the doctrine of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church. And I add, if "numerous and deadly errors" prevailed in the Church of Rome, and in the Churches in communion with her, that the Church of Christ would have failed in all that is essential to its being,

that Christ himself would have been wanting to his promise—consequently not be the God of truth, and that divine faith is no longer existing on the earth. These are strong expressions, and what they announce is of great importance; I place them in juxta position with the uncalled for assertions of the writer of “the Charge,” and should he at any time, undertake to prove what he asserts, I promise, if blessed with life and health, to refute his proofs, and to establish what I have advanced. This, however, would be an ungrateful task, and undertaken, like that in which I am now engaged, through necessity, and not through choice.

I abhor dissension, I dislike controversy; I have never, but in the lawful defence of my Country or Religion, when both or either were assailed, not by vulgar calumniators, but by men of station, opened my lips or dipped my pen in ink to interest the public: I have never exhibited to the disgust or indignation of my fellow subjects, the tyranny, the absurdity, the hypocrisy of the furious men who assail us, unless when I apprehended that truth or justice imperatively required of me to speak or write in our defence. I have from my youth deeply imbibed the sentiment of Lucilius,

“Virtus est dare quod reipsa debetur honori,
Hostem esse.....morumque malorum
Contra, defensorem hominum morumque bonorum,
Hos magni facere, his bene velle, his vivere amicum,
Commoda præterea Patriæ sibi prima putare;”

and though I may never be able to ascend to the place allotted to the wise and good, as exhibited in the picture of this life by Epictetus, I shall never, God being my helper, cease to combat those furious or deceiving passions which infest the way, embarrass or corrupt mankind, and augment the number of human ills.

APPENDIX I.

The following Series of EXTRACTS not only shew the present deplorable state of the Protestant Churches throughout Europe, but also that Protestantism, after loosing every moral bond, terminates in infidelity.

La Religion Catholique Apostolique et Romaine, est incontestablement la seule sûre.....Mais, cette religion exige, en même temps, de ceux qui l'embrassent, la soumission la plus entière de la raison. Lorsqu'il se trouve, dans cette communion, un homme d'un esprit inquiet, rémuant, et difficile à contenter, il commence d'abord à s'établir juge de la vérité des dogmes qu'on lui propose à croire : et ne trouvant point cet objet de la foi un degré d'évidence que leur nature ne comporte pas, il se fait Protestant ; s'apercevant, bientôt de l'incohérence des principes qui caractérisent le protestantisme, il cherche dans le socinianisme une solution à ses doutes et à ses difficultés ; et il devient socinien. Du socinianisme, au Déisme, il n'y a qu'une nuance très-imperceptible et un pas à faire : il le fait, mais le déisme n'est lui-même qu'une religion inconséquente, il se précipite, insensiblement, dans le Pyrrhonisme, état violent et aussi humiliant pour l'amour propre qu'incompatible avec la nature de l'esprit humain. Enfin il finit par tomber dans l'athéisme."—*French Encyclopedia, Art unitaires.*

The State of the Protestant Churches of the Continent, by Robert Haldane, in his second Review of the Conduct of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

“The *majority* of pastors and professors of divinity in Germany, for about the last thirty years, have called themselves Rationalists. Rationalism consists in a sort of idolatry of the human understanding, and it therefore rejects all truth which cannot be discovered, except by Divine revelation. In Germany, the Churches seem to vanish by degrees ; they are often seen in ruins. Mr. Dassel, the first clergyman in Sladhagen, wrote a book in the year 1818, in which he endeavours to prove, that the time is come when all Churches should be changed into manufactories, because the people now are sufficiently enlightened to reject the former use of them. About the end and beginning of the last and present centuries, several clergymen recommended in their writings the giving up of the old superstition, and began to preach the best method of feeding cattle, on choosing good kinds of potatoes, on agriculture in general, &c. The people becoming generally dissatisfied with the Scriptures, and thinking that they can find the same morality in other books, often gave up attendance on public worship altogether. On the whole, the greatest number of the pastors and professors in the north-west and middle part of Germany, are Rational Naturalists ; in other words, decided *Deists*.”

“It is curious to observe in what manner the Rationalists get rid of all miracles. Professor Paulus, in his critical commentary, presents many instances of these explanations. The man with the withered hand had, as Paulus explains it in his commentary, only a luxation of the shoulder, which Jesus observing, pulled it into joint. Professor Schultness explains this miracle as follows : ‘The man had a severe rheumatism ; Christ observing that his blood was much moved by the indignation with which he heard the question of the Pharisees, said to him in that favourable moment, stretch out thine hand ; the man attempted to do it and was healed, because that extraordinary excitement had removed the impediment under which he laboured.’”

“ When Christ restored sight to the blind man, we are informed by such interpreters, that the poor fellow had such a weakness in his eyelids, that he could not keep his eyes open. But for a long time he had not attempted to open them, and Christ observing that he never made the attempt to do it, said to him, ‘ thou shalt open thine eyes.’ The confidence of the man in him, as the Messiah, was so great, that making the attempt with all his might, he opened his eyes.”

“ Christ never walked on the waves, but on the shore, or he swam behind the ship, or he walked through the shallows.”

“ The daughter of Jairus was not dead, because Christ himself said, she sleepeth.”

“ When Jesus said to Peter, ‘ thou shalt catch a fish and find in his mouth a piece of money ;’ the meaning is, before you can sell it for so much, you must first open its mouth to take out the hook.”

“ At Cana, in Galilee, Jesus gave a nuptial present of very fine wine, with which, for a joke, he filled the water-pots of stone.”

“ The paralytic, (John 5) was an idle fellow, who, for thirty-eight years, had moved neither hand or foot. Christ asked him the ironical question, perhaps thou wouldst be whole? This irony stirred him up; he forgot his hypocrisy, and running away with his bed, left that hospital in which he had lain thirty-eight years.”

“ When Jesus is said to have ascended into heaven, the disciples lost sight of him in a fog.”

“ Some of the Rationalists teach, that the Apostles were deceived ; others, that they were deceivers ; and some, that they were at once deceivers and deceived. In short, Rationalism is Deism, ornamented with some phrases of the New Testament, and produces such effects as we might expect from it.”

SWEDEN, NORWAY, AND FINLAND.

“ The tide of infidelity more slowly reached these northern countries, viz : Sweden, Norway and Finland ; but its arrival

was only the later and not the less disastrous. The faith of the people was very much overturned by the preachers of humanity, sent forth by the infidel university of Copenhagen. Norway, united to Denmark, at a time when that kingdom seemed to have entirely abandoned the religion of the Cross, and embraced the principles of the wildest and vilest infidelity, shared its fate of being egregiously darkened and wholly converted into a merely nominally christian church."

PRUSSIA.

"Among the number of stationary clergymen of the establishment in Berlin, there are *four*, besides a Moravian minister, who preach and live evangelically, but all the other pastors are either directly opposed or indifferent to the truth. But what is here stated of Berlin, is not to be taken as a criterion for the rest of Prussia by any means, but rather as an exception, as it is well too well known, that the rest of the Clergy, go almost where you will, are in a state of neologian darkness." (Neologists are the same as Rationalists, that is, Deists.)"

"The City of Dantzick (with a population of about 50,000 souls,) affords a truly affecting spectacle, in a religious sense. During a stay there of nearly two months, I had full proof that the candle of the Lord was removed not from one, but from every religious body in the city."

HUNGARY.

"The state of religion amongst the Hungarians filled him with sorrow and grief, to behold such a multitude of people, who still bear the name of Protestant Christians, but who are very little better than the heathens, either in refined scepticism or gross superstition. The value of a Minister (among them) is rated according to his oratorical powers, no matter what doctrine he teaches, or what tenets he holds."

HOLLAND.

"Arianism and Socinianism have, during the last 25 years,

made great progress in the academies, and the reformed churches, although they preserve more or less the forms of orthodoxy, yet the spirit and life of it are wanting among the greatest number of pastors."

OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANTS.

"The Protestant college at Montanbau, (the only institution in France for the education of Protestant pastors) has been singularly unhappy in the appointment of those who have occupied the divinity department—while a few good pastors may be found in France, who, in spite of that miserable course of instruction under which they were placed, have been brought to the knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. It may easily be conceived how unfit the great body of the Protestant ministers must be for their office, Arians, Socinians, Neologists, of no fixed opinion whatever as respects the gospel—they are in general, blind leaders of the blind."

*EXTRACTS from L'histoire des Sectes Religieuses, par
M. Grégoire. Paris, 1814.*

"Dans les rémontrances du clergé présentées à Louis XVIII. en 1780 les évêques s'expriment ainsi : 'sans invoquer la notoriété publique, et sans se prévaloir des aveux échappés à l'indiscrétion de célèbres Calvinistes, n'avons-nous pas vu l'école même de Genève, donner, il y a trois ans le scandaleux spectacle d'une thèse publique non contredite, dans laquelle on n'a pas rougi de mettre en problème la divinité de notre Seigneur Jesus-Christ, borne immuable qui sépare toujours le simple déisme du christianisme ?'"

"Un Académicien de Berlin me disait que le Protestantisme (c'est sa religion) est à michemin de l'incrédulité ; un autre savant de la même communion, Stapfer, se plaint des Théologiens, qui par leur nouvelle Exegèse escamotent au peuple sa

religion : car la plupart des innovations religieuses en Allemagne sont leur ouvrage."

" G. F. Gruner, dans ses institutions de théologie dogmatique prétend que l'Eglise est en erreur sur la Trinité et l'expiation par Jesus-Christ."

" Le professeur Gambord, dans un ouvrage Danois intitulé ' Jesu Moral,' ne montre le Redempteur que comme un ambassadeur de la Divinité envoyé aux hommes."

" Bassedow, a Dessaw, se disait Arien ou plutôt Déiste et voulait qu'on bâtît un temple à la providence."

" Semler, dans ses ouvrages historiques sur le Christianisme le réduit à n'être qu'une doctrine purement humaine."

" Le Docteur Bahrdt, connu par l'étendue de ses connaissances et son libertinage, révoque en doute la réalité de la mort de Jesus-Christ et sa résurrection."

" Le ministre Schulz à Gielsdorf, en Brandenbourg, prêchait contre la divinité de Jesus-Christ, sa résurrection, sa Missiaon et celle de Moïse : des ministres ont pris, la défense de Schulz entre autres Loeffler, surintendant de Gotha. Quand on connaît Loeffler : on éprouve des regrets aimers de voir un homme si distingué dans les rangs de ceux qui voudraient ébranler les vérités fondamentales du christianisme."

" De Vos conseiller de cour à Weiman consent qu'on enseigne les hommes qui ont atteint la virilité d'après l'ancienne doctrine : mais il veut qu'on procède autrement pour la génération nouvelle."

" Le Docteur Bock, dans son Histoire des écrivains anti-trinitaires donne la notice de cent quarante-quatre. Certes actuellement on pourrait en doubler le nombre."

" Sleinbart distingue deux systèmes religieux : l'un pour le peuple, l'autre pour les savans. La religion Chrétienne n'est, à son avis, que la religion naturelle clairement exposée par Jesus Christ et nécessaire au peuple qui se conduit par son autorité ; mais inutile aux hommes instruits, qui ont la raison pour guide."

" L'électeur de Saxe en 1776 rendit un édit contre le soci-nianisme, que plusieurs savans, dit-il, cherchent à répandre."

“ Le sénat d'Ulm a défendu aux ministres de prêcher le socinianisme, qu'on prêche également à Copenhague, un ministre ayant dans un sermon, parlé de Jesus-Christ comme s'il n'était qu'un homme vertueux, reçut des reproches de l'évêque..... mais tout ce qu'il en résulta, c'est que, dès le dimanche suivant, toute la cour vint au sermon du curé.”

“ Les Protestans Français sont arrivés au même terme que ceux des autres contrées..... On voit par la collection intitulée *Acta Ecclesiastica*, publiée à Weiman pendant près d'un siècle, que depuis long-temps le socinianisme s'était répandu dans le pays de Vaud.”

“ Les ministres Gênévois interrogés, il y a une cinquantaine d'années, sur la divinité de Jesus-Christ, firent attendre pendant six semaines une réponse qui n'exigeait qu'une minute par oui, ou non. A cette occasion J. J. Rousseau, dans ses lettres de la Montagne disait ‘ Les Réformés de nos jours, du moins les ministres, ne connaissent ou n'aiment plus leur religion. Un philosophe les pénètre, les voit Ariens sociniens : il le dit, et pense leur faire honneur ; mais il ne voit pas qu'il expose leur intérêt personnel, la seule chose qui généralement, décide ici bas de la bonne foi des hommes. Aussitôt alarmés, éffrayés ils s'assemblent, ils discutent, ils s'agitent, ils ne savent à quel saint se vouer : et après forces de consultations, délibérations, conférences, le tout aboutit à un amphigouri où l'on ne dit ni oui ni non..... O Gênévois ! ce sont de singulières gens que vos ministres on ne sait ce qu'ils croient ni ce qu'ils ne croient pas, on ne sait pas même ce qu'ils font semblant de croire : leur seule manière d'établir leur foi est d'attaquer celle des autres.”

EXTRACTS from the Sermons of the Rev. Hugh James Rose, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, on the state of the Protestant Religion in Germany.

“ A large portion of the Protestant Churches of Germany hailed these principles (the principles of Rationalism) with

delight, and spread with eagerness this purer system of Christianity. It was taught by her divines from the pulpit,—by her professors from the chairs,—it was addressed to the old, as the exhortation which was to free them from the weight and burden of ancient prejudices and observances,—and to the young, as that knowledge which alone could make them truly wise, or send them into life with right and rational views. With the exception of Lessing, or, at most, one or two others, all the writers to whom I allude, are at least doctors in divinity. Paulus, one of the most atrocious of the party, was professor of divinity at Wurzburg. I cannot say whether he holds the same office at Heidleberg, where he now resides. De Wett, Kiu-noel, Wegscheider, and many others, are professors, either ordinary or extraordinary, in the Universities to which they belong. It need not be added, that the Protestant Church of that Country (Germany) is the mere shadow of a name. For this abdication of Christianity was not confined to either the Lutheran or Calvinistic profession, but extended its baleful and withering influence with equal force over each. It is equally unnecessary to add, that its effects were becoming daily more conspicuous in a growing indifference to Christianity in all ranks and degrees of the nation.”

“ They (the rationalizing divines) are bound by no law, but their own fancies ; some are more, and some less extravagant ; but I do them no injustice, after this declaration, in saying, that the general inclination and tendency of their opinions (more or less forcibly acted on) is this, that, in the New Testament, we shall find only the *opinions* of Christ and the Apostles adapted to the age in which they lived, and not eternal truths ; that Christ himself had neither the design, nor the power of teaching any system which was to endure ; that, when he taught any enduring truth, as he occasionally did, it was without being aware of its nature ; that the Apostles understood still less of real religion ; that the whole doctrine, both of Christ and his Apostles, as it is directed to the Jews alone, so it was gathered in fact from no other source than the Jewish philosophy ; that

Christ himself erred, and his Apostles spread his errors, and that, consequently, no one of his doctrines is to be received on their authority; but that without regard to the authority of the books of Scripture, and their asserted divine origin, each doctrine is to be examined according to the principles of right reason, before it is allowed to be divine."

"It will be sufficient to say, that they who wish to form a notion of the German method of explaining the doctrines of Scripture, as to the Saviour, the Atonement, and all the consequent doctrines, need only turn to the page of ecclesiastical history for a record of the various heresies of the early ages, and that they will also find a tolerable picture of them in the most violent English Unitarians. The Trinity, Incarnation, and descent of the Spirit are positively denied:—Christ was a mere man. The doctrine was not made up or established for nearly the three first ages. The doctrine of the Fall, and of Original Sin, is set aside entirely. God has always raised up men to repress vice and encourage virtue, as, especially, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Zeno, Seneca, Marcus Antonius, Zoroaster, Confucius, and Mahomet, but, among all, the greatest reverence is due to Jesus the Nazerene."

"It is expressly acknowledged, that, in Scripture, literally understood, there are some grounds (Semina) for the orthodox, as to the two natures in Christ, yet, as such a doctrine is of no use to the attainment of virtue, but rather prejudicial, by diminishing the force of Christ's example, as it contradicts reason, and some other declarations of Scripture, it is better to adopt the other side of the question. All the notions of glorifications are either without ground, or mythi (fables,) all notion of his Atonement is renounced. It appears unnecessary to go through the whole doctrines usually taught by the orthodox Churches, as it is obvious, that after these principles, the whole exposition of the doctrine is, and must be, Socinian at least."

"Some went so far as to attack the whole body of the Prophets as impostors, in the most outrageous and revolting terms. Faith in these deceivers, it is said in one of their books, is 'the

cause of there being no real faith in the world.' There is a book called, 'Moses and Jesus,' by Buchholz, published at Berlin, 1806, in which, Moses especially, is abused, accused first of deceit and then of terrorism. Ammon says, that, leaving to philosophers to decide whether the gift of prophecy be possible or not, it is quite clear that Christ himself renounces the power; (Mat. 24, 36. Acts 1, 7,) and that therefore there are no prophecies of his in the New Testament; that prophecies are recorded in the Bible as uttered by men of doubtful character, as Num. 22, 5, 1st King, 22, 22, that many are obscure, and are never fulfilled, and that others seem to have been made after the event, that all are reckoned obscure and imperfect by the Apostles themselves. As these accusations apply, he says, to almost all the prophecies of Old and New Testament, it must be confessed that the argument from prophecy needs whatever excuse it can find, both in the delirium of the prophets, who were transported out of their sense, (John 11, 31, 2nd Peter 1, 21,) the double sense in which they are quoted in the New Testament, (Mat. 2, 23, Rom. 10, 18,) and the remarkable variety of interpretations. Ammon and Wegscheider further say, that Jesus, in Mat. 11, 11, Luke 7, 28, spoke in terms of contempt of the Hebrew prophets, which is quite untrue. Wegscheider adds, that prophecies would favour fatalism, and that there are no prophecies, properly so called, sufficiently clear in either Testament."

"With respect to the miracles, when they were urged, as proof of immediate agency, by some, they were said to be that mythology which must attend every religion to gain the multitude; by some, the common and well known arguments and ribaldry of the infidel were unsparingly used; by one or more, high in station in the Church, some artifice, and probably magnitism, has been within the last ten years suggested. From the less daring, however, the answer was always, either that it was impossible that there should have been a miracle under such circumstances; or that, even allowing Christ to have had the power of working miracles, it was highly improbable that, in

the particular case alleged, he would have judged it right to exert it; and secondly, the words were examined, and, by every possible distortion, they were forced into any meaning but their own. Rosenmuller says, that miracles have lost all their force as proofs; and Thies, the translator of the New Testament, says, that neither the conversion of St. Paul nor the ascension of Christ, will now make converts; for, as the sphere of nature enlarges, miracles vanish. On the conversion of St. Paul, see Bretshuneider. Wegscheider says, that the story is so told, that we can make nothing of it, and that we must remember that St. Paul was much inclined to visions and extacies. And as to the ascension of Christ, Wegscheider has written expressly to prove it a mythus. Wegscheider says, that *though Christ seemed* to the standers by to expire, yet after a few hours, being given up to the *sedulous* care of his friends, he returned to life on the third day. Paulus tells us, that Christ did not really die, but suffered a fainting fit. One person, called Breneck, has written a book, to shew that Christ lived twenty-seven years on earth after his ascension. Another author says, 'that although we had better leave things as they are for the vulgar, who must have something extreme to rely on, yet divines should examine and find out the truth, that we see, in every religion many *mythi of the generations, incarnations, and apparitions of the gods*; and that they who call Mahomet an imposter, and Zoroaster mad—who laugh at the story of Buddha's generation from a virgin, who conceived him by a rainbow—or at Mahomet's discourses with Gabriel, &c., should not be angry if people examine the stories of Enoch, Moses, Sampson, &c. &c. or put the greatest part of what is related of Jesus and the Apostles into the class of fables; that the real religion of Jesus is rational, but that when he found that men could not be driven from their views otherwise, he began to assume a supernatural authority, and play the part of a prophet, and afterwards took up that of the Messiah, because some of his admirers thought he must be the person.' Afterwards 'he decides, that it was most probable Jesus had deceived himself, and was really per-

suaded himself, that he did possess supernatural powers, and that he was thus an enthusiast in the best sense."

"We see," says Luther, "that through the malice of the devil, men are now more avaricious, more cruel, more disorderly, more insolent, and much more wicked, than they were under popery."—(In Postil. Dom. part 1; Dom. 2, Adv.) "If any one wish," says Musculus, "to see a multitude of knaves, disturbers of the public peace, &c., let him go to a city where the gospel is preached in its purity," (he means a reformed city;) "for it is clearer than the light of the day, that never were pagans more vicious and disorderly than those professors of the gospel."—(Dom. 1. Adv.)—"The thing," says Melancthon, "speaks for itself. In this country, among the reformed, their whole time is devoted to intemperance and drunkenness, (*immanibus poculis*. So deeply are the people sunk into barbarity and ignorance, that many of them would imagine that they should die in the night, if they should chance to fast in the day."—(Ad. Cap. 6, lat.) Neither was this growth of vice and ignorance confined to foreign kingdoms. "In this nation," says Stubbs, (Motives of Good Works, with an Epistle dedicatorie to the Lord Mayor of London, an. 1596,) after he had made the tour of England, "I found a general decay of good works, or rather a plain defection or falling away from God.—For good works, who sees not that they," (the papists of former times,) "were far before us, and we far behind them?"—Erasmus thus describes the fruits of the reformation; he was, indeed, a Catholic; but a Catholic whom the Protestants allow to have been impartial.—"And who," says he, "are those gospel people?—Look around you, and shew me one who has become a better man; shew me one, who, once a glutton, is now turned sober; one, who, before violent, is now meek; one, who, before avaricious, is now generous; one, who, before impure, is now chaste. I can point out multitudes, who are worse than they were before. * * * * What tumults and seditions mark their conduct!—For what trifles do they fly to

arms !—St. Paul commanded the first christians to shun the society of the wicked ; and, behold ! the reformers seek most the society of the most corrupted ; these are their delight. The gospel now flourishes ; forsooth, because priests and monks take wives in opposition to human laws, and in despite of their sacred vows.” Capito, a great partizan of Luther, (Epist. ad Farrell, int. Calv. p. 5,) writes thus to Farrell, a leader among the Calvinists. “ I acknowledge the great evils which we have occasioned in the church, by rejecting, with so much imprudence and precipitation, the authority of the Pope. The people is now without bridle or curb, and despises all authority ; as if by abolishing the papacy, we had suppressed, in the same manner, the power of the servants of the church, and the efficacy of the sacraments ! Every one now exclaims—I have enough to guide myself ! As I have the gospel to lead me to the discovery of Jesus Christ and his doctrines, what need I of other help ?”—“ All the waters of the Elbe,” Melancthon writes to one of his correspondents, (Melancth. Ep. 1, iv. Ep. 100–129,) “ would not give me sufficient tears to bewail the miseries of the reformation.” Bishop Burnett gives the following view of the state of morality in England, in the reign of Edward VI. (History of the Reformation, part 2, p. 226)—“ The sins of England did, at that time, call down from heaven heavy curses. They are sadly expressed in a discourse that Ridley wrote after, under the title *Of the Lamentation of England* : he says, that “ lechery, oppression, pride, covetousness, and a hatred and scorn of all religion, were generally spread among all people ; but chiefly those of higher rank.”—“ Lechery,” says Latimer, “ is used in England, and such lechery, as is used in no other part of the world. And it is made a matter of sport, a trifle, not to be passed on or reformed.” Luther describes his conduct and feelings, while he remained within the pale of the Catholic religion, and observed the rules of his order :—“ When I lived in my monastery, I punished my body with watching, fasting and prayer ; I observed my vows of chastity, poverty and obedience.—Whatsoever I did, it was with singleness

of heart ; with good zeal, and for the glory of God, &c. I feared grievously the last day, and was, from the bottom of my heart, desirous of being saved." (Ad Gal.) After he had commenced reformer :—" I am burnt," he said, " with the flames of my untamed flesh ; I am mad almost with the rage of lust, and the desire of women. I, who ought to be fervent in spirit, am fervent in impurity, in sloth, &c. (In Col. Mens.) Relying on the strong foundation of my learning, I yield not, in pride, either to the emperor, prince, or devil ; no, not to the universe itself.—(Resp. ad Maled. Regni Angliæ.) Fletcher's translation of these three passages.—*Sermons*, vol. 2, p. 116-117.

The following Quotations shew the admirable accordance of the present with the past state of Protestantism.

" There are *among* us, those not less in darkness and ignorance than those that are to be found in the pagodas of China, or who, amidst the deepest wilds of Indian forests, sacrifice their children, or prostitute themselves before demons, at whom they tremble, but whom as Gods they adore."—*Home Missionary Magazine*, Jan. 1820, p. 22.—(Speech of John Wilks, Esq., Chairman at a Home Missionary Meeting.) At the same meeting the Rev. Mr. Iron stated, " In our own country, there were MILLIONS whose consciences were *never* appealed to by faithful ambassadors, and who *never* heard of the Prince of Life." The Rev. Mr. Evans stated, " that he had travelled through districts of twenty miles without a single school for religious instruction." In the Report read at the first annual meeting of the Parent Home Missionary Society, held May 15, 1820, it is stated in reference to " Northumberland, Cumberland, Durham, and part of Lancashire," that " darkness covers this part of England, and gross darkness the people" p. 2. that " the more internal parts of Northumberland are awfully destitute, and the people are living in the greatest darkness." p. 3.

That the county of Worcester "has been termed the garden of England ; but in a moral light it may be regarded as a waste, howling wilderness." p. 4. Staffordshire is stated to contain three hundred thousand inhabitants, "the greater part of whom sit in darkness and the gloomy shades of overspreading death." pages 4 and 5—Again, "Oxfordshire presents but a dreary desert." p. 5. And a "moral wilderness of awful dimensions." p. 7.—As to a part of Berkshire, it is stated, "no one unacquainted with similar scenes, can form an adequate idea of the extreme ignorance of the inhabitants of those villages." p. 5. The writer adds, "not only these villages, but a number of others near us, are similarly situated ; in one of them, the villages are in a state of complete mental darkness." p. 6. (Second Report of the Home Missionary Society, p. 12.) The framers of this report, state, that Mr. Sparks preached in four places, which "were mere moral wildernesses, and knew nothing of evangelical truth." p. 14. In the third annual report, it is distinctly asserted, that "none but those who have taken the trouble to explore the village population, can possibly conceive their wretched state of ignorance, and the degree of vice that prevails amongst them."—One of the Missionaries, on entering on his station, complains of "numbers greatly increased, moral degradation unusually deepened, ignorance with insensibility united, wickedness blended with every vice, and heightened into barbarity of manners." p. 24. Another says, "I verily believe, that this is the worst place under the heavens, for men, women, and children seem to glory in blaspheming the name of the Lord." p. 25. Another tells the Committee, "that his station exceeds every thing he ever witnessed for wickedness, for cock-fighting, for bull-baiting ; quarrelling, drunkenness, and lewdness generally prevail." p. 25. In the fourth annual report it is admitted, notwithstanding all their evangelizing labours, that "infidelity like a mighty flood, has been devastating society with the most awful errors and moral abominations." p. 15. Their fifth annual report, adopted 5th May last, and the reports

of the Baptist Home Missionary Society, are all in the same strain. In conclusion, the Committee states, "there are thousands of villages within the limits prescribed by your regulations, where the joyful sound of a preached Gospel is never heard." p. 15. So much for the "CENTRE OF LIGHT."

"The characteristics of the present times are confessedly incredulity and an unprecedented indifference to the religion of Christ."—*Bishop Prettyman's Charge*, 1800, p. 10.

Even in this country there is an almost universal lukewarmness and indifference respecting the essentials of religion."—*Bishop Barrington's Charge*, 1797, p. 2.

A late Bishop of London in his Charge, 1790, p. 14, informed us that in his diocese, there were many hundreds of wretched, ignorant, young creatures, of both sexes, totally destitute of all education, totally unacquainted with the very first elements of religion."

"In the population of England alone 1,170,000 children it is much to be feared, grow up to an adult state without any education at all, and almost without any useful impressions of religion and morality. In the present state of things, it is not too much to say, that every thirty years, at least four millions and a half of adults must, in case a remedy is not applied, mingle in the general population of the kingdom without any fixed principles of rectitude, and with very little knowledge either of religion or morality."—*Colquhoun's New System of Education*, p. 72, 73.

"It appears from the official documents which Mr. Yates has collected and compared, that within the small circle of ten miles round London, no less than nine hundred and seventy seven thousand souls are shut out from the common pastoral offices of the national religion.—"Shut out says Mr. Yates, from the pale of the Church, from all participation in its benefits, they are necessarily driven to join the ranks of injurious opposition, either in dissent and sectarian enthusiasm, or in the infinitely more dangerous opposition of infidelity, atheism, and ignorant

depravity." Well he may add, that, "such a mine of Heathenism and consequent profligacy and danger, under the very meridian (as it is supposed) of christian illumination, cannot be contemplated without terror."—*Quarterly Review for Oct. 1820*, p. 554.

"I doubt much whether the immorality of Edinburgh is not equal, perhaps greater, than that of London."—*John Macculloch, M.D. F.R.S. The Highlands of Scotland.*

"Let any who are acquainted with the different parts of England, whose avocations carry them into connexion with various persons—let them testify to the truth, and they will bear me out in saying, that in England there exists a bigoted obstinacy against the true religion." Again, "that the bulk of the peasantry of England require immediate and continual endeavours to instruct them concerning the truth, as it is in Christ Jesus."—*Rev. Hugh M'Neil, Report for the year 1824, of the Continental Bible Society*, p. 68.

"It is of the utmost importance, that all persons who desire that the preaching of the gospel may be heard on the Continent, should bear continually in mind, that the word Protestant, means nothing but a person who does not go through the ceremonies prescribed by the Church of Rome, and who has, together with the superstitions, for the most part renounced also every fundamental of Christianity."—*Report, an. 1823, of the Continental Bible Society*, p. 41-2.

"It should be observed, that Catholicism and Protestantism there, (on the Continent,) do not mean what Catholicism and Protestantism mean in England. The former admits of all the fundamentals of Christianity—whilst the latter denies the basis of Christianity altogether."—*Mr. Drummond, Report 1824*, p. 63-4.

"The populace of England are more more ignorant of their religious duties, than they are in any other Christian country." It would make "any one Christian heart bleed to think (says Bp. Croft,) how many thousands souls there are in this land, that have no more knowledge of God than heathens; thousands of the mendicant condition, and thousands of the

mean husbandry-men, as they grow up to be men, grow mere babes in religion ; so ignorant, as scarce to know their heavenly Father." At this day the case is worse than Bishop Croft represented it.—*Quarterly Rev. No. 37, Sep. 1818, p. 20, On the means of improving the people, &c.*

"Infidelity is a rank weed, it threatens to overspread the land, its root is principally fixed amongst the great and opulent."—*Bp. Watson in his apology for the Bible, last page.*

"J'ai voulu indiquer comment les croyances protestantes ont dû disparoître toutes, et laisser la religion vacante dans leurs contrées respectives : comment leur diversité et en dépit de leurs professions de foi, elles ont eu pour tout product un vague déisme qui a engendré la doctrine des prétendus sages du dix-huitieme siecle. J'ai la conscience intime d'avoir écrit sans passion et je donne comme résultat certain, d'après mes recherches et mes méditations, la dispésition totale du protestantisme : Il n'y a réellement plus de Lutheriens ni de Calvinistes : il n'ya plus de mystiques dans les rangs des réformés, il ne s'y trouve même plus de Sociniens, on n'y reconnoît qu'une masse de sentimens confus composés de raisonnemens et de sensations indéfinies et à laquelle l'Allemagne protestante a donné elle-même le nom de *religiosite* pour la distinguer de la religion. La morale s'y rencontre jusqu'à un certain point : mais la foi en a disparu."—*M. le Baron d'Eckstein, dans son Protestant converti à la foi catholique, œuvre intitulé "le Catholique."*

The few remarks here following, are the reluctant evidence of Protestant writers, against that nominal religion, which they vainly seek to uphold, and in favour of that holy and always enduring faith, whose efficacy and merits they are obliged to acknowledge.

"What must they (the Catholics,) conclude concerning Protestants, and the cause of the reformation, when they seethat the name Protestant pastor, is sufficient to sanction every heresy, while the doctrines of the gospel are entirely disregarded? No wonder they openly declare that the state of religion amongst Protestants, forms the strongest argument against the

reformation ! In their Church there are fundamental doctrines retained of the highest importance, which, if really embraced, will conduct to life eternal. But the state of the public ministry, in many Protestant Churches is such, that salvation, by means of it, is impossible."—*Second Rev. of the British and Foreign Bible Society, by Robert Haldane, p. 120.*

"At whatever hour you enter a Catholic place of worship, (on the Continent) some persons will be found at one or other of its altars, on their knees, abstracted in solitary devotion, whether the church be full or crowded with spectators. At the hour of vespers, you hear the evening hymn from every house in a village : and in the streets of a busy and populous town, at the sound of the vesper bell, the passengers uncover their heads, and halt or utter a prayer as they pass on." "Comparing the state of mind which is thus produced, with that of our own town populace, if the populace alone were considered, we might almost wish that they had still been suckled in a creed out-worn." Again, "They (the Continental Catholics) may have their jest against the priest, and their tale and their proverb against the friar, but this levity leaves no leaven of infidelity behind, it passes as it comes, and the principle of faith remains unaffected. The observation of every intelligent person who has travelled in Catholic Countries, may safely be appealed to in proof that we have not exaggerated the effect which is produced upon the popular mind, by the forms and discipline of the Catholic Church."—*Quarterly Review for October 1820, p. 557.*

"The Protestantism of the Continent, is a system from which the whole of Christianity is excluded, but the forms. In fact, of the two, if I were to judge, I would say popery is the best."—*Rev. Dr. Thorpe, Report of the Continental Bible Society, for the year 1824, p. 64.*

"There are pious Catholics who adhere to the doctrine of the divinity of the Son of God, who and consequently will, we doubt not, be themselves saved : while on the other hand, multitudes calling themselves Protestants, have destroyed the very

foundation of a sinner's hope."—*Robert Haldane in his letter to M. Chenevière, p. 124.*

The foregoing extracts have been selected, not without industry and attention, from a large mass of others of a similar nature or tendency; they are submitted, without a comment almost, to every sincere christian. Let him reflect on the occasion which called them forth—and then refer them to the tribunal of his own conscience, before he is himself presented before the tribunal of his God !

APPENDIX II.

*EXTRACT from the Dublin Weekly Register of
November 4th, 1826.*

“The Church of England and Ireland presents itself as tolerant. * * * * * If, indeed, in the *first days* of the Reformation, during the perilous struggles of the glorious divines and martyrs who laboured to rescue the Catholic Church from the despotism and corruption of the Roman, *some* acts are discoverable, which *connect* our Church immediately with intolerance, it must be remembered that the long reign of Popery had rendered Europe so familiar with the idea of persecution, for the sake of religion, that it is not to be wondered that *some vestige* of this sad corruption of Christianity should have *lingered* with others, from which those most excellent of men, reared, as they had been, in all the errors of Popery, were not able *at once* to effect their perfect emancipation. But from the time when the Church of England and Ireland became *fully* released from this antichristian influence, and when she had assumed her true form, adjusted to the sound Scriptural principles on which she was founded, what do we find in the language in which she gives her sense of the Christian doctrines, in the spirit which pervades her formularies, or in the temper which has distinguished all her genuine sons and followers, but *the truest toleration and the most Christian charity?*”—(Charge of Dr. Magee, Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, at his late visitation.)

SIR,—There can be no surer standard whereby to measure the tolerance of protestantism than the Acts of the English Parliament : they are not like the Decrees of Councils, made in remote ages, whose language may now be tortured by different interpretations. No, the English Statutes are understood to the letter, for they have been acted upon even within our own time, and they cannot claim the excuse of being enacted by men living secluded from the world, or whose minds were soured by austerities and mortifications, for they are the councils of men, enjoying all the sweets of social and domestic happiness. Such are the authorities by which I frame my opinion ; and the abstract of them, which I annex, must satisfy every mind, that the mild tolerance of the Church of England is a gross delusion, and that there is another and *a more intolerant Church than that of Rome.*

As many writers, in their zeal for the Reformation, will not allow the eighth Harry to be the first Reformer, I have to *eschew* contention, commenced with the reign of King Edward the Sixth. In the year 1548, this young prince, as supreme head, had it ordained and enacted, that any clergyman not using the Book of Common Prayer, and other rites, ‘ according to the Church of England,’ or using any other form of prayer, should *suffer imprisonment during life.* This bold beginning with the Pastors must have reduced their flock, then the whole population of the kingdom, to a pretty alternative ! Hume says, that one third of the Clergy of England were *deprived for non-conformity* ; and with this precedent full in view, why should we wonder to see the regicides under Cromwell, in the next century, depriving and abolishing Archbishops, and all other Dignitaries, and selling their estates, to carry on the war against their King ! King Edward’s attention was next directed to the Laity : in 1551 it was enacted, that every person should resort to where the Book of Common Prayer, &c. shall be used, under pain of Church censures ; and that if any person be present at any form of prayer or ecclesiastical rites, other than those set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, he

shall *suffer imprisonment during life* !!—Good God, am I to believe that the Reformation and slavery went hand in hand? Where, then, were the civil liberties of Englishmen? Was there no liberty of conscience, and could some dozen of individuals thus throw fetters over the national mind? Was it thought that the Reformed Religion contained nothing which might, after a time, recommend it to the country?—and could nothing but tyranny enforce the Reformation?—Indeed, it appears not. Such, at all events, was the tolerance of the infantine reformed Church! Soon after it was enacted, that, for *doubting* the Queen's supremacy, (a point questioned by some Protestant Divines, and denounced by Hume,) christians in England were to suffer the PAINS OF DEATH and FORFEIT THEIR ESTATES, as in *cases of high treason* !!! It was also enacted, that for causing *any prayers* to be said or sung, other than those contained in the said Book of Common Prayer, you should *forfeit your estate and be imprisoned for life*; that to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, or *withdrawn from the Church of England*, was punishable as for high treason; that if at the *age of sixteen* you went not to Church, you should pay a penalty of 20*l.* per month; and if unable to pay this penalty, *you should be imprisoned until you conformed*.—If, unfortunately, you had an estate, *two thirds of it were vested in the Crown until you became a Protestant*; and if you had no estate wherewith to satisfy those penalties, you were forced solemnly to *abjure your country, and transport yourself beyond the seas for ever*, giving your personal property, chattels, &c. to the crown; and should you return, the penalty was the death of *a felon without benefit of clergy*. If you did not become a member of the Established Church, under another Act, you dare not *move more than five miles in any direction from your own house*. You could neither *christen, marry, nor bury*, according to the rites of any but the Established Religion. Many of the Acts respecting wives, children, servants, guardians, &c. are such as I shall not shock the feelings of your readers by commenting on, but will merely refer every

enquirer, anxious for truth, to the following abstract, containing the principal Laws of England, connected with religion, as they stood from the year 1548, until so late as the year 1791, when their violence was somewhat chastened down by the 31st Geo. III.

A perusal of this brief summary, must lead to the conviction, that intellectual slavery was the first consequence of the Reformation in England—that the Reformed Religion did not succeed by its own merits—that no respect was paid to liberty of conscience—that the Reformation was forced on the country by arbitrary punishments—that under the edicts of the supreme head of the Protestant Church, it was impossible to be otherwise than a Protestant—that liberty, estate, country, and life, became the penalties of not acknowledging that supreme head; and after gathering from the most faithful historians some knowledge of how those penalties were enforced, must you not confess that those who now boast of the Civil and *Religious* Liberties of Old England, are meanly pandering to public delusion.

I am, Sir,

M. H.

ABSTRACT of Acts of Parliament made in England on the subject of religion, from the year 1548 to the year 1791.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1548.

Any Parson, Vicar or other Minister, refusing to use 'the Book of Common Prayer, and other rites and ceremonies according to the use of the Church of England,' or 'using any other manner of Prayer,' or speaking against the said Book of Common Prayer, and being afterwards thereof three times convicted, 'shall suffer imprisonment during his life.'

STATUTE PASSED IN 1551.

Every person shall resort to Church where Common Prayer shall be used, 'upon pain of punishment by censures of the

Church.' And any person hearing, or being present at any manner or form of Common Prayer, of administration of the Sacraments, making of Ministers, or of any rites, other than those set forth in the said Book of Common Prayer, shall suffer 'imprisonment during his or their lives.'

STATUTE PASSED IN 1558.

The Queen declared to be supreme head of the Church, and all persons having promotions and offices, ecclesiastical or temporal, refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy, disabled from retaining or exercising any such offices during life.—Any person asserting the jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, of any foreign Prince, Prelate, &c., heretofore used in this kingdom, shall, with his abettors, be attainted, forfeit all his estates, and 'suffer pains of death, and other penalties, forfeitures, and losses, as in cases of high treason, by the laws of this realm.'

Any Minister convicted of refusing to use the book of Common Prayer, or using any other rite or ceremony but what are set down in said book, shall forfeit his benefice, be imprisoned for twelve months, and on third conviction, shall be deprived, *ipso facto*, of all his spiritual 'promotions—and also, shall suffer imprisonment during his life.' If the offender have no spiritual promotion, he shall suffer imprisonment for life. Any person causing prayers to be said or sung than those set down in the book of Common Prayer, shall, for first offence, forfeit 100 marks; for second offence, 400 marks; and on third conviction, shall forfeit all his lands and goods to the Queen, and suffer imprisonment for life.

Every person absenting himself from his Church, or place where the book of Common Prayer is used, 'shall suffer punishment by the censure of the Church,' and forfeit twelve pence for every Sunday and holiday so absent.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1563.

All persons must take the Oath of the Queen's Supremacy; and any person refusing 'shall suffer and incur the danger,

penalties, pains and forfeitures ordained and provided by the statute of provision and premunire aforesaid, made in the 16th year of the reign of King Richard the Second.' Refusing the oath the second time, declared to be treason. And no person to sit in the House of Commons without first proving his adherence to the Protestant religion by taking this oath.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1571.

Any ecclesiastical person maintaining doctrines contrary to the 39 Articles, shall be deprived of his benefice.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1581.

It is hereby enacted, that it shall be treason 'to withdraw any person from the Religion established, to the Romish Religion.' And that 'it shall be treason to be reconciled to or withdrawn to the Romish Religion.' And all aiders to suffer as for misprision of treason.

Any person saying or wilfully hearing Mass, shall forfeit 200 marks, and suffer twelve months' imprisonment.

Any person above the age of sixteen, not going to Church or usual place of Common Prayer, shall forfeit 20*l.* English per month; and should he absent himself still, he shall give sufficient sureties for 200*l.* at least, 'to their good behaviour,' and shall so continue bound until they conform themselves and come to Church. Any person keeping a schoolmaster, who shall not repair to the Established Church, shall forfeit 10*l.* per month.

Every person forfeiting money under this Act, and not able to pay same, shall be committed to prison, there to remain until he pays the penalties, 'or conform himself, or go to Church, and there do as is aforesaid.'

For the information of your English readers, allow me (within a parenthesis, as it were) to shew the 'virgin Queen's' ideas of civil and religious liberty. My author on this occasion is David Hume—and when we accuse Hume of bigotry, whenever he treats of Ireland, or catholicity, let us remember,

(though contemptible indeed is the apology) that he wrote in the last century, and then, too, for a London tradesman: This extract, with others which your limits preclude, will prove by what a lengthened and lamentable suspension of every human right the infancy of Reformation was protected in England. In the year 1584, Queen Elizabeth 'appointed 44 Commissioners, 12 of whom were Ecclesiastics; three Commissioners could exercise the whole power of the Court; their jurisdiction extended over the whole kingdom, and over all orders of men; and every circumstance of their authority, and all their methods of proceeding were contrary to the clearest principles of law and natural equity. They were empowered to visit and reform all errors, schisms—in a word, to regulate all opinions, as well as to punish all breach of uniformity in the exercise of public worship. They were directed to make enquiry, not only by the legal methods of juries and witnesses, but by all other means and ways which they could devise: that is, by the rack, by torture, by inquisition, by imprisonment. Where they thought proper to suspect any person, they might administer to him an oath called *ex-officio*, by which he was bound to answer all questions, and might thereby be obliged to accuse himself or his most intimate friend. The fines which they imposed were merely discretionary, and often occasioned the total ruin of the offenders, contrary to the established law of the kingdom. The imprisonment to which they condemned any delinquent was limited by no rule but their own pleasure. They assumed a power of imposing on the Clergy what new articles of subscription, and consequently of faith, they thought proper. Though all other spiritual Courts were subject, since the Reformation, to inhibitions from the supreme Courts at Law, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners exempted themselves from that legal jurisdiction, and were liable to no controul. And the more to enlarge their authority, they were empowered to punish all incests, adulteries, fornications, all outrages, misbehaviours, and disorders in marriage; and the punishments which they might inflict were according to their wisdom, conscience, and discre-

tion. In a word, this Court was a real Inquisition, attended with all the iniquities, as well as cruelties, inseparable from that horrid tribunal. In the next century, we find the Protestant Clergy of Ireland exercising the powers of those Inquisitors.

The Roman Catholics, then forming the majority of both Houses of Parliament, tendered 120,000*l.* to Charles I. for redress of 'Grievances, which,' says my Reverend Friend, Dr. Leland, the government historian, 'persons of all denominations had experienced.' One branch of redress which Charles promised was, that 'touching any contumacies pretended against Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction;' the Clergy should not 'be permitted to keep any private prisons of their own for these causes, but delinquents in that kind are henceforth to be committed to the king's public gaols, and by the king's officers.' It probably may be necessary to say, that Charles accepted the 120,000*l.* but I am sure it is wholly unnecessary to add, that he did not fulfil his promise; and, as a proof how unchanging and unchanged are some of the doctrines of Protestantism, I need only advert to the well known fact, that during the present year, a respectable member of the Established Church was arrested on the Sabbath, in a Church in this city, and detained, during Divine Service, in the custody of some of the servants, by virtue of a written power signed by a Prelate. This written instrument I have read, and it appeared to be, as far as its want of grammatical correctness would allow me to understand it, an impudent, illegal, and vulgar imitation of the *Sci Fa's* and *Fi Fa's*, issued from the King's Courts, indicted in the Saxon, or some obsolete dialect of the English language.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1586.

All Jesuits, Seminary, and other Priests, remaining in England, or entering the kingdom after forty days, 'shall, for his offence be adjudged a traitor, and shall suffer, lose, and forfeit, as in case of high treason.'

Receiving or relieving any such person shall be a felony—and sending money or relief to such persons, out of England, shall

be punished with the penalties of premunire, or in other words, with transportation and forfeiture of property.

No children to be sent beyond seas, without license; and any knowing where a Jesuit is in this kingdom, and not discovering it, shall forfeit 200 marks!

Persons submitting under this Act, and conforming to the Established Church, shall not go within ten miles of the Queen for ten years!

Note—Innumerable executions took place of Priests, &c. under this Act, but so late as 30th June, 1646, when the English and Scotch nations were in arms for liberty of conscience, Rushworth, v. 4, p. 305, tamely mentions, as an ordinary occurrence, that one Morgan, for having received Orders beyond the seas in the Church of Rome, and coming into England, contrary to law, was drawn, hanged, and quartered, at Tyburn.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1587.

Two-thirds of the lands and other estates of every person refusing to go to Church, shall be taken into the Queen's possession, 'leaving the third part only of the same lands, &c. to and for the maintenance of the same offender, his wife, children, and family.'

STATUTE PASSED IN 1593.

All recusants, (persons were so called who refused to conform to the Protestant Church, in the English Statutes) shall give in their names to the Curate of their Parish, who will certify same to the Justices, in order to take proceedings against them; and any Priest refusing to acknowledge himself as such, shall be committed to prison.

Note—How offensive it would be to hint that there was ever an 'Inquisition in England.'

Any person above the age of sixteen, refusing to go to Church, or impugning, by speeches, the Queen's authority ecclesiastical, or persuading others not to go to Church, or going

to any other place of religious meeting, shall be committed to prison, there to remain, without bail or mainprize, until they conform to the Church, and hear Divine Service, as established by law.

Any person offending against this Act, and not coming in within three months and conforming to the Church, must abjure and depart out of the realm, and refusing to do so, is declared felony, without benefit of Clergy.

Any person keeping in his house any one who refuses to go to Church, shall forfeit 10*l.* for every month, and for every such person refusing.

The lands and goods of persons forced to depart out of the realm by this Act, shall be forfeited to the Crown.

ANOTHER STATUTE, SAME YEAR.

All persons above sixteen years of age, convicted of not going to Church, shall repair to their dwellings and 'not pass or remove above five miles from thence, under penalty of forfeiting all their lands, goods, &c. to the Queen.

All persons not having sufficient means to pay the penalties above enacted, and who still refuse to go to Church, shall, on their corporal oath before two Justices, abjure and depart out of this realm for ever, and should they refuse so to abjure, they shall suffer and lose, as in case of felony, without benefit of Clergy.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1602.

Confirms most of the foregoing Statutes, and enacts that any person sending a child to a Popish Seminary beyond sea for instruction, shall forfeit 100*l.*, and such child shall be afterwards incapable of inheriting his estate, or making any purchase.

No person to keep a School out of the Universities or Colleges, unless in the family of a Nobleman of the Established Church, under penalty of 40*s.* per day.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1605.

Every recusant conforming, shall receive the Sacrament once

a year in his parish Church—Church-wardens to return monthly lists of persons refusing to attend Divine Service, and of their children above nine years of age—Justices to make proclamation that such offenders render their bodies to the Sheriff—monthly penalties of 20*l.* on each, and two-thirds of their Estates to be taken for the King.

Every Bishop shall examine the persons in his Diocese on oath, and he who 'shall refuse to answer upon oath,' shall be committed to prison without bail or mainprize. (Here is a specimen of the Protestant Inquisition.)

Any person above eighteen years refusing the oath of Supremacy shall incur the danger and penalties of premunire. No indictments of such persons shall be reversed for want of form.

Any person reconciling another to the Church of Rome, 'shall have judgment, suffer and forfeit as in cases of high treason.'

Penalty of 12 pence for every time persons are absent from Church, and 10*l.* per month penalty on those who keep or relieve a servant not going to Church service.

The Sheriff or other Officer may break open any house wherein Popish Recusants shall be.

ANOTHER STATUTE SAME YEAR.

Any person discovering where Mass was said, shall have his own pardon and one-third of the goods, &c. forfeited by the attainer.

No recusant to come within ten miles of London, under penalty of 100*l.*

No man married to a Popish woman shall hold any office, and every married woman not conforming to the established Church, shall forfeit 'two parts of her jointure and two parts of her dower.'

Note—Rushworth, v. 1, p. 241, mentions instances of 'Gentlemen' flying to prisons, and there remaining as 'protection from the lawful proceedings (the fellow says with the coldness of an Eunuch) that might be had against them for recusancy.'

Every Popish recusant 'shall stand and be reputed to all intents and purposes disabled as a person lawfully and duly excommunicated,' until they come to Church and receive the Lord's Supper.

Any man married, 'otherwise than according to the orders of the Church of England, by a Minister lawfully authorised,' shall be utterly disabled from taking any lands in right of his wife. Any woman, being a Popish recusant, marrying, shall be utterly excluded from any dower, &c. in right of her husband. And if any man marry a Popish woman, who has no lands in her own right, he shall forfeit 100*l*.

Any parent not getting his child baptised by a lawful Minister, shall forfeit 100*l*. !!!

The executors, &c. of every person not buried in a Church or Church-yard, according to the ecclesiastical laws of the Established Church, shall forfeit 20*l*.

Children sent beyond seas, shall forfeit their estates, and if, on their return, they do not conform, their next a-kin being Protestant shall inherit their estate. Persons sending children beyond seas to forfeit 100*l*.

No person not a member of the Established Religion shall present to any Church, Benefice or Advowson, &c.; but same are hereby given to Oxford College for ever.

Note—Under this Act Oxford College now presents to some hundreds of valuable Benefices, the Advowsons of which belonged to Roman Catholics. Is it any wonder then that this former seat of learning should be converted into a hive of ignorant, indolent bigots?

No Popish recusant shall be executor, or administrator, or guardian; and no Popish books shall be brought from beyond the seas.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1609.

Every person above the age of eighteen shall take the Oath of Supremacy. Any person refusing to do so, shall be committed to Prison, without bail or mainprize, until the Assizes;

and if he then refuse, he shall incur the danger and penalty of premunire, except women covert, who shall be committed to prison only, there to remain without bail or mainprize till they will take the said Oath and conform, or until her husband pay to the King 10*l.* per month, or the third part of all his estate.

Note—So rigidly were all those laws executed, that in 1626 we find Lord Scroop, accused to the King for conniving at Recusancy, inasmuch as he had only convicted 1670 Catholics in the East Riding of Yorkshire !!!

STATUTE PASSED IN 1627.

Any person going himself, or sending any other beyond the seas, to be bred or instructed in Popery, shall be disabled to sue or use any action at law or equity, to be executor or administrator or capable of any deed or legacy, or to bear any office, and shall lose and forfeit all his goods and chattels, 'and shall forfeit all his lands, tenements, and hereditaments, rents, annuities, offices, and estates of freehold, for and during his natural life.'

STATUTE PASSED IN 1662.

That all Deans, Parsons, Vicars, Ministers, &c., refusing to read and declare their assent to use 'the Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the Sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England; or who will not read the Book of Common Prayer, and declare his assent thereto, shall be *ipso facto* deprived of all their spiritual promotion.' Any schoolmaster, tutor, &c., not doing the same, shall, for the first offence, suffer three months 'imprisonment without bail or mainprize,' and for the second, and every other offence, three months' imprisonment, and a forfeiture of 5*l.* to the King. And no other form of prayer to be used openly in any Church or public place in the kingdom.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1670.

If any person above sixteen be present at any assembly under

pretence of any exercise of religion, 'in other manner than according to the Liturgy and practice of the Church of England,' he shall be fined—any person preaching in any such meeting shall forfeit 20*l.*, and for second offence 40*l.*—any person permitting such meetings in his house, offices, &c., shall forfeit 20*l.* and Justices of Peace, Constables, &c., are empowered to break open doors where such meetings they are informed may be held.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1673.

All persons that bear any offices or places, &c., must take the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, and other oaths, and receive the Sacrament—any person not brought up from his infancy a Papist, who shall instruct his child in the Popish religion, is disabled to bear any office of trust or profit, in Church or State; and such child shall be disabled also to bear any office of trust or profit in the Church or State, until he 'shall be perfectly reconciled and converted to the Church of England, and shall take the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance aforesaid.'

STATUTE PASSED IN 1688.

No Peer of the Upper House, or Member of the House of Commons, shall sit or vote in either House, until they first take the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, and make, and subscribe, and audibly repeat this the declaration against transubstantiation.—(Another bonus on conformity to the Protestant religion.)

STATUTE PASSED IN 1668.

All persons holding offices, ecclesiastical or civil, shall take the Oaths herein mentioned of Allegiance, and against the Pope's supremacy—every person refusing to take same shall be committed for three months and fined 40*s.*—for second offence, at the end of his imprisonment, he shall be imprisoned for six months longer, and pay a fine not exceeding 10*l.*—if he refuse the third time, he shall be adjudged incapable of office, and shall be bound to good behaviour until he take the oath.

STATUTE PASSED IN SAME YEAR.

The declaration against Popery directed to be tendered to all Papists, who, if they refuse same, shall forfeit and suffer as 'a Papist recusant convict under the laws already made' since 1546, or in otherwise banishment or imprisonment for life, loss of estate, and in some cases of life, &c.

Note.—These two Statutes are the first made by King William's Parliament, and they exhibit what ideas the Protestant Church had then of Civil and Religious Liberty.

ANOTHER STATUTE OF SAME YEAR.

Persons refusing the Oaths of Supremacy, &c. shall suffer the penalties of all the laws above recited; and after some clauses in favor of Dissenters, who, by the way, were still forced to acknowledge the fundamental doctrines of the Reformation before they were entitled to such benefits, it is enacted, that nothing herein contained shall be construed to give ease to any Papist or Popish recusant.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1700.

A reward of 100*l.* for taking a Popish Bishop or Priest, and prosecuting him, for saying Mass, or exercising any of his functions. Any Popish Bishop or Priest saying Mass, or keeping school, shall be adjudged to perpetual imprisonment. Papists not taking the oaths when 18 years old, shall be incapable of inheriting any lands, &c., and their next of kin, being Protestant, shall enjoy their estates; neither shall Papists purchase property: and if a Papist do not allow his Protestant child competent maintenance, the Chancellor shall make order for that purpose.

STATUTE PASSED IN 1714.

Justices may tender the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration, to any persons whom they may suspect, who, refusing same, shall be adjudged a Popish recusant convict!!!

No office to be held by any person, civil or military, unless they take the said oaths, and all heads of Colleges, Tutors, Preachers, Constables, Lawyers, Proctors, Attornies, Clerks, or Notaries, &c. &c., shall take said oaths; and any person refusing, and afterwards attempting to act in office, shall be disabled from serving at Law or Equity, from being guardian of his children, or executor or administrator, from taking by deed or gift, from voting for Members of Parliament, &c. &c., and shall also forfeit the sum of 500*l*.!!!

STATUTE PASSED IN 1719.

Any Mayor, Bailiff, or other Magistrate, being present at any religious meeting, other than the Church of England, as by law established, he shall be disabled from filling the office of Mayor, or any other office whatsoever.

STATUTES PASSED 1736 and 1757.

If any person neglecting or refusing to take the oaths and the Sacrament, and make and subscribe the declaration, shall execute any office, he shall be disabled from suing at Law or in Equity, from being guardian of his children, executor, or administrator, or from taking by legacy or deed of gift, and shall forfeit the sum of 500*l*. &c. &c.

And thus far for the toleration of Protestantism from 1546 until 1791.

THE END.