

assumption of titles by the Romish Hierarchy; but he has already declared, that such provisions are contemptible. Neither the Cabinet nor Parliament will consent to any measure which shall have any tendency to throw dust in the eyes of an indignant Protestant community. And the ultra-Protestant body, perfectly aware of the position of the Government, stands ready to show that it is not blinded by the dust with which its champions are preparing to confuse it. If Lord John Russell goes forward, his old allies will stop short; if he hesitates, his followers will press him from behind. Some strange *tour de force* is required to combine the *maximum* of display with the *minimum* of reality. While these serious discouragements are checking the agitation of its more responsible promoters, an almost comic misunderstanding has occurred among the gravest and most respectable opponents of Romish usurpation. If the blunder which has given rise to this collateral dispute were less accidental and unimportant in its nature, we might hesitate to call attention to the inaccurate language with which the Irish bishops justly charge their brethren of the English bench. In the singularly awkward document in which, after three separate attempts, the assembled prelates failed to express their own meaning or to satisfy the acute criticism of the Bishop of Exeter, and the wise and philosophic scruples of the Bishop of St. David's, they unfortunately assumed titles as completely unknown to the law as those which derive themselves from Westminster and from Birmingham. However familiar the phrase may be in common use, there is, undoubtedly, no such legal entity as the Church of England. The Crown and Parliament of England ceased to exist when the Act of Union with Scotland was passed. The Church of England survived for a century longer; but the Irish Union merged it in the new corporate character of the United Church of England and Ireland. It was unfortunate that in protesting against illegal assumptions of dignity, the prelates of the Establishment should have taken upon themselves titles to which they have no shadow of a legal claim.

It is from no disposition to indulge in verbal criticism that the Irish Archbishops and Bishops remonstrate. They are naturally unwilling to be thrown over by colleagues who are more prosperously and securely seated. In strict law their claims are equally well founded, and the nature of the controversy in which the mis-statement occurred allows of no other appeal. The Archbishop of Canterbury's apologetic explanation is, perhaps, unparalleled for simplicity. He acknowledges that the document would have been "more correctly worded if it had been written in the name of the English Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland"—in other words, a corporation is, "more correctly" described by its legal corporate title than by any popular nickname or abbreviation. But the Archbishop suggests that the accurate use of words would have involved "the inditing of an inharmonious sentence." Probably such a reason for a formal blunder has never been assigned before. Dr. Wiseman may, perhaps, justify his claim to the See of Westminster on the ground that such a title is pleasanter to English ears than the barbarous Greek provincialism of *Melipotamus*. The argument would be as good as that of an Archbishop who forgets the legal title of the Church over which he presides, in the anxiety to round his periods. The Primate might have found a better excuse in the example of a more exalted potentate. When the Emperor Francis, on the establishment of the Rhenish Confederation, determined to exchange his ancient elective honors for a new hereditary Imperial crown, he formally assumed the title of Emperor of Germany, which had never been assumed by himself or by his predecessors during the eight hundred years of their dominion. The King of Germany, Emperor of the Romans, forgot the title which he intended to abandon, as the Archbishop mistakes that which he vindicates against a competitor; but we have never heard that the Chancellery of Vienna excused itself on the ground that it was desirable, in a formal document, to avoid an inharmonious phrase. The mistake is, perhaps, natural, and the excuse is an afterthought; but the blunder, and the necessity of explaining it away, may usefully suggest the difficulty which arises in dealing with titles whether legal or unauthorized. The new law which, we are told, is projected, must be framed so as to preclude any excuse for neglecting its provisions for the sake of euphony and harmony. Unless carefully drawn up, it may, perhaps, include in its purview all bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, who usurp episcopal rank in an imaginary Establishment confined to the limits of England.

(Translated from the *Univers*.)

The *Times*, in a retrospective review of the events of the year which has passed, tells us, "Historians will have to chronicle, that in the year 1850, the Royal supremacy in affairs spiritual, was definitely recognised." This fact, recorded by history, forces deep groans from the bosoms of Puseyites. The year which has just closed, has been fatal to England's official Church. The results of the Gorham business, the professions of faith, to which the *Papal aggression* has given birth, prophesy to her, of the coming of days more bitter still.

The *Guardian*, with deep anguish, announces that the Anglican Church is about to enter upon a period of her existence, in which she will have much to do, and much to suffer. The *Guardian* is the victim of delusion. The events of late years show us, that Anglicanism knows well how to pass through the most difficult crises, without exposing herself to any amount of suffering. Had the Anglican Church known how to suffer, she would have had many occasions to manifest her love for the cross, when the

stern hand of power forced upon her in spite of all her indignant protests, an heretical bishop—when an assembly of laymen presumed to decide, in the name of the Queen, upon points of doctrine, and when she allowed a minister to stigmatize practices the Church herself recommends, as "absurd mummeries."

Yes, Anglicanism will have much to do, and she will act, in times to come, as she has acted in times past. But as to suffering. The *Guardian* is right only upon the supposition, that it means by these words, that the Church "will put up with a good deal,"—that she will bear with much resignation, all the insults which may be offered to her acceptance. In this sense, we believe that the Anglican Church will suffer, not only a good deal, but all that the future may have in store for her, and that is saying a good deal. The warlike demonstrations against the Papacy, which we have lately witnessed, will cost her more than she anticipated. In the means which she has employed against Catholicity, she has betrayed the secret of her impotence. The public meetings which have so rapidly succeeded one another, manifestly declare, that the Church of England is no longer Anglican. That great nation has not only lost all memory of the faith, and of the traditions which were established three centuries ago, but it turns with anger upon those men who would fain recall the past, and denounces them as traitors.

England is no longer Anglican. She is merely Protestant. She proclaims, by the press, by public meetings, her attachment to the "principles of the Reformation, and to the Protestant faith." This fact, denied hitherto, can no longer be concealed. True Anglicans, who are found only in the ranks of the Puseyites, scorn to yield to the change that is desired to be wrought upon their Church; the *Guardian*, their organ, proclaims the purity of their faith. "Our allegiance is due, not to the principles of the Reformation, or to the Protestant faith, but to the reformed Church of England, to which we belong, and whose faith is preserved in her formularies." But the people of England know no longer where to find the ruins of their faith, and thus the journal "sole faithful found" to the ancient doctrines, is obliged to point out *where* such doctrines are preserved. But England has forgotten, and cast them off, refusing to submit her neck a second time to the yoke. The principle of the Reformation is alive within her, and, one by one, those doctrines of Catholicity, which Henry VII. left intact, have been destroyed by the deleterious agency of Protestantism.

It is worthy of remark that, in all the meetings held for the purpose of protesting against the Catholic Hierarchy, the Anglican Church has been as severely handled as the Catholic. England is ripe for another religious revolution, which will, in all likelihood, be accelerated by the late events. The Thirty-nine Articles, the Book of Common Prayer, the Liturgy, will be revised, and undergo a change, in virtue of the spiritual supremacy of the Queen and Parliament;—passing through the crucible of public opinion, it is not difficult beforehand to estimate the value of the product.

CATHOLIC INTELLIGENCE.

THE CATHOLIC HIERARCHY.

CARDINAL WISEMAN'S CONCLUDING LECTURE.

(From Report in Daily News.)

The Cardinal delivered his concluding lecture on the above subject, on Sunday evening, at St. George's Catholic Cathedral, to a very crowded auditory. He commenced by saying that, having explained in the former lectures, what the Catholic Hierarchy was not and what it was, he should proceed that evening to explain any difficulties which might arise respecting the manner of its institution. The institution of the Catholic Hierarchy might have violated no one's rights, might be strictly legal, might even be a measure of the greatest importance as one of Catholic organisation; but still, would it not have been better to waive those rights, to forego that advantage, rather than produce excitement, clamor, and ill-will? Such was the question which he was about to answer that evening. To one only upon earth was it ever given to know the full consequence of this great undertaking. He saw that it would cost vast revolutions, convulsions, and destruction to nations. Before him was the temple of Zion in flames, Jerusalem rased to the ground, Judea captive. He saw the Roman empire dismembered; its sumptuous buildings overturned; its literature and arts for a time debased; its institutions, social, moral, and political, overturned; and yet he performed his work. He saw his followers despised, persecuted, denounced as the enemies of the human race—his Deacons stretched upon the gridiron—his Priests distended on the rack—his Pontiffs bowing beneath the sword, and yet he accomplished his work. From Gogtha he saw, as the very first effect of that work, himself reviled, blasphemed, scourged, thorn-crowned, and crucified; and yet he inexorably finished his work. He also instructed his disciples in their duties; he gave them treasures of precepts for charity, as well as doctrines of faith; and He sent them forth to do their work in total uncertainty of all save one thing—that their work was His. He was further pleased to place before them certain criterions, whereby they should know at any time whether what things befel them were the consequences of performing the work committed to them, or the results of departure from His Divine Will. No human wisdom could have told St. Peter and St. John that they would be called to account by the Supreme Tribunal; but when this happened to them, they went away rejoicing, because it corresponded with what had been foretold. Thus, their line of duty was clear—to obey in all things the purely civil power, but not to hold themselves responsible in religious matters for encountering the preju-

dices and passions of men. Between the establishment of Christianity and the year 303, ten savage persecutions assailed the Church of Christ. Were the Christians to blame because they took advantage of intervals of toleration to strengthen their position, and to strengthen the restoration of their Ecclesiastical state? Did they take blame to themselves, because they were not contented to burrow year after year, and century after century, in the catacombs? It was well to study accurately the rules which the Blessed Redeemer had given. It might appear as if Catholics had placed themselves, in regard to their opponents, on the same footing as the early Christians were with respect to those who persecuted them. But they had been warned that there was a visible and enduring power which waged perpetual war against them. This was what their Blessed Saviour had again and again denounced to them as the world. The world which, at one time, consisted of haughty and oppressive monarchs, of grand barons and mailed knights, with their overpowering retainers, who sought to crush the poor and to defy the Church, of which they still considered themselves members, might now be found to consist in the mechanical and practical genius of the time, and in that selfishness, materialism, and fear of too much Faith, which were its characteristics. Between the world and the Church there was declared to be a perpetual war, and it was important to observe the distinction between the two. In all that had passed within these few eventful weeks, on which side had been the greatness and nobility, and intellectual boasting, and pompous display, and the influence of wealth, and the pride of warfare? These were not the characteristics of the little flock; and let those who believed that the word of Christ was as true now as when it was spoken, tell him on which side the world was, and then say whether it was better to be its ally or its opponent? But their Blessed Saviour was pleased to descend to further and more minute particulars, and to lay down the very words which the opponents of his work would speak. How might an apostle have been startled when he perceived that, by his preaching the most painful divisions and separations were produced in families, had not these words been spoken to him beforehand: "I have come not to send peace but the sword; for I have come to set a man at variance with his father, and to separate daughter from mother, and the enemies of a man shall be those of his own house?" Their Blessed Redeemer had told them that men would hate his true disciples, that they were blessed when men should revile them and persecute them, and should speak all that was evil against them untruly, for his sake. They were to expect calumnies and false imputations; and he asked his Catholic brethren present, who knew what they had been taught to believe and practise, if it would be easy to match the reckless flow of false and calumnious charges which had been poured forth from every avenue of publicity with regard to them and their religion—false professions of faith, forged forms of excommunication, garbled extracts of laws and decrees? Catholic truth, Catholic morality, Catholic discipline—all had been mis-stated and most foully misrepresented, by those who must, or ought to, have known better. But this was little. They were to be hated. Hatred was a thing which was abhorred by any well-regulated mind; the age was too easy, too unyielding, too unearnest to have; and yet never, he believed, in their memory or in that of any preceding generation, had there been such intense hatred, such detestation and execration, as had been again and again expressed in regard to their religion—its rulers, its Clergy, its members; and the walls of that city and its very pavement had been blotted with curses and imprecations of evil. It might be said that that was the only way in which untutored minds expressed their religious zeal. Strange religion, indeed, which smiled when in its service the name of God was taken in vain, and one of His commandments violated? And who was it that had urged on these minds? Those who were bound to check such an evil. He had not heard of a single Bishop or Clergyman of the Established Church protesting against such language. But the evil speaking had not ended there. There had been things said, too shocking for him to utter. Their religion had been declared, amidst thunders of applause, to have come from the infernal abyss, and its Ministers—God forgive him for speaking such words in His holy place!—had been openly pronounced to be the Ministers of Satan, and the practices of their Holy Religion to be but juggleries and deceptions of the father of lies. All this had been said of a Church which had bred up and counted amongst its Ministers, men of the most exemplary piety—a Church which had preserved the Bible for the Dissenter to boast of, and Apostolicity for the Churchman to claim—a Church which had been the only Hierarchy now in this kingdom that could bear a unanimous, a clear, and an unvarying testimony to the great mystery of the Trinity and of the incarnation of their Lord. The Redeemer had been pleased to prepare them even for this. He Himself was accused of casting out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, and was told by His enemies that He was a Samaritan and had a devil—that is, that He was under the influence of an evil and infernal prompter, who led Him to make men from being Jews become Samaritans; in other words, to adopt a foreign religion. The disciple was not to be greater than his master, nor the servant above his lord. If they had called the good man of the house Beelzebub, how much more they of his household? The consolation of Christ's followers, was, that in the lowest abyss He would be their defender. If they turned now from what was to be said by the opposers of Christ's disciples, to what they were to do, they would find the same consolation. They could not but be struck with the discovery how soon and how eagerly the opponents of the foundation of Christ's Church had recourse to the power of the State.

The Jews soon abandoned the theological question, and knowing that the doctrine of Christ tended to diminish their influence, they had recourse to the civil jurisdiction of Cæsar. Such was the case when St. Paul was brought before Felix; and surely the meeting of the silver-smiths and the whole population convoked by them at Ephesus, presented the same character of a tumultuous assemblage sitting in judgment on the doctrines of the Church, as had been presented of late, and the modes of proceeding were distressingly, though, at the same time, encouragingly alike. "Now, some cried one thing, and some another, for the assembly was confused, and the greater part knew not for what cause they had come together. And Alexander, beckoning with his hand for silence, would have given the people satisfaction—(a Catholic comes into the assembly and wishes to speak)—but so soon as they perceived him to be a Jew, all with one voice for the space of about two hours, cried out 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians.'" Christ declared, in his reply to his enemies, that his "kingdom was not of this world." His Apostles, as being men, pursued a more human course. St. Paul entrenched himself within the legality of his acts; he put forward his privileges as a citizen, protesting against arbitrary measures; but when those principles had been infringed in his regard, he insisted on a full and an honorable reparation. Further, knowing that the multitude of his opponents was composed of classes of men holding different religious opinions, some having higher and some lower views respecting traditions and doctrine, he ingeniously changed the conflict into one between these different sects. In these respects, Catholics imitated the Apostle. The Lord had authorized them even to draw a parallel between his position and theirs, saying, "If they have done so unto me, so will they to you;—if they have called the master by an opprobrious name, so likewise will they call you." When, then, we saw the High Priest of old rending his garment and saying, "He blasphemeth," he could not but think what a slight change of phrase (none of signification) was required to transform these words into that accusation of teaching blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits, which had been made so lately against the Church of God. And again, these senseless and repeated declarations which they had heard—without one shadow of reason—that the establishment of the Catholic Hierarchy led necessarily to the destruction of British institutions, and to the introduction of Papal jurisdiction and usurpation, how might all these have been most pitifully and most truly expressed in the bare sentence of the High Priest, "The Romans will come and take our place and nation!" When he heard the Clergymen of a Church who considered purity as the badge of Jesus Christ, and, consequently, as honorable in all men, pronounce publicly, as one of the principal objections to what had been done, "that a beggar"—an epithet applied to the head of our Church—"a beggar pretended to cope with the mightiest empire of earth," he must ask, did he speak the words of that Christianity which used to boast that twelve fishermen spiritually conquered the Roman empire, or the language of the indignant soldiery, who platted a crown of thorns to mark their opinion of the beggar king? When on the seat of judgment in this city, it was pronounced that "a little imprisonment would do the Cardinal good," or when a graver jurist declared "that a process by which the new Bishop could be put into a felon's dock, and disgraced by being committed for a few days to the common gaol might be advisable, he was reminded of the saying of the judge of old, that the scourge would do an Apostle good—"I will chastise him, and let him go." When he heard of one belonging to a nation, who boasted of its religious freedom—an elder of that city—declaring before his fellow-citizens that with his own hand he would willingly strike the mitres off the head of the new Bishops, how he shuddered as there were thus brought to his remembrance many who in the hall of Caiaphas were so eager to strike the head off the first Christian Bishop! And this brought him to the concluding point. His parallel, he might be told, was incomplete, inasmuch as it would not be brought before the civil tribunal, or visited with legal inflictions. Thanks to the spirit of the age, and the safeguard of the Constitution, for it had not been for want of right good will, that this had not come upon them. Had there not been a sufficient cry that old and dormant statutes should, if possible, be put in force against them—that obsolete legislation should be searched into, to see if, under its neglected folds, there could not be found some unrepealed clause that might be turned against them? And had not even those who called themselves liberal, proposed to re-enact the Draconian code of an old persecution, and at least to record sentence of death against them? Men's minds had been familiarised with the idea of punishing; and though the Legislature had been busy in blotting out bloody laws from the statute book, there still lived men who believed they would be doing a service to God by putting Catholics to death. Talk of Inquisitions—talk of persecutions abroad—there were hearts at home that would institute the one, and arms that would carry out the other. How had the persecuting spirit been manifested by those orgies which had been repeated and continued even till now? The inhabitants of villages and towns were invited to mock executions, of which it might be said that it was well for those who were the objects, that their effigies only, and not their persons, were in the hands of the contrivers. He did not wish to blame the people, who were always easily led away by an unwonted spectacle, whether by a Lord Mayor's show, or by the hanging of a criminal; but what was to be said of those who thus fed the nation? Had they forgotten that the falcon was trained to dash its beak into the prey with a stuffed lure? That the Knight of Rhodes, before he went to slay the dragon, first fleshed his horses and dogs on an artificial representation of his foe? Was it wise