

Reviews.

REPORT OF A PUBLIC DISCUSSION at Simcoe, Canada West, on Wednesday and Thursday July 16 and 17th 1851. On the Clergy Reserves and Rectories, Voluntaryism and Church Establishments.

The great controversial conflict which took place under the auspices of the Reverend Rector Evans, seems to have resulted in a very decided victory for the true cause. The forces which were marshalled under the Banner of schism, were the leading men of that side. Every thing would appear to have been conducted with great good sense and to have been arranged with judgment and care. There was the usual amount of polemical heat exhibited, and we must in justice say, particularly by the opposition. Altogether the pamphlet before us is a very interesting document. Our notice of it might be extended to some length, but we think that our readers must be pretty familiar with the general question and therefore we need not recapitulate. The following are the propositions sustained by the Church party:—

- 1—That the endowment of the Church by the State is not repugnant to the Word of God, nor to the spirit of Christianity.
- 2—That the State being a divinely appointed instrument for the promotion of the glory of God and the welfare of mankind, is bound to acknowledge, protect, and support the Church, but that in the discharge of this duty the rights of conscience are to be held sacred.
- 3—That before we abandon the principle of endowing and supporting the Church, satisfactory evidence should be afforded of the righteous tendency of the Voluntary system, and of its sufficiency to supply the spiritual necessities of the nation.
- 4—That it is evident from the wording of the Statute Geo., III., cap. 31, that the Clergy of the Church of England were intended to be designated by the use of the term, a Protestant Clergy; and that the settlement made by 3 and 4 Vic., was a compromise by which the Church of England relinquished a part of her just right.
- 5—That neither the Imperial Parliament nor the Provincial Parliament can be accessory to the alienation of any part of the property secured to the Church of England by the 3rd and 4th Vic., without great and manifest injustice.
- 6—That irrespectively of the uses to which the Clergy Reserves were to be applied, the fact of their having been reserved has proved a great boon to the actual settlers in Canada.

To which the voluntaries oppose these general statements:—

- 1—That State endowments of Religion in any form are anti-Scriptural.
- 2—That governments are the result of human necessities, and not the agent or instrument designed of God for the direct or indirect control of religious faith and opinion, which are to be based on the Word of God only.
- 3—That the Voluntary principle in the Church, for its pecuniary support, has Christ's express sanction, and has proved adequate to all the necessities that have occurred for its maintenance and furtherance.
- 4—That the term "Protestant Clergy," used in the Imperial Statute of 1791, must have been used in contradistinction to Roman Catholic, and not intended to be restricted in its application to the Clergy of the English Church. That the term "Protestant Clergy," being intended to exclude Roman Catholics only, the settlement made by 3 and 4 Vic., was an act of injustice, and so far from being a compromise, was a fraud upon those who were not assenting parties to the arrangement.
- 5—That the 57 Rectories were established in violation of the public faith, contrary to the instructions of the Imperial Government, and at variance with the oft-expressed wishes of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Upper Canada.
- 6—That the Imperial and Provincial Parliaments have power to appropriate the Clergy Reserves to any secular purpose that is adapted to promote the general welfare of the Province, such as the secular education of the whole people.
- 7—That the Clergy Reserves have proved a source of bitter contention to the various religious sects, diffusing a blighting influence over the Churches which have participated in them, and impeding Missionary enterprise, and the general good of the Province.

THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE. A sermon preached at an Ordination of Priests, in the Cathedral Church of Montreal, on the second Sunday in Lent, 1852, by the Rev. J. H. Nichols, M.A., Principal of Bishop's College, Lennoxville. Published by those who were then ordained.

"We are unto God a sweet savour of CHRIST, in them that are saved and in them that perish. To the one we are the savour of death unto death, and to the other the savour of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things?"—2 Cor. ii. 15. 16.

Such are the title and text of an able and practical discourse, in which the obligations, duties, trials and rewards of the faithful priest in Christ are graphically pictured.

STATISTICAL STATEMENT OF CRIME IN THE CITY OF TORONTO, FOR THE YEAR 1851.

Mr. Allen has here presented us with a business like document, into the merits of which we are at present disinclined to enter, although it well deserves examination.

JANSENISM.

(Concluded from our last.)

The aspect of the quarrel was now changed:—

"The controversy now raged on the question, whether the five propositions were or were not to be found in the Augustinus. At a somewhat later

period it was that Louis XIV. desired the Count de Grammont to read the book, and to tell him whether they really existed there. One may easily imagine the style in which the unfortunate nobleman performed the enjoined task. 'I have read the book, if it please your Majesty,' said he, after some weeks had elapsed. 'And the propositions?' 'I have not been so fortunate as to find them, but they may be there for all that, incognito.'—*Ch. Rem.*, p. 111.

On this occasion it was that the see of Rome committed the strange blunder, of claiming infallibility on matters of fact. In a Brief addressed to the clergy of France, bearing date, September 29th, 1654, Innocent X. decreed that the five propositions were actually contained in the work of Jansenius. On this point the Jansenists joined issue, and denied that the Papal infallibility extended to matters of fact. It was attempted to meet this by a distinction between a *fact*, and a *dogmatic fact*. A *fact* is one which has no connexion whatever with doctrine; a *dogmatic fact* is one which is in some way or other connected with some question of dogma. The assembly of the French clergy embraced this distinction in 1656. But the difficulty obviously arises,—what question of fact is ever likely to come before the church, which is not connected with matters of doctrine?

The Brief is now defended on somewhat different principals, of which Dr. Tregelles gives an excellent illustration, in the report of a conversation, which took place about twenty years ago between Cardinal Cappucini, Papal Legate in Holland, and Mr Van Santen, the present Archbishop of Utrecht. The writer in the *Christian Remembrancer* confirms from his own knowledge, the accuracy of the report:—

"VAN SANTEN.—'I have read the *Augustinus* of Jansenius more than once through; I know that the five propositions, as condemned, are not contained in that book; how can I then, as an honest man and a Christian, subscribe a declaration as true which denies a simple fact? I have to do with God and my conscience, even if the Pope and all the whole Church should be misinformed. As they cannot alter a *fact*, so they can have no authority from God to require me to sign my name to a declaration which contradicts a fact.'

"CAPPUICINI.—'You see, M. Van Santen, that the table at which we are sitting is covered with a *green* cloth. Now, supposing that the father of a family were to prohibit his children absolutely from entering this room, or even looking into it—well, but if one of the children were to look in through the keyhole, and were thus, by disobedience, to acquire the knowledge that the cloth on the table is *green*, how then would the case stand? If the father were to make out an inventory of the furniture in the room, and if he were (whether by mistake or design, it matters not) to describe the *green* cloth as being *red*; and if he were, on the ground of his parental authority, to require each of his children, as relying on their father's information, to subscribe this inventory as perfectly correct, it would not be competent to the child who had *seen* the cloth to act upon the knowledge he had gained by disobedience, and refuse to subscribe the statement in which its colour was said to be *red*. The father had a right to forbid his children to look into the room; he had also a right to prescribe to his children what they should sign; and no act of prior disobedience, on the part of any of them, could take away the obligation of unhesitating compliance.'

"ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'You have brought forward a curious illustration; but how would you apply it? and how would you vindicate even in such a case, the subscription to a known untruth?'

"CAPPUICINI.—'There is no untruth at all supposed in the case that I have put: the child is absolutely bound to believe his parent; and, as the only ground he could have for said scruple of conscience would be part of his sinful disobedience he ought to say, "The command of God requires me to obey my father; I must, therefore obey him in this point, which involves the sacrifice of my own opinion; and as I am bound, in duty to God to declare my belief that the cloth is *red*, I may reasonably suppose that my eyes were mistaken when I saw it. Perhaps a sunbeam hindered me from seeing the colour correctly; or, perhaps, in punishment of my disobedience, an optical illusion was sent to deceive me. Any of these considerations is enough to justify me fully in subscribing my full belief that the object is really *red*, and not *green*.'

"ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'But how do you apply the idea of knowledge obtained through disobedience to the question of fact involved in subscription to the formulary?'

CAPPUICINI.—'Obedience would thus require the work of Jansenius, entitled "*Augustinus*," should not be read, since it was condemned by the bull of Pope Urban VIII. (*In eminenti*). Any knowledge, therefore, which any person now has of the contents of that book must have been obtained through a transgression of that obedience to which he was bound.'—*Tregelles*, pp. 85–87.

The history of this controversy becomes, beyond measure, intricate after 1655. Arnauld was expelled the Sorbonne; and the expulsion of the inmates of Port-Royal was only deferred in consequence of the miracle which was announced to

have been wrought within its walls in the case of Marguerite Perrier, a child of ten years old, the niece of Pascal, who was cured of an acute disease by means of a thorn from our Lord's crown! The most *miraculous* part of this transaction, in our judgment, being, that the fact was credited, and that too as being miraculous, even by Pascal himself, as we learn from some remarks of M. Faugere the late editor of his works, which are prefixed to that section of the "*Pensees*," entitled, "*Des Miracles*," Pascal's allusion being as follows:—

"Voici une relique sacrée. Voici une épine de la Couronne de Sauveur du monde, en qui le prince de ce monde n'a puissance, qui fait des miracles par la propre puissance de ce sang répandu pour nous. Voici que Dieu choisit lui même cette maison [La communauté de Port Royal] pour y faire éclater sa puissance."

In 1656, Cardinal Chigi, now Alexander VII., renewed the constitution of Innocent X., condemning the Five Propositions, with the addition that they were condemned as being held by Jansenius, and in the sense of Jansenius. In the general assembly of the French clergy a Formulary (which afterwards obtained notoriety) was adopted to be signed by all candidates for ecclesiastical preferment, accepting both constitutions, and binding the candidate to declare—"I am obliged in conscience to obey those constitutions, and I condemn with my heart and mouth the doctrine of the Five Propositions of Cornelius Jansenius contained in his book entitled '*Augustinus*,' which these two Popes and the Bishop have condemned."

There was, however, a temporary reaction. By the celebrated "*Pacification*" of Clement IX., who succeeded Alexander VII., it was only required to anathematize the Five Propositions, with a reservation of the sense of St. Augustine; and in 1679 Innocent XI. condemned sixty-five propositions contained in the authoritative writings of the Jesuits. But this reaction was soon at an end. The Jesuits again resumed their influence. To record the sufferings and persecutions of the inmates of Port Royal would far exceed our limits. Suffice it to add Dr. Tregelles' account of its final catastrophe:—

"On the 29th Oct., following [1709], the valley was filled with troops; a commissary entered the abbey, who demanded all title deeds that they might have there; he then further declared his commission to disperse the nuns immediately. The prioress gave them her blessing for the last time, and they were sent separately into confinement, in different nunneries, as obstinate heretics. Their removal was accompanied by circumstances of great cruelty. . . . The nuns were dispersed in 1709; in the following year the cloister was pulled down; in 1711, the bodies were disinterred from the burial ground, with the grossest brutalities and indecency; and in 1713, the church itself was demolished."—*Tregelles*, pp. 39–40.

One point only remains. Pasquier Quesnel, born in Paris in 1634, was a devoted follower of Jansenius. In his work, *Reflexions Morales*, which appeared in 1694, the Five Propositions are put forward in their strongest form. The Jesuits soon directed their assaults to this quarter:—

"The Molinists compelled their instrument, Clement XI., to move actively. In 1700, forty doctors of the Sorbonne declared that a *respectful silence*, without submission, was all that was due to a dogmatic decree of the See of Rome. Fourth came the *Vineam Domini Sabaoth*, July 15, 1705, condemning this decision in the strongest terms; renewing all the doctrines of the Constitution and the Formulary, and making no account whatever of the pacification of Clement IX. The General Assembly of the French clergy received this constitution; the Bishop of St. Pons alone had courage to publish a *Mandement* against it. . . .

In February, 1712, Clement XI. appointed a congregation of five cardinals and eleven theologians, to consider the *Reflexions Morales*. After the deliberations of a year and a half—the assemblies having been for the latter part of the time held twice a week, and the Pope generally being present—the work was ended. On Sept. 8, 1713, appeared the famous constitution, *Unigenitus*, in which 101 propositions, extracted from the writings of Quesnel, were condemned, not separately (as is usually the case), but in the lump.—This dogmatic constitution, perhaps the severest blow the Roman Church ever received, may be regarded as the work of three persons—Louis XIV., Madame de Maintenon, and Le Tellier, the King's confessor."—*Ch. Rem.*, p. 120.

The Bull *Unigenitus* excited, as may well be imagined, considerable consternation in France. On the 1st of March, 1717, four Bishops formally appealed from it to the future Œcumenical Council. The different faculties of theology at once gave their adhesion to the appeal. Cardinal De Noailles and his chapter; with eleven Bishops, appealed. They were excommunicated by the Pope, in his Bull *Pastoralis Officii*. The appellants appealed again; whole religious communities joined them, and the various Parliaments suppressed the *mandements* of the Ultramontane Bishops against the appeal. But this resistance was not destined to succeed. At a Provincial Council held at Embrun in September, 1727, De Tencin, Arch-

bishop of that See, succeeded by a series of measures, which we cannot here detail, in crushing all opposition, and in procuring the acceptance of the Bull *Unigenitus*. The See of Rome was not slow in advancing to high station the instrument of its success, whose character and antecedents were worthy of the cause which he served. De Tencin who had been notoriously elevated to his former see by simony, and whose sister, a renegade nun, was the king's avowed mistress, was rewarded with the archbishopric of Lyons, and a Cardinal's hat.

But we must say a word before we conclude, on a matter closely connected with this topic, to which we have already alluded. We mean the see of Utrecht, the history of which connects the fortunes of Jansenism with our own time. Previously to the Reformation, this See had enjoyed several important privileges; not the least of which was the power vested in its chapter, of freely electing their Bishops. How this national episcopate was subsequently opposed by the Jesuits, and how it was thus brought into collision with the See of Rome, we have not space to record. We can only allude to its connexion with the persecution of the Jansenists in France:—

"It was a Protestant country that afforded such a refuge and shelter to the remnant of the Jansenists that they could again appear as a definite and tangible body. There were in Holland many Roman Catholics, and amongst them the Augustinian opinion had been widely spread, insomuch that at the end of the seventeenth century the Roman Catholics of Holland were apparently regarded as mostly Jansenists. Their numbers were then estimated at 330,000. Amongst them many from France had settled."—*Tregelles*, p. 52.

This circumstance did not if course diminish the hostility of Rome. The Chapter of Utrecht became divided in opinion. The legitimate Archbishop, Codde, had died in 1710, and the condition of the Church may be judged of from the following fact:—

"Fifteen years had now elapsed since any ordination had been held in the Church of Holland. The elder priests were dying off; while a stream of young Molinists and Ultramontanes was continually poured in from Brussels and Cologne. If this state of things could not be remedied, the Church of Utrecht was plainly near its end."—*Ch. Rem.*, p. 143.

The temporary remedy adopted was rather singular. The Chapter of Utrecht applied to Luke Fagan, titular Bishop of Meath, who consented to come to their aid.

In four ordinations he ordained twelve priests; this was in the years 1715 and 1716. He however, required a solemn promise from each of the candidates that they would never reveal the circumstances of their ordination during his life. A curious event occurred some years afterwards. The secret was not so well kept as to prevent an indistinct rumour from reaching the Court of Rome that some Irish bishop had ordained priests for Utrecht. Fagan, by this time [titular] Archbishop of Dublin, received orders to discover which prelate had done so. He convoked the Irish bishops; put the question to each of them individually; and returned for answer that, after examination, he was persuaded that none of the bishops, of whom he had inquired, had held any such ordination."—*p. 143.*

We cannot pursue this history any further. We must conclude by observing, that the Chapter of Utrecht, acting under the advice of the celebrated Canonist Van Espen, succeeded in restoring the Succession of their Bishop, since that period, has given notice to the See of Rome of his election and consecration, and has in due course, been answered with a Brief of Excommunication. This Brief of Excommunication has always been answered by an appeal to the NEXT ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL; the last appeal from the present Bishops bearing the date of February, 1825.

Advertisements.

DR. MELVILLE,
CORNER OF YORK AND BOLTON STREETS,
TORONTO.

November 13th, 1850.

16-1f

DR. BOVELL,
John Street, near St. George's Church,
TORONTO.

April 23rd, 1851.

30-1f

MR. S. J. STRATFORD,
SURGEON AND OCUList
Church Street, above Queen Street, Toronto.
The Toronto Dispensary, for Diseases of the EYE, in
rear of the same.

Toronto, May 7, 1851.

41-1f

WILLIAM HODGINS,
ARCHITECT AND CIVIL ENGINEER.
OFFICE:—Directly opposite the Arcade, St.
Lawrence Hall, King Street, Toronto.
Toronto, February, 1852.

28-1f

J. P. CLARKE, Mus. Bac. K. C.
PROFESSOR OF THE PIANO-FORTE,
SINGING AND GUITAR,
Residence, Shuter Street.
Toronto, January 13th, 1837.

5-1f