

From the Catholic Herald.

TO THE REV. W. H. ODENHEIMER, A.M.
Rector of St. Peter's Church, Philadelphia.

No. VII.

REV. SIR:—In my last I proved by direct testimony, that the ancient British Christians admitted the authority of the bishop of Rome. The facts there adduced, with one exception, belong to the time of St. Augustine, or to an anterior period. I now come to establish the same truth, from the constant communication which always existed between the Britons, and the Anglo-Saxons, and between them both, and the other nations of Christendom.

The charity of ancient Christians did not consist in holding communion with error; it impelled them to do all in their power to make the truths of faith known to all, even at the risk of their lives.—They did not endeavor to open the way to heaven, by throwing down the barriers which Christ had raised round his church; but they spared no efforts to make all partakers of the blessings which they themselves enjoyed. The church was, in their eyes, a society of faithful men, partaking of the same sacraments, living under the superintendence of pastors,—themselves linked together in one compact body, however differing in customs or language, or separated by place.—While thus the faithful found every where a church constituted on the same principles, before whose altars they might worship, of whose sacraments they could partake; those who were not guided by those principles, however nearly they approached them, formed no part of that one body, which alone they believed the constituted guardian of the mysteries of God.

Modern indifferentists may call this intolerance; but it was an intolerance that necessarily flowed from their belief of the divine constitution of the Church. In whatever light it is viewed, it clearly proves that where a constant communion in religious matters existed, the same faith was professed—the same principles of Church government were adhered to.—Even those who assign a late date to the other doctrines of what they are pleased to call 'Popery,' have not as yet attempted to show, that in the sixth, seventh, or any other century, our church has swerved from this salutary intolerance in religious affairs; our undoubted adherence to it has been always our boast; and a source of bitter reproach from the enemies of our faith.

Of the communion existing between the British Church, and the churches of the continent of Europe, before the time of St. Augustine's arrival in England, we have undoubted proof. We have instances of it in its first foundation by bishops sent to that country by Pope Eleutherius, at the request of Lucius: we find British bishops sitting in continental councils; and the French bishops: Germanus, Lupus, and Severus, going over to Britain, and taking a prominent part in the ecclesiastical affairs of that country. Indeed, this is not denied by any one.

During St. Augustine's administration, notwithstanding the pretended "protest" of the Welsh against him, we find Oudoceus receiving consecration from 'the schismatical intruder;' nor do we find that he was received with less honor on that account by his own countrymen.—On the contrary, the king and nobles, as well as the clergy of Wales, are said to have received him in solemn procession. He celebrated several synods, and obtained so high a place in the estimation of his countrymen, that Spelman calls him "a great star in the British church."—Spelman endeavors to throw some doubt on the fact of his having been consecrated by St. Augustine, though he felt em-

barrassed to find a more ancient Archbishop of Canterbury, from whom he could have received consecration,—an obvious difficulty, as no archbishop existed there before him. This, however, was given up by Wilkins; he yielded to the proofs brought forward by Usher, to establish the fact. Nor was Oudoceus the only bishop of Landaff who received consecration at Canterbury; his successors ever after continued to follow his example; and were not, on that account, considered to have held communion with a "schismatical" church.

Another example of this communion, and consequently a proof of the identity of doctrine, is found in the conduct of Cadwallader, King of Wales, who became a monk at Rome, and died there in 689.—in 14 years after the time you assert, that the Welsh, or British Church, protested against the usurpations of the Roman Pontiff.

In the meantime, the successors of Gregory had abated nothing of the claims put forward by him; nay, even in the chronological table which you give at page 87 and 88, as exhibiting the time in which the various errors of Popery were first introduced (a curious document, by-the-by, to which I may have occasion to return,) you date of the origin of the Papal supremacy from the year 607; eighty-two years before the death of Cadwallader. This Cadwallader, however, not only became a monk himself in Rome, but founded an hospital there for the reception of Welsh pilgrims. Fuller relates this as follows: "Here he purchased lands, built an house (after his death converted into an Hospital) and by his Will, so ordered it, that certain priests of his own country should forever have the rule and government thereof. These were to entertain all Welsh Pilgrims with meat, drink, and lodging, for the space of a month, and to give them a certain summe of money for *viaticum* at their departure towards their charges in returning in their own country."

I need not tell you, sir, that Protestant nations have never been anxious to establish hospitals in Rome, for the use of Protestant pilgrims to that holy city: this will enable you to judge, whether Cadwallader or his people, knew anything of the "protest" entered against Rome in the sixth century, and echoed on, as you say, to the days of the Reformation. The hospital was not a useless fabric during all this time—it continued in existence till Wales became in reality, Protestant, and was thus rendered useless. After the Reformation, its endowments were handed over to the English College at Rome, where they yet remain. So clearly was its object kept in view all along, that Dr. Morris, a Welshman, and first rector of that college, insisted that it should continue to be used exclusively for Welshmen, in educating missionaries for that country, as pilgrims were no longer to be expected. But the opinion of the Jesuit Father, Parsons, was followed, who thought it more advisable to unite the funds of this, with those of an English hospital, that had been established for a similar purpose, by Offa, and thus form one institution, in which missionaries would be educated indiscriminately for any portion of England. From this institution a Wiseman, a Waterworth, and so many other Catholic missionaries have been sent forth, to preach the faith that Phaganus, and Deruvianus had preached in ancient days to his pagan forefathers. Few, I imagine, will deny, that were the royal monk to revisit our earth, he would consider this use of his bequest more in accordance with his intentions, than that made in his own country of the bequests of his Cambrian ancestors and successors, which now support men who denounce his monkery as a superstition, himself and

his fellow-pilgrims as idiots, and Rome itself as the seat of the Anti-Christ. The royal houses of Wales, as well as those of England, supply other instances of a similar manifestation of their attachment to the see of Peter. Eygen in 853, and Howel in 885, went on a pilgrimage to Rome. In my last letter, I spoke of the visit of Hoel-Dha, son of Cadill, in 928. He went there accompanied by four bishops, and thirteen of the nobility of his kingdom.

St. Wilfrid, when in Rome in 680, was present at a council of 125 bishops, convened in opposition to the heresy of the Monothelites. Notwithstanding the excessive importance he attached to the mode of celebrating Easter, when called on to make known "his own faith, and that of the island from which he came," he did not hesitate to attest that "the true and Catholic faith was held in the whole of the Northern parts, in the islands of Britain, and Ireland, which were inhabited by the English, the Britons, the Scots, and the Picts. Though this had special reference to the controversy before the synod, the declaration of agreement in faith, as was often the case on similar occasions, was general and unqualified, and the decrees were signed by him in their name. Indeed, had he considered the Britons heretics or schismatics, neither he nor the Roman synod, would have cared much what their opinions were, nor would he have been allowed to sign the council in their name.

It might be objected against what I have hitherto proved, that Bede speaks of the Britons as doing many things contrary to Catholic unity; that he and St. Wilfrid, appear to have looked on them as well as the Scots, as schismatics;—the latter would not receive orders from them. Stillingfleet lays great stress on this argument.

But all this is easily explained, by the national animosity of the Britons against the Saxons, the decay of ecclesiastical discipline in their church attested by their own writers, and the importance attached to the Easter controversy by those in England who followed the Roman custom. St. Wilfrid received his early education in the Irish monastery of Lindisfarne; and, with the approbation of the monks, went to Rome to complete it.—This as well as the testimony he bore to the faith of the Scots and Britons, when in Rome, shows that they did not differ on any essential point. In the beginning of his career, Wilfrid appears to have been under the impression, that the British custom was condemned by the church as can be seen in his conference with the Scots before King Oswio. There was no ground for this, but the fact that he tho't so sufficiently explains his conduct. His mistake arose from confounding their custom with the condemned practice of the Quartodecimans, to which alone the ancient canons had reference. Though even Bede appears to have attached rather too much importance to this controversy, his eulogy of the monks of Hy, who adhered to the Irish custom; and of Aidan who converted the Northumbrians, clearly shows that he considered them as brothers and members of the same church.

The Britons, on the other hand, hated the Saxons as enemies of their nation; they not only would not preach the Gospel to them themselves, but could not even bear that others should do so. Though these feelings were unjustifiable, and were manifested in a most disgraceful manner, they are but in accordance with the decay of Christian piety which their own writers prove to have existed among them. The consecration, however, of the bishops of Landaff by the metropolitan of Canterbury; the communication existing between the Welsh and Rome, as well as with the Irish, who were them-

selves in communion with the rest of the church, clearly prove that the animosity of the Britons did not proceed from a difference on points deemed essential on either side.

The positive proofs which I have brought forward, to show that the Britons always acknowledged the authority of Rome, are not less conclusive, than the impossibility of accounting for their acknowledging it at a later period, if it had not been established amongst them from the beginning. The favorite explanation of its first introduction amongst them, seems to be, that it did not prevail until the archiepiscopal dignity of St. David's became extinct, and its bishops became subject to Canterbury; which happened during the reign, and by the influence of Henry I. in the twelfth century.

Spellman gives this account and it seems to be adopted by most Protestant writers. But the history of this affair, however it may account for the authority acquired by the See of Canterbury, gives no explanation of the origin of the Pope's influence; on the contrary, its history shows that they had been always subject to him. I will take it from Giraldus, who was himself bishop of St. David's, and who strongly, although ineffectually, defended his See.

In the first, the very position which he undertook to prove, shows that they never pretended to be independent of Rome.—"Until the time of King Henry I. of England," says he, "the See of St. David possessed the whole of the metropolitanical dignity, owing subjection to no other church "but to that of Rome," and being "immediately subject to her." You see, at once, by this, that subjection to Canterbury, and to Rome, were not one and the same thing; nor did the Britons think, that the first followed from the second. To prove the authority always possessed by the bishops of St. David's, he shows that till the year 900, they had the pallium: that, at that time Sampson, bishop of that See, fled from Wales, in consequence of a pestilential disease that raged there, and taking his pallium with him, went over to Armorica Gaul, where he became bishop of Dole. The bishop of Dole continued to use this pallium for some time, until prevented by the Pope; whereas the bishop of St. David, who succeeded Sampson, being thus left without a pallium, ceased to enjoy the title of archbishop, although they continued to exercise most of its rights.

You, yourself, tell us, at page 49, that "the pall" (or pallium) "is a vestment worn by the archbishop on his shoulders, as a mark of obedience to him from whom he received it." If you had added, that besides this, it expresses the authority which he possesses over his suffragan bishops, which, so far is a participation of the primatial authority of the Pope, who conferred it—pointing at the same time, to the existence and the source of his authority,—your explanation would have been complete. The mere fact, therefore, of the archbishops of Menevia, having worn this, clearly proves, that they were subjects to Rome. Indeed, the journeys of Giraldus and of Bernard, one of the predecessors of Rome, to defend the independence of their See, would have been absurd, if they were independent of Rome. I am now discussing the merits of the question between Canterbury and St. David's; I merely allude to the grounds, on which the independence of the latter was defended; and these prove that it was never imagined that the Welsh bishops were independent of the successor of Peter, supreme head of the One, Holy Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

What you have asserted in the words of Ingram, (17) is true. "No national synod had granted to him (the Pope) that dominion, nor had any General Council