

by their own passive endurance of the English iniquity. "This, however, the Pope and his advisers seem determined shall not be done." For all which, we thank God and bless the Pope.

(From the Westminster Review for January.)

THE STRENGTH OF THE CATHOLIC DOGMA.

A true British Protestant, whose notions of "Popery" are limited to what he hears from an Evangelical Curate, or has seen at the opening of a Jesuit Church, looks on the whole system as an obsolete nummery; and no more believes that men of sense can seriously adopt it, than that they will be converted to the practice of eating their dinner with a Chinaman's chop-sticks instead of the knife and fork. He pictures to himself a number of celibate gentlemen, who glide through a sort of minuet by candle-light around the altar, and worship the creature instead of the Creator, and keep the Bible out of everybody's way, and make people easy about their sins; and he is positive that no one above a "poor Irishman" can fail to see through such nonsense. Few even of educated Englishmen have any suspicion of the depth and solidity of Catholic dogma, its wide and various adaptation to wants ineffaceable from the human heart, its wonderful fusion of the supernatural into the natural life, its vast resources for a powerful hold upon the conscience. We doubt whether any single Reformed Church can present a theory of religion comparable with it in comprehensiveness, in logical coherence, in the well-guarded disposition of its parts. Into this interior view, however, the popular polemics neither give nor have the slightest insight: and hence it is a common error both to underrate the natural power of the Romish scheme, and to mistake the quarter in which it is most likely to be felt. It is not among the ignorant and vulgar, but among the intellectual and imaginative—not by appeals to the senses in worship, but by consistency and subtlety of thought—that in our days converts will be made to the ancient Church. We have receded far from the Reformation by length of time; the management of the controversy has degenerated: it has been debased by political passions, and turned upon the grossest external features of the case; and when a thoughtful man, accustomed to defer to historical authority, and competent to estimate moral theories as a whole, is led to penetrate beneath the surface, he is unprepared for the sight of so much speculative grandeur, and if he have been a mere Anglican or Lutheran, is perhaps astonished into the conclusion, that the elder system has the advantage in philosophy and antiquity alike. From this, among other causes, we incline to think that the Catholic reaction may proceed considerably further in this country ere it receives any effectual check.

CATHOLICISM A POLITY.

If, then, we had to deal simply with a form of worship and theology, there would be no ground for distinguishing between the case of the Catholics and that of the Dissenters. And practically, perhaps, in the actual condition of Europe, the question now in agitation might be permitted to rest there. But, in fairness to the Protestant feeling, it should never be forgotten that the Catholic system presents a feature absent from every other variety of Nonconformity. It is not a religion only, but a polity; and this in a very peculiar sense. Other systems also—as the Presbyterian—include among their doctrines an opinion in favor of some particular Church government, which opinion, however, professing to be derived from Scripture by use of private judgment, stands, in their case, on the same footing with every other article of their creed. You might differ from John Knox about Synods, without prejudice to your agreement in all else. But with the Romish Church it is different. It is not that her religion contains a polity; but that her polity contains the whole religion. The truths she publishes exist only as in its keeping, and rest only on its guarantee; and if you invalidate it, they would vanish, like the promissory notes of a corporation whose charter was proved false. Christianity, in her view, is not a doctrine, productive of instructions through spontaneous action on individual minds; but an institution, the perpetual source of doctrine for individual obedience and trust. Revelation is not a mere communication of truth, not a transitory visit of Heaven to earth, ascertained by human testimony, and fixed in historical records; but a continuous Incarnation of Deity, a permanent Real Presence of the Infinite in certain selected persons and consecrated objects. The same Divine Epiphany which began with the person of the Saviour, has never since abandoned the world: it exists, in all its awfulness and power, only embodied no longer in a redeeming individual, but in a redeeming Church. The word of inspiration, the deed of miracle, the authority to condemn and to forgive, remain as when Christ taught in the temple, walked on the sea, denounced the Pharisee, and accepted the penitent. These functions, as exercised by Him, were only in their incipient stage; He came, to exemplify them, indeed, but chiefly to incorporate them in a Body, which should hold and transmit them to the end of time. From His person they passed to the College of the Twelve, under the headship of Peter; and thence, in perpetual Apostleship, to the Bishops and Pastors, ordained through legitimate hands, for the governance of disciples. These officers are the sole depositories, the authorised trustees, of Divine grace; whose decision, whether they open or shut the gate of mercy, is registered in Heaven, and is without appeal.....

The same Spirit of absolute Truth, which spoke in the living voice of Christ, which guided the pen of Evangelists, still prolongs itself in the thought and counsels of Bishops, and renders their collective decisions binding as Divine oracles. The people, who form the obedient mass of the Catholic Body, are not without a share of this miraculous light in the

soul; not, indeed, for the discernment of any new truth, but for the apprehension of the old. The moment the disciple is incorporated in the Church, faith bursts into sight; he passes from opinion into knowledge; he perceives the objects of his worship, and the truth of his creed, with more than the certainty of sense; and as he bows before the altar, or commits himself to the "Mother of God," the Real Presence and the invisible world are as immediately with him as the Breviary and the Crucifix. Through the whole Catholic atmosphere is diffused a preternatural medium of clairvoyance, which, at every touch of its ritual, vibrates into activity, and opens to adoring view, mysteries hid from minds without.....

For what is this scheme but an organised and undying attempt to establish a theocracy? The Church is not only a Heaven-appointed polity, but an imperishable Incarnation of the Personal Deity; the Episcopate is the head-office of His supernatural administration; the Sacraments, His occasions of audience and union with His subjects; the Priests, the Ministers of His Court, the directors of its ceremonial, the channel of every petition and every reply. On what terms can the mere secular State live with such a companion? Those who wield the sceptre of the Most High, will pay small heed to the baton of the constable. Where the Almighty reigns, what room will there be for the police magistrate?—and where Omniscience directs, for debates in Parliament?

INFERENCE TO BE DRAWN.

What, then, is the political inference to be drawn from this theocratic character in the Roman Church? Have we been supplying premises for a No-Popery conclusion? Not so;—unless the canons of Exeter Hall logic are henceforth to be the rules of English statesmanship; and a fickle cowardice to take place of that noble courage with which, in many a danger, the English people have dared to be just. The religious liberties which have been won, through the cost and struggle of two centuries, would not be worth a twelvemonth's purchase, were they held on no tenure of immutable justice, but only during theological good behaviour. Shall it be said that, in passing the great Emancipation Act, the British Legislature mistook the nature of the Romish system, and fancied it a meek affair like Quakerism? Is the Catholic religion so new a thing that its character, obscure in 1829, wakes us into wild surprise in 1850? If there is anything in history known by the attestation of unbroken experience—if anything deep-cut into the memorials of British life by the graver of the nation's resolve and agony, surely it is the lofty pretensions and the sleepless patience of the Church "one and indivisible." Had this been a secret twenty years ago, the removal of Catholic disabilities would lose not only every noble, but every respectable feature, and would be degraded from an act of Legislative rectitude to the level of a defeated bargain, or an extorted boon. But it was no secret; the repeated Parliamentary debates, the protracted controversies between the established and the disabled communions, had long brought out every feature of the case; and nothing was done but with open eyes. It was fully intended to take all the risks of a just course, and to leave to the Roman Catholics the undisturbed advantage of any arrogance or weakness—any policy or success—any mitre, pallium, or title, for which room might be found within the limits of the law. We have seen nothing to convince us that the appointment of the new Catholic Hierarchy involves the violation, or even the slightest straining of the law; and it may now be fairly presumed that Mr. Bowyer's pamphlet, in which the legal aspects of the case are strikingly presented, is felt to be unanswerable. The Papal Brief, then, is valid for its end; the Bishops appoints are already there, lawfully accented by their titles, and exercising supervision over the Clergy of their dioceses. No prosecution can disturb them; if they are to be deprived, it must be by Act of Parliament; but what could be the provisions of such an Act? Is it to prevent the Roman Catholics from having Bishops?—to say that their Church must cease to be Episcopal? This would be tantamount to an absolute proscription of their religion, which, as we have shown, is essentially a polity, and apart from the Prelatical element, can have no existence. It is a mockery of toleration to permit people to believe in a divine corporation, and then refuse them the corporate officers. Or is it to allow the Bishops, but to make restrictive rules as to what they shall be called? This being the most simply vexatious course, enough to show a petty temper, not enough to touch the distribution of real power, is most likely, we fear, to be thought soothing to the English Clergy, and to be offered to them as adapted to their taste. It were better, we think, to leave them unsoothed than to bring British legislation into contempt. Or, finally, is it to allow both Bishops and their names, but to control their nomination from Rome, and in some way insist that their origin be indigenous, and their dependence insular? On political grounds, this is the only measure for which a plausible excuse can be urged.....

This argument, however, is not applicable as against the administration of the new Hierarchy. For, if you sweep that Hierarchy away, you only reinstate the Vicars-Apostolic, whose Papal dependence is even more close, and more open to the objection urged, than that of the Provincial Episcopate. Must we go further, then, and cut off the organic connection with Rome in every form? Desirable or not, the thing is simply impossible. Without the living connection with their Head, the members of Catholic Church cannot subsist as parts of a spiritual body; and to require them—either by electing their Bishops or by vesting their allocation in an English High Priest—to form themselves into a detached Church, is only to insist upon their becoming apostates. No doubt, they ask more than satisfies the

Dissenter; but it is not optional with them to do this or to take the humbler place. They cannot shut up within the four seas a Church whose universality, whose identity with entire Christendom, whose bounden allegiance to the Chair of St. Peter is the prime article of their belief. They must either enjoy, then, this larger liberty than others, or they must have none at all. While their altars remain open, and hundreds of Priests daily appear at matins and vespers, no choice remains but between open and clandestine communication with Rome; and if there be contingent political danger in a foreign connection, that danger is not likely to be lessened when the correspondence is maintained, in the style of a conspiracy, between an offended Pontiff and a disaffected English and Irish people.

ANGLICAN CONVOCATION.

(From the Catholic Herald.)

The rents in the unfortunate establishment are multiplying at such a rate as to defy the power of language to name them. We have had meetings of Tractarians, meetings of Evangelicals, and meetings of middlemen; but on Thursday last another party assembled its forces in Freemasons' Hall, and disowned any warm sympathy or antagonism with either of these classes, while they formed a piece of tessellated pavement, out of fragments of their doctrine, with a design to disarm the virulence of opposition, or to lay down common meeting ground, to lure them into their views.—They clamored for spiritual authority with the Tractarians, protested against Rome with the Evangelicals, and upheld the Royal supremacy with the *via media* clerics, at the same time that they claimed for the institution which fostered all these contradictory principles the privilege of being the ground and pillar of truth, and the only exponent of God's views to the world. It is idle to point out to men, whose minds are jaundiced, the folly of supposing that truth can utter contradictory opinions, or that the Church which God has set up as the depository of his verities, and the herald of his messages to men, should have for 130 years failed in its high mission, and allowed itself to be gagged by parliament, and to be coerced by lay tribunals, into admission of principles which strike at the fundamental doctrines of its Divine founder. Christ can not have been so skillful an artificer as Mahomet, or so wise a designer as Confucius, if the Church which he established for the sole purpose of perpetuating his doctrines should have failed, at the very moment when Constantine gave her an opportunity to proclaim them with effect, and not have recovered her ancient purity, until the 15th century, and then only for a little handful of Saxons, who after basking in the light for a century and a half, saw its rekindled glory again expire in the downfall of convocation.

If the Church is crippled, if her oracles are silent, and if her leading ministers bear witness to falsehoods, what is this but a tacit admission of the human origin of her principles through the blundering stupidity, or plain want of foresight evinced in their construction. The establishment is stricken with the leprosy of a disease engendered at its birth, and there is no help for it; it must die. The revival of convocation, which the new party propose as a cure, would only increase the malady, and hasten its dissolution. It has been tried before and found to yield quite as uncertain a sound, as the state-tribunals which they denounce. Convocation under Henry held the real presence communion under one kind, celibacy of clergy, sacred vows, private masses and confessions, as binding under pain of death. Convocation under Edward rejected communion in one kind, with the other five doctrines, which its predecessor had decreed. In later times, when the Catholic and the Calvinistic element began to develop themselves in the Church, these assemblies not only contradicted one another, but even fell to blows among themselves, on every point of government administration and policy. Archbishop Wake wrote a book to prove what was a plain staring fact, that they were subject in everything to the crown: Atterbury wrote a book to show, that as a branch of the primitive Church, they were not, and ought not to be, dependent upon the breath of earthly princes. The Lower House put themselves in a state of permanent insurrection against the Bishops, who could only get rid of their importunities, by petitioning the Minister to prorogue them. The Upper House condemned Toland's book, the Lower refused to concur. The Prolocutors condemned Burnet, which the Bishops interpreted to be an audacious insult upon themselves. About the very question of baptism they were engaged in hostile conflict, the Lower House decreeing in Queen Anne's reign, that lay dissenters ought to be re-baptised, while the Upper voted the doctrine absurd, unchristian and irrational. Nor even when they harmonised their discordant voices, and that upon high points of doctrine, have they always been supported by the crown. Whiston, a Cambridge divine, wrote a book, in defence of Arianism, or as he called it Eusebianism, which fell under the censure of Convocation; but because Queen Anne did not choose to notice the condemnation, he was allowed to propagate the noxious heresy, in the bosom of Anglicanism.

We do not see, therefore, that the revival of this institution is calculated to help the Establishment out of its present difficulties. The members could not take into their consideration any points of doctrine without the license of the State; nor even if agreed upon any explicit enunciation of dogma, would the announcement have any effect without the stamp of the Crown. But the supposition is impossible. With Exeter and Hereford leading on the combat in the Upper House, and Close and Pusey at the head of their respective parties in the Lower, a discord would ensue, to which French clubs, and electioneering booths would furnish a very faint comparison. The hatreds and animosities which are now scattered over the nation, would be drawn into one arena, and lead

their possessors to gripe for ascendancy. The rationalists would assail the middle men, and the Evangelists spit fire at the Puseyites; bigot would be exchanged for heretic, and ridicule would be returned for anathema, in the name of a religion which lays down charity as its fundatory principle. We are glad for the sake of our common Christianity, that the spirit of the age places a recurrence of such scenes within the regions of impossibility.

These reasons are already prevailing with the majority. The absence of all the distinguished Puseyites from the platform of Freemasons' Hall, on Thursday last, shows that they have ceased to place any confidence in their Convocation panacea, and that they have given up the State of the Establishment, as too much interwoven with the fibre of its nature, either for prevention or cure. Their hope in the orthodoxy of Anglicanism is vanishing with the day dreams of their youth, and they are lingering, like Cæsar, on the confines of Rome, half afraid, and yet determined to take the plunge. Their aristocratic leaders, among whom are to be found the names of some of the principal nobility, have set them a glorious example, and we dare predict, that in less than half-a-year, the Church will be in possession of all who are worth having in the ranks of Anglicanism.

(From the Pittsburgh Catholic.)

As it is possible that an attempt will be made during the coming session of the British Parliament, to re-enact the Penal Laws—those *mild and Christian Laws* that rendered venerable parents subservient to disobedient children, and the husband to the refractory wife—it may not be out of place to set them before the public, as many of our citizens may never have had an opportunity of seeing them; they are as follows:—

1st. This code stripped peers of their hereditary right to sit in Parliament. 2d. It divested gentlemen of their right to be elected members of the House of Commons. 3d. It deprived all of the right to vote at elections, and taxed every man who refused to abjure his religion. 4th. It debarred them from all offices of power and trust. 5th. It deprived them of the right of presenting to Church livings. 6th. It fined them, at the rate of twenty pounds, (or nearly \$100.) for keeping away from the law church. 7th. It disabled them from keeping arms for the defence of their houses; from maintaining suits at law; from being guardians or executors; from practising law or physic; from travelling five miles from their houses, under heavy penalties in case of disobedience. 8th. If a married woman kept away from church, she forfeited two-thirds of her dowry, she could not be executrix to her husband, and might, (her husband, still living,) be imprisoned, unless ransomed by him at £10 per month. 9th. If any man were convicted of not going to church, any four justices of peace could cite him before them, to compel him to abjure his religion; and, if he refused, could sentence him to banishment for life, (without judge or jury); if he returned, he was to suffer death. 10th. Any two justices of peace could cite before them, without information, any man they chose above 16 years of age, and, if such person refused to abjure the Catholic religion, and continued in his refusal six months, he was rendered incapable of possessing land; and any land, the possession of which might belong to him, came into possession of the next Protestant heir, who was not obliged to account for any profits. 11th. Such man became incapable of purchasing lands, and all contracts made by him, or for him, were null and void. 12th. It imposed a fine of £10 a month for employing a Catholic teacher in a private family, and £2 a day on the teacher so employed. 13th. It imposed a fine of £100 for sending a child to a Catholic foreign school, and the child so sent was disabled from ever inheriting, purchasing, or enjoying lands, profits, goods, debts, legacies, or sums of money. 14th. The saying mass was punished by a fine of £120, and for hearing it, the fine was £60. 15th. Any Catholic priest who returned from beyond the seas, and did not abjure his religion in three days afterwards; also, any person who returned to the Catholic Religion, or caused another to return to it, was punished with hanging, ripping out of bowels, and quartering.—Are we speaking of the laws of Turks, Hindoos, or Savages? No; but of Christian, Evangelical England, the land of liberty and happiness! whose people boast of being foremost in civilization! which is called the dwelling of the Muses, the seat of arts and sciences; yea, England that claims the foremost rank in civilisation, free, happy, tolerant England.

But this is not the darkest shade of the picture. Turn to the laws of the sister kingdom; the land of continual persecutions—the island of saints—and, in addition to the foregoing, we find the following 20 enactments:—

1st. A Catholic schoolmaster, whether public, private, or even usher to a Protestant, was punished with imprisonment, banishment, and, finally, as a felon. 2d. The clergy were not allowed to be in the country without being registered; if they removed even for promotion, they were transported. The following rewards were given for their discovery—£50 for a Bishop, £20 for a Priest, and £10 for a Schoolmaster or usher; this was, certainly, providing for the education of the people. 3d. Any two justices of the peace might call before them any Catholic, order him to declare on oath, when and where he heard Mass; who were present; the name and residence of any priest or schoolmaster he might know of; and, if he refused, they had power to condemn him, without judge or jury, to a year's imprisonment in a felon's gaol, or the payment of £20. 4th. No Catholic could purchase any manors, nor hold a lease for a longer term than thirty-one years. 5th. Any Protestant, if he suspected any one of holding property in trust, or being concerned in any sale,