

For the present I will use your own symbol, and compare your prayer book to 'the old cathedral'—'perfect in its proportions'—'overgrown with the ivy of centuries.' But supposing that you allude to the old cathedrals of England, in which your prayer book is used, I will add, that like them, its parts are stripped of their original destination, their hoary appearance is only mocking the now-fangled appendages, which fancy has added, and which only spoil their former symmetry; everything in them points to an interior spirit, which now breathes no more. The lengthened nave and spacious aisles, that echoed the voices of thousands, singing the praises of the spotless victim, that dwelt on the altar, now empty, and abandoned, while a few are assembled behind the screen, to listen to the voice of a minister, may be compared to the beautiful lessons, and soul-stirring prayers, that once prepared the faithful for the celebration of the holy mysteries, for which a sermon is now the principal substitute; the empty niches, everything directing the mind to something great at the eastern end, which now contains—nothing worthy of veneration; the altar of God demolished, or dwindled into a small table, used occasionally for communion, while the minister's desk rises in gorgeous pomp over its ruins, are but a counterpart of the unmeaning canticles, prayers, and solemn dirges, which prepare—hearers for instruction, while they were once intended to prepare adorers to worship God in spirit and in truth. And as many visitors of the present day on entering these cathedrals, cannot fail to admire the 'masterpiece' itself, as well as its various details, though they never reflect, that these ornamented niches once contained something, that the aisles were made to receive persons, who did not come merely to hear a clergyman speak, that the various symbols had all a meaning, of which none of the present occupants seem to be aware; so many admire various parts of your prayer book, who never reflect on the spirit, from which they proceeded, on the soul that gave them life, without which they would no more have been produced for Protestant use, than Yorkminster would have been built for a Protestant church.

Your second chapter is chiefly taken up in conveying your view of the history of the Protestant Episcopal church. A proper notion of this you consider essential, to form a proper idea of the prayer book; and in this we fully agree. My chief endeavour, in the few letters I will take the liberty of addressing you, shall be to lend my feeble aid in forming exact notions on this subject.

While you claim for your church a commission, transmitted from the Apostles, if I understand your theory, you claim nothing through St. Augustine, whom you are unwilling to call 'the Apostle of England'; nay you designate him as 'a schismatical monk.' Your authority, you say, has been transmitted through the British church that existed before him, and continued after him in England, protesting against the usurpation which he established as much as circumstances would permit, till finally, having the power in the 16th century, she ejected for ever, the church intruded by Augustine and Gregory.

The English bishops would thus derive their authority from the Apostles in an unbroken chain, equal to that by which the present Pope Gregory XVI. derives his from Christ, through his long line of more than 250 predecessors, of whom St. Peter was the first.

Having given your view, allow me now to give mine. Do not consider me offensive, if I try to be explicit and clear. I

look upon the Protestant Episcopal Church, as a creature of the law, established for the first time in the 10th century in England. To make room for this their creature, the civil authorities at that time did everything in their power to crush the old religion; they seized on the property, the churches, the titles of the old bishops, and conferred them on those whom they had created. The church, which they almost entirely supplanted in that country, was a branch of the Catholic church, united in faith, and subject to the same spiritual head with all its other portions throughout the world. Its pastors lawfully succeeding St. Augustine, received their authority through the bishop of Rome, supreme head of the Universal Church.

Through this channel alone, can any commission be claimed by those who came after them. The Church of England, before the Reformation, knew no other, is now too late to engage in exploring one. In my next I will examine your claim to derive authority through the British church.

Allow me here to remark, that your position, though not new, seems to me strange for a "churchman." Augustine, whom you treat as a schismatic, and Gregory, whom you consider as the author of the Usurpation, are found enrolled in the calendar of Saints, retained by the church established by law in England, "to which, under God," you acknowledge yourselves "indebted for your foundation," and glory in pointing out as your mother church. I find in the English Prayer Book, the festival of the one on the 26th day of May, that of the other on the 12th of March. I know that you have expunged them at this side of the water, but I am not aware that you profess to have changed the doctrines of your mother church. You possibly may know better than I do, what she means by placing them in her calendar, but I can hardly imagine, she would have conferred this honor on them, had she considered them schismatic, and usurpers. It evinces but little respect for this church, to treat in this manner, persons whom she ranks in so honorable a place. Indeed, though you may quote many writers of your communion, who support your views, many more could be brought forward, who are satisfied to derive their commission through that same schismatical monk and usurping Pope. You are aware, I am sure, that many staunch churchmen are fully satisfied with themselves, when they think they have found a way of connecting their church with that established by Augustine in the sixth century, and are little disturbed by the epithets of schismatic, and usurper hurled against him by their brethren.

Before I close this communication, I may be permitted a few observations, which I submit with all due deference.—They may be of use, when you are throwing the "Offering" into the form of question, and answer, for the use of the young churchmen "who attend the Sunday Schools, of the Protestant Episcopal Church." The child to be sure, may impose on the man; but occasionally, when the man discovers that the child has been deceived, he is doubly indignant. It is of little consequence, by whom Christianity was first established in Britain. Christians were to be found there at a very early period—Catholic Christians, professing the same faith, and subject to the same government, with the other portions of the Catholic Church of that, as well as of the present age. But you are not satisfied with this; you endorse the opinions of those "learned writers," who adopt the unfounded legend, that would make St. Paul himself, the founder of

that church. The authorities, which you quote in support of this assertion, appear to me so complete a failure, that I would respectfully suggest,—you owe it to yourself, to pass them over altogether, in the catechism for the young churchmen.

First, for the fact you quote Tertullian, Origen, and Chrysostom. By any impartial reader, who looks at their words, as you yourself give them at page 123, it will be seen, that they contain no more, than that Christians were in Britain when they wrote. Now Tertullian according to some, died, A. D. 216, according to others as late as 245; Origen died A. D. 253; St. Chrysostom A. D. 407; how does it follow, from Christians being in Britain in their time, that their religion had been introduced during the lifetimes of St. Paul?

For the exact time of its introduction you quote Gildas; and the passage which you give, as if from him, allow me to say, is the worst of all. If what you place between inverted commas, were a proper translation of his words, he would be but a poor authority to quote from; you make him say, that Christianity was preached in Britain, towards the end of the reign of Tiberius. Poor Gildas, to be sure, wrote bad Latin; but it is unfair to take advantage of the imperfection of his style, to make him speak nonsense, when his words can be easily translated so as to make sense. Tiberius died, A. D. 37; St. Paul was converted, A. D. 34, his solemn call to the Apostleship is placed by chronologists, A. D. 42, or thereabouts, Gildas certainly did not imagine, that in the meantime he had gone to England.—Indeed, if the words in your version be true, he must have stepped over from Arabia even before he went to Jerusalem, which he himself tells us he did only after three years. (Gal. i. 18.) Gildas's words, omitting his bombastic circumlocutions, as you yourself have done, must be translated: "In the mean time, the true sun, Christ, having shown his splendour to the world, about the close of the reign of Tiberius, granted his rays (that is, his precepts) to this frozen island, &c." The reign of Tiberius is mentioned, as the period when Christ first showed his splendour to the world; the time when his rays were communicated to the frozen island, depends on the period to which the words, in the mean time, have reference. Immediately before he had been treating in general of the state of Britain, during the government of the Roman emperors. For all that he says, it might have been introduced at any period before the reign of Dioclesian, which is the next thing of which he treats.

The passage you quote from Eusebius. Dem. Ev. is the only one, that has an appearance, of establishing the fact, that the Gospel was preached in Britain by some of the disciples of the Lord. He is speaking of the many places, where the Apostles and other disciples penetrated, and amongst others, mentions, "the islands, called British." But when we reflect, how usual it was for ancient, as well as it is for modern writers, when speaking in an oratorical style of the countries, through which the Apostles preached, to include those visited by their immediate successors, we shall be less inclined to press his words to the very letter on a point where all the rest of antiquity is silent. This is still more true of Theodoret, whom you quote last; he includes the Germans amongst those converted by the Apostles, though I am not aware, that any writer says, they had been converted by any of the Apostles, and from the whole tenor of his discourse it will be easily seen, that he is speaking of the effects of the labours of the Apostles, including what was accomplished by their successors, as well as what they did themselves. Though Eusebius uses the words

"islands" in the plural number, he certainly does not mean that Ireland also was converted by the Apostles; nor is it to the Orkneys that he refers, when speaking in the plural number. Even from this it would appear, that he allows himself some latitude.

You quote Clemens Romanus, to shew the very man who preached in Britain.—He, you say, affirms that St. Paul travelled "to the utmost bounds of the West." As if Spain, and Gaul did not belong to the Western boundary of the empire, as much as Britain. If a choice must be made, between these three countries, it would seem natural to prefer Spain; for while many respectable authorities explicitly state, that he preached in Spain not one ancient writer says that he preached in Britain. This is Bishop Pearson's interpretation of Clemens. Fell and Lardner, both Protestant writers, says he meant Rome. This will not appear a strange interpretation, when we reflect, that the word "utmost" of your translation is not in the original, and his words are better translated "coming to the bounds of the West, and having suffered martyrdom" &c., which from the pen of a person, writing to the East, very naturally may mean Rome, from which place he was writing.

I fear sir, you will be obliged, after all, to go to Rome for a mission even for your British bishops. I hope, at any rate, that you will admit the propriety of my suggestion, of passing over altogether, in the catechism, the authorities, by which you endeavour to prove, that St. Paul himself preached the Gospel in England. That a Christian church existed there at a very early period, no one denies; that a remnant of that ancient church yet remained in the Western extremity of the island, when St. Augustine came to preach the Gospel to the Saxons, is equally certain. How far you can claim any authority through that Church, I will examine in my next.

CATHOLICUS.

FOREIGN.

ENGLAND.

The Great Western arrived at New York on Thursday last, making the passage from Bristol in fifteen days.

The principal news is the meeting of Parliament—the Queen's speech—the amendment to the address by the Tories, and the defeat of the Whigs after a four nights debate by a majority of 91. The Whig Ministry resigned, and the Queen sent for Sir Robert Peel to form a new Ministry. He had not made out a list when the Western sailed.

Lord Morpeth is about to make a tour of the United States.

The Duke of Wellington has improved in health and says he will form one of the new Cabinet.

The McLeod case has been the subject of discussion in the House of Commons, but the late ministers expressed themselves satisfied with Mr Webster's letter, and were content to let the trial go on. All things looked peaceable.

THE CABINET COUNCIL ON SATURDAY.—At the Cabinet Council on Saturday last, at which the whole of the Ministers forming the Cabinet were present, it was determined unanimously that the resignation of the Ministry should be immediately forwarded to the Queen at Windsor. Shortly after the breaking up of the council, Viscount Melbourne proceeded to Windsor Castle, to acquaint his sovereign with the result of the deliberations of himself and the other members of the administration. We have heard from very excellent authority that the noble premier will communicate the resolution of the government to the House of Lords this afternoon, and also that Lord John Russell will make a similar communication in the House of Commons on the meeting of that assembly to-day.—*Chron. Aug. 30.*

HOUSE OF LORDS, Monday Aug. 26. The House met at 5 o'clock.

RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS.

Viscount Melbourne.—My Lords, I consider it my duty to acquaint your lordships that in consequence of the vote which was come to by the other House on Saturday morning last, and which was precisely similar in terms to the vote