

so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded."—(Acts ix.)

Now, we tell the gentlemen who call themselves "Priests of the Anglo-Catholic Church," that there is yet a way for them honorably to retreat from their ridiculous and dangerous position. But we warn them, that if they abide much longer where they are—if they stay for the meeting of Parliament—if they wait till the wild boar makes his rush, they will have to fly out of the Establishment, stripped of their possessions, and wounded in character, if not in person. And then Catholics will think of them as the discomfited pseudo-Priests, who sought to use the power of the Church to drive out the evil spirit of "pride, licentiousness, and discord," which possesses England. In short, they will be looked upon, all the world over, as the representatives of "the Sons of Sceva."

Some of our readers will think that we are ill-natured in thus laughing at the poor Puseyites. We may reply, that it was not we who wrote the history of the Sons of Sceva, and that if their history have any application and use, it must be in the case of such persons as the "Anglican Clergy;" that we never knew any good to come of tenderness to heresy, humbug, and sham; and, lastly, that we know of one, at least, late of "her Majesty's Clergy," now a Priest, who some years ago, on comparing the history in the 19th of the Acts of the Apostles with the events going on in the Church and out of the Church, made haste to renounce his pretensions, to lay down "the wages of iniquity," and to escape out of the Establishment, lest the fate of the Sons of Sceva might befall him. It is reasonable to think, then, that others may, to their own great profit, do likewise.

#### THE RECTOR OF RUGBY AND THE PAPIST LETTER-CARRIERS.

(From the Weekly Despatch.)

This pastor and this flock have been busy smelling out a Gunpowder Plot of their own—have pounced upon a post-dated Guy Fawkes, in the shape of a postman! In short, the Marquis of Clanricarde has actually appointed two letter carriers to the Rugby district, and the wretches are—Roman Catholics! If Jesuit kitchen wenches made the blood of the Bishop of Oxford run cold, how can we be surprised that Papist postmen should make the veal creep of the calves of Rugby? They have dangerous opportunities—they chat with the housemaids as they deliver the letters. Loyola may sap loyalty below stairs, and the "real presence" some day stalk into the parlor! And so the Rector of Rugby draws up a petition, superscribes it first, gets the sign manual of the clerk, and the mark of the beadle, sends it round to the faithful for their autographs, and calls upon the Government instantly to dismiss the brace of letter-carriers, simply and solely because they are Papists. They are on the horns of a dilemma; and they insist on sticking the postman on the horns of the Bull of Pio Nono! Lord John Russell has raised the Devil, and he cannot lay him when he would. In vain he tries to strangle the monster he has created—it is like throwing water on quick-lime, the more the allaying liquid is poured, the more fiercely the mortar burns, and the louder is its hiss. It only crumbles to become the cement of the Temple of Intolerance. His very toad-eaters and tools leave tuft-hunting for heretic-hunting. They have come upon the spot, and bay for blood. The whisper begins, that the Relief Bill must be repealed. The English Clergy now cry out for "pains and penalties" upon the Synod of Thurles, and even Dissenting Ministers and their flocks lend their sanction, by their presence, to the meek and evangelical proposal of transporting the Catholic Hierarchy to Norfolk Island.

#### CATHOLIC INTELLIGENCE.

##### CARDINAL WISEMAN ON THE CATHOLIC HIERARCHY.

The following is the substance of Cardinal Wiseman's first Lecture, delivered on Sunday, at St. George's, Southwark, on the subject of the Catholic Hierarchy:—

"The question of the Catholic Hierarchy, or rather its history, may be summed up in a very few words. Its substance is as follows:—Catholics being, in regard to the exercise of their religion, on a footing of perfect equality with their fellow-subjects (so at least it was thought till a few weeks ago), and being members of a Church necessarily Episcopal, having been governed till now, under a temporary form, by Vicars-Apostolic, have received, from the acknowledged and legally recognised head of their Church, a Hierarchy—that is, a body of Bishops having their sees and titles from them in England. Now, let it be observed, that the change does not consist in this, that up, till lately Catholics had no Bishops, and now have them; for their Vicars-Apostolic were Bishops with foreign titles. Had this been the change, we might easily have imagined that the Church of England, if till then the only Episcopal Church in this island, might have raised an outcry at the sudden appearance of another body of Bishops, whose character, as such, it does not now impugn. But this was not the case. It has been merely a change of title. Bishops who before bore foreign titles, under which spiritually to govern British Catholics, have now received domestic titles. And the sphere of their jurisdiction is called a diocese instead of a district.

"Let us see more in detail what the amount of difference is between the previous and present position of these Prelates:—

"1. Not one of them has received or will receive any new consecration. Not one, in other words, will be one atom more a Bishop than he was before.

"2. Not one enlarges or alters materially the limits of his Ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Some few counties are transferred from the limits of one former district to another, but these are only slight deviations from the principle of merely changing districts into dioceses.

"3. Not one obtains any increased power or jurisdiction over Clergy, or laity, or property, or trusts, or any person or thing. If anything, powers before held are curtailed or limited.

"4. Not one probably will change his place of residence.

"5. Not one will gain, by the change, any increase of emoluments or of income.

"6. Not one acquires, or dreams of acquiring, the slightest alteration of social position, or legal addition of title or honor.

"Each one remains where he was, and as he was, and what he was, with the sole change, so far as outward relations go, of the titles which he bears. He, for instance, who was Bishop of Hetalona is Bishop of Birmingham, where he has always lived in honor; he who was Bishop of Samosata is now of Hexham, and will, no doubt, continue to live at Darlington, where he has lived respected by all, till now.

"And now, let the first question be, to whom or to what is any danger threatened? Is it to the State, or to the religion of this country?

"In the confusion of ideas which has prevailed during the recent period of excitement, there certainly seems to have been no thought of unravelling this question, and deciding which of the two was in danger. The usual results followed; all were mixed up, and the cry embraced every possible or imaginable peril. It was the State in every department, which was invaded by the Pope's granting to Catholic Bishops more titles in England. The Crown was wounded in its prerogative, its supremacy, its right to allegiance, its very sovereignty; the constitution was endangered in its principles of civil and religious liberty; the nation assailed in its 'spiritual independence'; individual freedom jeopardised by the intended introduction of the inquisition, of the confessional, and some undefined mysterious agency on the mind; the Church was endangered and suddenly, after years of acquiescence, not only in dissent of every sort, but in latitude of pasture within its own pale, to the extent of a desert, it has been again asserted to be so completely part of the constitution, that to assail it is to attack English nationality; its Episcopal rights are encroached on; its universality of jurisdiction in the realm trenching on; and the toleration graciously granted by it to Catholics abused. And finally, this is not all. Protestantism, as a general and comprehensive form of religion, embracing many divisions, has been insulted, attacked, threatened, and almost put to peril.

"Now, my brethren, this is but a small part of what has been said of this Ecclesiastical change in our body. And let me put it to your common sense, must it not be something of vast magnitude, of huge power, that could at once, in one moment, produce all these complicated and tremendous effects? Ought it not to be a political earthquake, and a religious hurricane combined, that could thus shake the stability of a vast empire from throne to hearth, from cathedral to cottage? Would news of a foreign invasion by a vast confederated army, united with a wide conspiracy detected at home, have done more, or threatened more, or alarmed more? Could there have been, in the event of such concurrence of foreign and domestic dangers, more warm expressions of feeling, more enthusiastic resolutions of resistance, more concentration of power?

"Then, now let me ask you another question. Suppose that any one had told you six months ago that the Bishop of Rome had it in his power to throw this vast empire into convulsions; to upheave, by 'the breath of his nostrils,' the granite foundations of the noble British constitution; to shake to its basis the throne of our gracious Queen, which rests secure upon the affections of every subject (of none more than of Catholics); to despoil of its rights and prerogatives a Church which has a thousand roots in the very substance of the nation; to imperil the religion of the Bible in all its various diramations; and finally to introduce all that has been a popular bugbear in Popery into your very families:—had any one told you six months ago that the Bishop of Rome had power to do all this in England, you would have laughed—yes, you would have laughed to scorn the man who should have presumed to tell you that he had such tremendous power.

"And if, by way of jest, or through curiosity, you had asked the fanatic who told you so, by what wonderful machinery, by what magical agency he could do all this; and he had answered you: 'By a scrap of paper, wherein he should desire the Catholic districts of England to be thenceforth called dioceses, and the Bishop of Trachis to be called the Bishop of Beverley, and the Bishop of Thoa to be called Bishop of Liverpool; you would, I am sure, have considered the man little better than an idiot, who asserted or believed in such effects from such a cause.

"And yet, now that this has been done, all those terrible consequences are seen to have flowed from it: the nation is made to believe that the Pope has possessed, and has exercised this tremendous power. But go back to your former cooler judgments, and through them look at the matter now effected, as you would have looked upon it when spoken of as future, and you will see that it is ridiculous to attribute such mighty results to so simple an act of Ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

"And in truth, my Brethren, if the Holy See does possess the power attributed to it, we may reasonably infer that its effects would be in proportion to the

strength and vigor which it infuses into its acts. The sending of a Bishop into a country must be a more direct and effectual exercise of the Pope's strength than the change of that Bishop's denomination. The communicating to him an immediate and personal delegation from himself, and placing him on the scene of his activity as a part of his own individuality, as a vicarious-self, an 'alter Ego,' would naturally appear to any one as a more direct bringing to bear of the Papal jurisdiction and strength upon a country, than the appointment to it of Bishops constituted as they are in Catholic countries, with ordinary, not extraordinary, powers. And again, the multiplying of such agents, the doubling of those active centres of his own power, would seem to be a much more alarming act (if cause of alarm there be) than the altering the style and title of those already holding those Vicarial offices.

"But no; in the present state of feeling it is not so; it cannot be allowed to be so. The Pope has named Bishops where there were none before, whether in Ireland or the colonies; but it mattered not. He has had his Vicars in this island and its dependencies, Bishops with more than ordinary faculties; yet no one heeded them. Within these few years he has doubled their number in England, and nearly so in Scotland, and still nobody gave himself concern. But now he changes their titles, and all England is on fire at the dangers, as at the supposed boldness, of the deed! Then, is a title more to give, or more to fear, than authority? Is a name more powerful than jurisdiction? Does more strength lie in a sound than in action?

"Now, I tell you, as you have been again and again told, that the Bishops, as now constituted, have straitened, and not enlarged powers compared with what they had before; and as to the importance of the step taken ten years ago of doubling the number of Vicars-Apostolic, no one who has observed its results will hesitate to allow that to it may be traced an increased vigor of action in the Catholic body, and a diffusion of Catholic doctrine without it. But even taking the question of names, I have scarcely any doubt that a very few years, or perhaps even months ago, had the question been put to the great mass of the English people, 'Whom would you rather have to govern the Catholic Church in this island, the Pope's own Vicars, or Bishops belonging to the country?' the latter would have been preferred and chosen, as being more thoroughly native English, and domestic, and as implying, in name at least, a less immediate connection with that great object of Protestant prejudice, the Pope of Rome. Indeed, I have been assured, upon what I consider excellent authority, that even in 1799 Pitt suggested to Cardinal Erskine, as one good mode of diminishing English prejudices in regard to Catholics, that the Bishops should cease to be Vicars-Apostolic, and become local titulars."

Throughout all this excitement, one important element of calculation, one obvious source of deduction, seems to have been overlooked. Public speakers and writers treat the matter as if England were the only country in the world to which certain acts, and still more certain possibilities, could apply. They overlook the experience and tests of other vast countries. They forget that there are Catholic countries which exercise great vigilance over the Church, and are as jealous as England of either foreign or ecclesiastical authority. They seem not to know that there are other powerful countries which have a mixed population, containing Catholic Bishops and their flocks.

"Calm and reasonable minds would look at the working of the Catholic system in both these, and thence judge of the reality of dangers announced to England by prophets of evil. Have not the people been threatened with the fear of the inquisition, or other terrible institutions, as being necessary consequences of the prevalence of Catholicity? And yet is there any inquisition in Spain, in Portugal, in Brazil, in Mexico, in any of the South American Republics—countries exclusively Catholic? Certainly not. Is there any in Austria, in Bavaria, in Belgium, countries with a mixed population, but with Court, Government, and majority, eminently Catholic? Certainly not. Then is it not mere imposture to tell the people that there is even the remotest danger of the introduction of such a tribunal into England, of all places in the world, should it even all become Catholic? Could not the people resist what it called Papal tyranny, or interference in temporal concerns, as well as the natives of Spain or Portugal?

"I put all this as a supposition—as an imaginary case; for it is too ridiculous to put it seriously to thinking men. And it is only to get up a cry, and to gull people (I use a homely but expressive word) into fanaticism, that interested persons pretend to fear what they know to be, not remote, but (to use now a more scientific phrase) too distant to have a parallax.

"Again, the canon law is quoted as containing assertions opposed to the rights of the Crown, or the principles of civil law; and those, of course, are dangerous to England alone. Would not fairness and common sense dictate, that as this law cannot, by either possibility or fatality, be more forced on England than on other countries, so no more need be feared here, supposing things to come to what (in the minds in question) would be the worst, than is experienced in so many other countries? Let any one, therefore, go and ask in Belgium, or even in Spain, whether the Bishop or Clergy stir up the people against their civil rulers, on the ground of a text in the 'Decretals,' or the 'Extravagantes,' or whether the people are edified by newspaper or pamphlet extracts from the 'Corpus Juris,' as it is called, to prove to them that they must withhold their spiritual allegiance from the Pope! What some are so busy in doing now, in this line, is as wise and as practical

\* The statement came from the late Sir John Cox Hippeley.

as it would be in one who knows nothing of law to rake up the statute-book, and pretend to argue about the present practical state of the law from the enactment of King Stephen and Richard I., without any reference to modern enactments, declarations, explanations, judgments, tacit repeals by desuetude, or actual usages and prescriptions.

"Again, oaths or declarations are brought forward as inconsistent with the civil duties of those who take them. It is not for a moment reflected that the same oath has been taken certainly for at least 700 years, and probably much more, by every Bishop of all Christendom, with knowledge and consent of their Sovereigns and rulers, from the Emperor of Austria to the President of the French Republic, without jealousy or suspicion; and, what is more, without a single instance on record of any Ecclesiastical in history having involved his allegiance, and justified it by that oath.

"But, my brethren, I will give you two most practical illustrations of how well other countries can understand the difference between Ecclesiastical and civil duties, and know how to let each estate take care of itself, without apprehending a collision between them."

After citing America as an instance, his Eminence continued:—

"But to come to another government nearer home. In Belgium there is no State Church. The majority of the nation is Catholic: the King is Lutheran.—All religions are equal in the eye of the law. When the country asserted its independence, it was in the power of the Catholics to legislate as they pleased. But they asserted no pre-eminence for their Church—they preferred freedom to the golden fetters of the State. The Cardinal Archbishop of Malines and the Bishops have no seat in the Chambers; nor have they any tribunals of their own. The Ministers of all religions are paid by the State, Protestants, perhaps, more than Catholics, being a married Clergy. But the Government has nothing to do with the nomination of Bishops or Clergy, or other purely Ecclesiastical matters—it has no Concordat with Rome. In this respect the Clergy are in the same position as we are. Now, let us see how clearly the Government can discriminate the duties, or, to use a more homely word, 'the business' of each power, the civil and the Ecclesiastical.

"While England was in the height of its ferment, on account of the 'Papal aggression,' the Minister of Justice in Belgium, who has charge of religious matters in the Government, M. Tesch, thus spoke in the Chamber of Representatives (the House of Commons) of Belgium, Nov. 16th last:—

"What, for example, is our present position?—On the one hand, the Pope has the right to name, in Belgium, as many Bishops as he thinks proper; to create as many dioceses as he pleases. What is the right of Government? That of not paying any more than it considers sufficient for the wants of religion. . . . And so again with regard to Canons of Cathedrals: the Ecclesiastical authority can create ten, fifteen, twenty, in a diocese, if it pleases; but, on the other side, the Government preserves its right of not giving salaries to more than it considers necessary for the administration of dioceses."

"Two months have now elapsed since the Papal letter (for Bull there has been none) was issued; and the new Bishops have carried on their administration for nearly that period under their new titles. Has anything sinister thence arisen? Have they 'tithed or tolled' in the realm of England? Have they summoned Protestants to their obedience? Have they claimed any portion of the revenues of Church or State? Are the dangers, or invasions, or aggressions, so loudly denounced, as yet in prospective? They were not then in the act itself. If not, wait a few weeks more; nay, a few months, and see if they gradually unfold. But if, after a further period, you shall find that all is as it has been, that the Catholic Church in this island keeps on in its usual and even course, and no interest, public or private, has suffered, you will perhaps come to the reasonable conclusion that religious questions like these had better be left to the wise standard of judgment suggested of old by Gamaliel: 'Ye men of Israel, take heed to yourselves what you intend to do, as touching these men. . . . And now, therefore, I say to you, refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought. But if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it: lest perhaps you be found even to fight against God.' (Acts v., 35-39.) New legislative enactments may be passed, as it has been suggested, whereby the obnoxious sound of new titles may be hushed, and the ears of the zealous be no longer offended by their utterance; and then the conclusion will come of itself, that the name, and not the thing, caused all the fear and the displeasure.—For no amount of human legislation can touch the substance, annul the spiritual and organic structure, of the Catholic body, or permanently derange its vital functions. You will have to probe rights most tenderly cherished by every class, religious or social; you will have to disturb the powerful possession by millions of dearly-earned privileges; you will have to recommence the destructive work of reproducing inequalities, the moment you attempt to deal with religious principles and convictions, or make them subject to external control. Now, the obedience which every Catholic will pay to his Catholic Bishop, the bond of union which holds together Pastor and flock, cannot be affected by any law; and so long as every Catholic, who, six months ago, obeyed a Vicar-Apostolic of a District in which he lived, now will obey the Bishop of a See placed in another county, because the Pope has named that Bishop, and has transferred him to his obedience; so long as this is the case, all the substance, and essence, and reality of the Hierarchy will exist, although he may