

ed, (Collier vi p 321) that if any one should say or hear mass, he should, for the first offence forfeit all his goods; for the second, suffer banishment; and for the third, death. In 1563, the Emperor Ferdinand wrote letters to the Queen, respecting the sup'rs of the English Catholics; and indeed many families had been obliged to fly the kingdom; many noble persons had been thrown into prison, and before the end of her reign more than 120 priests, besides laymen and women, had suffered martyrdom for their faith. You can scarcely call such a compliance as this was, an acceptance of the new religion.

But, even if it were otherwise, even if it were true that the English church had accepted the Reformation, yet this could not in any way affect the Apostolicity of the Roman church in this country; for suppose a National church should become Arian, for instance, all its Bishops and clergy to a man heading the Apostacy, and that the See of Rome should send forth Bishops and priests into that land to reclaim its people to the ancient faith, finding it convenient moreover, to send them not as an established hierarchy, but as a missionary church 'in partibus infidelium,' I am sure that you would not yourself doubt that such a church would be the Apostolic church of the land, though without the ancient sees; and supposing further that the Pope had waited for a while, unwilling to interfere prematurely, and hoping that the National church would recant its errors, and return to the communion of the faithful, surely this would in no way alter the case. It is idle then to deny the Apostolicity of the Roman Church in this kingdom, simply on the ground of intrusion, when you must know that the question between us lies very much deeper. It is mere unreality to talk of the English and Roman churches as rival communions, with no important point between them, but that of rightful jurisdiction in this country; for if the Roman church is true anywhere, she is the only true church here; for such she is according to her own theory, and if that theory is false, she is a false church every where. The two churches are antagonist bodies representing antagonist principles, and holding antagonist systems of faith; and, therefore, laying aside all question of succession or jurisdiction, they cannot, here or anywhere, be both apostolical.

For you will readily admit that the apostolical succession is not only the channel of sacramental grace, but also the guarantee for the faithful transmission of all christian truth, and that therefore the maintenance of Apostolic doctrine is one inalienable mark of an Apostolical Church; in fact, were it otherwise, the Jacobite, Lutychian, and other heretical communions are all Apostolical churches. Now in this particular, the case of the church of England stands thus, she cannot claim Apostolicity on the ground of a regular transmission of Apostolic doctrine from Bishop to Bishop within her fold, since, as she would herself allow, her present Bishops teach a doctrine on many points diametrically opposed to that which was taught by St. Augustine, from whom they profess to derive their commission to teach, and by his successors for many centuries; more especially as this discrepancy is not the result of silent and gradual change, but of a sudden convulsion, one set of Bishops teaching the doctrines they had received from their fathers, and their immediate successors denouncing that system as corrupt, and teaching another absolutely contradictory to it. The Church of England, therefore, is either herself not Apostolic, or she is the only Apostolic church in the world, since there is none other she agrees with in doctrine. In a word, even if her orders and spiritual jurisdiction were admitted, her claim to Apostolicity must still be judged by her possession or lack of the other notes of the true church if she be One, Holy, and Catholic, and have besides an Episcopate deriving orders and jurisdiction from the Apostles, then she must be Apostolic also; but if any one of those other notes is lacking to her, the possession of such an Episcopate cannot of itself make her Apostolic.

If, however, we would determine, by the simple light of reason and common sense which church might rightly claim the title of Apostolic, as the true representative of the church of the Apostles, we must recall to our minds an idea which is almost forgotten by English churchmen in general, and which even those of your school have scarcely considered with the attention it deserves; I mean the idea of the church as a kingdom. You know that many who recognise the Church as the treasure

house of divine power for their rule and governance. Yet all acknowledge that our Blessed Lord is not only the Prophet and Priest of his people, but also their king, and you, at least, would not shrink from confessing His church to be his perfect representative upon earth. And further, a moment's reflection will remind us how uniformly it is spoken of in Scripture, not as a literature, or a philosophy, or simply a religion, but as a kingdom. As such it appeared in the vision of Nebuchadnazar, side by side with the great visible kingdoms, which have successively held dominion over the world: it was foretold of our Lord that "the government should be upon his shoulder;" that He should "sit on the throne of his father David," and that "of His kingdom there should be no end;"—in the Psalms and Prophets the Church is set forth as a kingdom into which all nations shall flow, and before which all the powers of this world should bow down to the very dust; nay, the Jewish Church, in which the Christian church existed in embryo, was itself a kingdom; and when our Lord sent his apostles forth to preach the Gospel, they preached saying, "the kingdom of heaven is at hand,"—as the "kingdom of heaven," he himself sets it forth in all his parables;—and St Paul constantly speaks of it as the 'kingdom of Christ,' 'the kingdom of God's dear Son;'—moreover we cannot but see, that in the Apostolic times it was a compact and visible society, governed by its own rulers and its own laws, gathering into itself 'the elect' from divers nations, altogether independent of any of the powers of this world. Now it as the Anglican theory would have, the church in each nation has really no necessary dependence on the Church, in any other nation, but is a part and parcel of the constitution of the realm, and hangs on the throne as its supreme authority, in what sense can the church be called a kingdom? and if it be not a kingdom, why is it always so represented in Scripture? Of course if nothing existed answering to the 'sure word of prophecy,' if the Church were every where thus merged in the State, one should conclude that the obvious meaning of Scripture in this matter is not the true one; but you know well that there is a kingdom claiming to be this 'kingdom of heaven,' a kingdom whose internal polity is the wonder of mankind; whose reproach it is in the eyes of the world, that its rulers have humbled to the dust the pride of princes: which has undergone many vicissitudes, and risen again living and triumphant, as 'fated not to die;' nay, of which its very enemies feel that it has within it the principle of enduring existence. Hear the testimony rendered by one of them, (Macaulay's Essays, vol 3, p. 207.) and then judge whether this be not the kingdom, which as the Prophets speak, shall 'stand forever.' 'The proudest royal houses are but of yesterday, when compared with the line of the Supreme Pontiffs; the Republic of Venice is modern when compared with the Papacy;—and the Republic of Venice is gone, and the Papacy remains;—the Papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigour. The Catholic Church is still sending forth to the farthest ends of the world, missionaries as zealous as those who landed at Kent with Augustin, and still confronting hostile kings with the same spirit with which she confronted Attila. She saw the commencement of all the governments, and of all the ecclesiastical establishments which exist in the world, and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon set foot in Britain . . . . She may still exist in undiminished vigour, when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge, to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's.'

#### THE LAST TORY LIE.

The 'guts and garbage' vehicle of falsehood, says this week, that a communication to the Volunteer signed a Catholic was written by the Editors of the Cross. A greater lie was never told by the Father of lies himself. Our sentiments concerning Scotchmen are well known, and have been already published to the world in the pages of this Journal. The falsehood however, like so many others has been coined for base political purposes. Perhaps the Tory Protestant Journals would wish to provoke the Cross into a political contest. If so, we believe we could not inflict a greater punishment upon them, than by gratifying their desire. The religious chastisement which they received at our hands was but mere child's play to what they may expect if we take up the political cudgel. Verbum sap.