



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. VII.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1856.

No. 19.

REV. DR. CAHILL,
ON THE APPEAL OF ARCHDEACON DENISON.
(From the Dublin Telegraph.)
Ballyroan Cottage,
Nov. 19, 1856.

The reading public of Great Britain and Ireland are already acquainted with the case of Archdeacon Denison, in reference to the doctrine of the Eucharist in the Protestant church. Taking "the Thirty-nine Articles" as the standard of the Faith of Protestants; again, assuming (as they allege) the Scriptures as the sum of Christian belief; and further, comparing these two positions with the arguments of the Protestant Primate and with the defence of the Archdeacon, it is not too much to say, that no man of conscience and of theological learning can risk the salvation of his soul on the recognised constitution and the avowed creed of the English Establishment. The two principal points attempted to be maintained, by what is called "the Reformation," in reference to Christianity, are, firstly, "that the Scriptures alone are the only and the all-sufficient revelation and law of God and man;" and, secondly, "that the authority of the Pope and the infallibility of the Church are a human invention, and a damnable fallacy."

No language can adequately describe the incongruities of these two propositions: and no fancy can justly depict the melancholy results which, up to the present time, have followed the public acceptance of these principles, which, on minute examination, will be found at variance with the axioms of Christianity, and with the laws of the Gospel. Without wishing to say one word, or to give even a hint which could offend—Protestantism is a confused heap of inconsistency and incongruity on these two points: and the Converts who have joined the Catholic Church: the Fellows of their Universities: the English Noblemen: and the English and Scotch Noble Ladies have all left their former communion, from the irreconcilable principles, and the contradictory doctrines, which meet the reason and faith of the inquirer at every step he advanced through the labyrinth of "Reformation." Without citing the numerous examples which could be adduced in support of these assertions, one important instance will be quite sufficient.—It has reference to one of "the Thirty-nine Articles," namely, the fifth article: it is one of the articles of the English faith: and as such is, therefore, necessary to salvation. Yet neither this article in its entirety, nor one explicit word of this article, is found in the sacred volume.—The doctrine referred to is the procession of the "Holy Ghost from the Son:" that is, the procession of the third person of the Blessed Trinity from the Son as well as from the Father. The fifth article of the English creed has it as follows:—

"V.—OF THE HOLY GHOST.—The Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God."

Now, the words "proceeding from the Son," or even any words expressing the same idea, are not found in any passage or passages of the Sacred Volume. At this assertion the reader will inquire and ask on what grounds, then, does the Protestant church profess (on the all-important doctrine of the Blessed Trinity) an article of faith which is not contained in any direct or explicit passage of the New Testament? The answer is, namely, that the English church has adopted this article of their faith from the decision of one of the Councils of the Catholic Church: thereby demonstrating the inconsistency of this church in asserting the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures alone in matters of faith, while at the same time borrowing an article of that faith from the sole authority of the Catholic Church.

The passage amongst many others, on which the decision of the Catholic Church is founded, is as follows, JOHN XV., 26:—

"But when the Paraclete cometh, whom I will send from the Father, the spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, he shall give testimony of me."

In this and similar texts, neither the expressed words, nor the explicit ideas, assert the procession of the third person of the Blessed Trinity from the second: but the Catholic Church in Council has decided, that as Christ sent the Holy Ghost, he therefore proceeds from Him. But the truth clearly is founded solely on the authority of the Council, and not on the expressed words, or explicit ideas of the text.—Hence this one example, on this vital point, will be sufficient to prove that while the Anglican communion asserts the sufficiency of Scripture alone, in matters of faith, she contradicts her own tenets, when she adopts an article of that faith founded solely on Catholic authority.—Without, therefore, entering on the questions of her rejection of whole books of scripture: of her mistranslations: of her metaphorical interpretations, if one, even one damaging case, can be successfully made out against her articles of Faith, it essentially impeaches and taints her entire creed which, therefore, as a matter of course,

must be abandoned, as untenable and false, by every scholar who reasons correctly, and by every Christian who values his eternal salvation.

Whoever wishes to study "the history" of the Thirty-nine Articles, and to read the Acts of Parliaments on which they are founded, will learn without doubt, that the entire system of the new religion is one of a revolutionary constitution, and of a political expediency.

Burnet (I. iii., p. 398) speaking of Elizabeth, writes, "she thought that in her brother's reign they made their doctrine too narrow in some points; therefore, she intended to have some things explained in more general terms, so that all parties might be comprehended by them: her intention was to have the manner of Christ's presence in the Sacrament to be left in some general words:" and hence she proposed "to have the Communion Book so contrived, that it might not exclude the belief of all parties; for, the chief design of the Queen was, to unite the nation."

The process of religion-making and creed-manufacturing which may be seen in the quotations just made, will be observed to proceed to higher degrees of gospel-jugglery, in the extracts about to be given from Synods, and from the following Acts of Parliaments:—

"The supremacy or headship of the Church (Act, &c., 1559) is annexed to the Crown, and declares that the authority of existing, correcting, and reforming all things in the Church is for ever annexed to the Royal dignity: and whosoever should refuse to swear and acknowledge the Queen to be the Supreme Head of the Church, and governor in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, within her dominions, is to forfeit any office he may hold either in Church or State." (Burnet I. iii., p. 385, 386.)

Here, in the last quotation the Parliament, after having "made religion," and "contrived" a Book of Common Prayer, have made a woman Pope, who ever after, during her reign, gave permission to preach by letters patent: who made bishops like her father, either for a limited time, or during their lives, at her pleasure: who issued Excommunications: regulated external worship: adjusted faith: adjudicated on the dogmas of religion: and gave, as from the source of Christ himself, both validity and legality to the entire constitution of the new Gospel. Hence, when "the Thirty-nine Articles" were manufactured according to the wish of the Queen, and in conformity with the Acts of the Parliament, the Articles were published, and headed with the following words:—"That these articles being authorized by the consent and assent of Queen Elizabeth, ought to be received and executed throughout the whole realm of England."

If it were not a public universally known fact that the English Parliament did really pass the acts just quoted, no man living could believe that any man or set of men could conceive and execute the plan of making a new religion! and if it were not equally an admitted fact that the laity did embrace this religion so made, future generations could not fancy that in the short period of forty-five years, all England (Lancashire excepted) had abandoned the old faith, and adopted a system, which, they all knew, had its origin in political crime, was constructed on human principles, and executed in malice and in social revenge!

This brief historical review will enable the reader to approach the case of Archdeacon Denison with an accurate knowledge of the legal premises on which the English Primate founded his ecclesiastical charge against him. The case stands thus: Archdeacon Denison preached and published a sermon on the Eucharist, of which one passage in particular is declared by the Protestant Primate to be at variance with the Anglican creed. The proposition censured by the Primate is as follows:—

"Mr. Denison says:—
"By all who come to the Lord's table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the body and blood of Christ are received."

Dr. Lushington, the agent and prosecutor of the primate, asserts, that the proposition referred to contradicts the 29th of Elizabeth's articles, which is as follows:—

"XXIX. OF THE WICKED WHICH EAT NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE SUPPER.—The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing."

The question, therefore, is, whether these two propositions can be reconciled; and their meaning mutually adjusted. The Archdeacon says they are not at variance with each other, while the Primate asserts they are. From the pleadings on both sides, the following condensed extracts are taken:—

"The defence made by the Archdeacon is, that the Articles must be understood in a sense to agree with other documents of equal authority in the Church of England. So he appeals to the Prayer Book and the Church Catechism, and even summons the Homilies

to his aid. As these documents, too, may be supposed to admit of further elucidation, he quotes the writings of the Reformers and other divines of the Church of England, as well as other passages from St. Augustine besides that quoted in the Article, and a great deal more.

"That, then, is his defence. Dr. Lushington meets it by observing that it was a legal, not a theological question, he was called on to decide. The charge against the Archdeacon was, that he had published words contradictory of the 29th and 29th Articles, which it was no business of his to defend. Had the words of the Articles required any explanation—did they admit of the least doubt—were they not absolutely and singularly clear and express, then there might be some occasion to appeal to other documents and writings, with a view to ascertain, not the doctrine, but the meaning of the Articles. In this case, however, there could be no doubt whatever as to the meaning of the two Articles. It was wholly unnecessary, then, to go beyond the text of those Articles for their interpretation. Archdeacon Denison's words were equally clear and self-explained. The two passages thus so plain were as plainly contradictory, and there was no alternative but to pronounce the sentence of deprivation against Archdeacon Denison, who, of course, appeals, with the certainty of a similar judgment in any court in this land."

Whoever wishes to compare the pleadings in this case with the avowed doctrines of the Anglican Establishment cannot fail to note the inconsistency, the contradiction, the incongruity, and indeed the deceptiveness which are manifest in this human system.

Firstly—In their sermons, their books, their placards, they inform the public that the Scriptures alone contain their Rule of Faith: and yet one of their vital articles of Faith is not taken from the Scriptures, but from the decision of the Catholic Church, which (Catholic Church) having learned the word of God from the teaching of their ancestors, knew how to make clear that which was obscure, and to decide as certain that which might otherwise be doubtful.

Secondly—In all their discussions, controversies, treatises, &c., Private Judgment is put forward as the means given by God for understanding the word of the Gospel; while in the case before us Archdeacon Denison is refused the right of his private judgment, is compelled against his judgment to bow to a code of laws made three hundred years ago: and in case of refusal he is dismissed from his office, and is punished by the withdrawal of the support of himself, his wife, and his children; in fact, he is tried, convicted, dismissed, degraded, banished, beggared, starved, and perhaps killed, for insisting on a right which they tell all the world is the fundamental principle of Protestantism.

Thirdly—In several Acts of Parliament, and in all their synods and convocations, they have declared, that the Pope is an anomaly in religion: that general councils are a profane institution: and that their decrees are a fallacy in gospel legislation: while at the same time they appoint a woman, a child, a Profligate, or perhaps a Fool as an English Pope: obey an assembly of Laymen, in framing acts of faith: and transfer to a corrupt human legislation the homage and the reverence which (if the Gospel be true) are alone due to the appointed ministers and anointed constitution of God.

Fourthly—They never cease before the public repeating the hackneyed phrase, "search the Scriptures," to learn the truths of God; and yet, when Mr. Denison appeals to Scripture, in his defence, Dr. Lushington meets him by saying he "did not appear to defend a case of doctrine but of English law." In fact, in this pleading, the Gospel is set aside, and the authority of the English Parliament is clearly introduced as the sole rule of Faith!

Fifthly—No man of candor and honest conscientious feeling can read the entire case at issue without seeing in every stage of the proceedings the most glaring inconsistency; in fact, it can be called by no other name than a corrupt system of gospel-jobbing, which has only to be exposed to public scrutiny, in order to be universally abhorred.

Who, therefore, that has studied the early workings of this system, and watched its progress, could remain within an Institution where every thing is marked with the corrupt character of ambitions and wicked men: hence the distinguished English converts: fellows of colleges: have retired from all connexion with kindred, home, and emolument, in order to rest their heads within the ancient fold of the Apostles; and hence the many names even in Ireland who have joined the ranks of the Catholic Church within the last ten years. In the article just written there is no desire to utter one word of offence against the conscientious feelings of any class in the community: the writer merely quotes the proceedings in the case of Archdeacon Denison; and he feels certain that the Archdeacon and his friends would employ the same arguments before his Primate as are here put forward in these hurried remarks.

D. W. C.

THE FOR TAT.—As a lady was viewing herself in a mirror, she said to her daughter, "What would you give to be as handsome as I am." "Just as much," replied the daughter, "as you would give to be as young as I am."

Extracts from the most eloquent and most distinguished writers of modern times.

LECTURES ON CATHOLICISM IN ENGLAND.

BY JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D. D., PRIEST OF THE ORATORY OF ST. PHILIP NEERI.

HOW PROTESTANTS HAVE EVER PERSECUTED.

The horrors I have been describing are no anomaly in the history of Protestantism. It has persecuted in England, in Scotland, in Ireland, in Holland, in France, in Germany, in Geneva. Calvin burnt a Socinian, Cranmer an Anabaptist, Luther advised the wholesale murder of the fanatical peasants, and Knox was partly to bloody enactments and bloody deeds. You will think that with scandals such as these at their doors, Protestants would find it safest to let history alone, and not meddle with the question of persecution at all, from a lively consciousness of deeds identical with those which they impute to the Catholic Church. Not a bit of it. What then is their view of the matter? Strange to say, they make it their plea of exculpation, and the actual difference between Catholics and them, that they condemn persecution in principle; in other words, they bring their own inconsistency as the excuse for their crime. Now, I grant them, I am far from disputing it, that a man who holds a right principle and occasionally, nay, often, offends against it, is better than he who holds the opposite wrong principle, and acts consistently upon it; but that is not the present case. The case before us is that of persons who never once have acted on the principle they profess—never once; for they cannot produce their instance when Protestants, of whatever denomination, were in possession of national power for any sufficient time, without persecuting some or other of their polemical antagonists. So it has been, so it is now. Three centuries ago Protestantism in England set off on its course with murdering Catholic priests; but a few months have passed since a clergyman of the Establishment gave out to his congregation that transportation was too good for us, and he thought we all ought to be put to death. So far from the Protestant party feeling any real shock at this avowal, a little while after a second clergyman, as influential in Manchester as the first mentioned is in Liverpool, repeated the sentiment; and still no shock or sensation in the Protestant public was the result. Doubtless they gave their reasons for wishing it, sufficient in their own judgment, and so too did the Protestant Elizabeth, so too did Gardiner and other advisers of the Catholic Mary; but still such was the upshot of their reasons—death to every Catholic priest. The present case then is not that of an individual, or a ruler, or a body politic laying down a good principle, and not being able at times and under circumstances, through passion or policy, to act up to it; no, it is the case of a religion saying one thing, and on every actual and possible occasion doing another. Can such a religion extenuate its acts upon the ground of its professions? Yet this is the excuse, nay, this is the boast, the glory of the Protestant party;—"We always do one thing, and we always say another; we always preach peace, but we always make war; we have the face of a lamb and the claws of a dragon. And we have another boast; to be sure, we persecute; but then, as a set off, you see, we always denounce in others what we are in the practice of doing ourselves; this is our second great virtue. Observe, we, persecutors, protest against persecution—virtue one; next, we persecutors, blacken and curse the Papists for persecuting—virtue two; and now for a third virtue—why, we are so superlatively one-sided, that we do not even see our own utter inconsistencies in this matter, and we deny, to use a vulgar but expressive proverb, that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. We think that profession and denunciation make up a good Christian, and that we may persecute freely if we do but largely quote Sacred Scripture against it."

And now I might leave Protestants to explain this matter if they can, and to unravel the mystery how it is that, after all their solemn words against persecution, they have persecuted, as I have shown, whenever, wherever, and however they could, from Elizabeth down to Victoria, from the domestic circle up to the legislature, from black looks to the extremity of the gibbet and the stake; I might leave them, but I am tempted to make them one parting suggestion. I observe, then, it is no accident that they unite in their history this abomination with this practice of religious coercion; the two go together. I say it boldly and decidedly, and do not flinch from the avowal—Protestants attempt too much, and they end in doing nothing. They go too far; they attempt at what is against nature, and therefore impossible. I am not proving this; it is a separate subject; it would require a treatise. I am only telling the Protestant world why it is they ever persecute, in spite of their professions: it is because their doctrine of private judgment, as they hold it, is extreme and unreal, and necessarily leads to excesses in the opposite direction. They are attempting to reverse nature, with no war-

rant for doing so; and nature has its ample revenge upon them. They altogether ignore a principle which the Creator has put into our breasts; and, in consequence, they deprive themselves of the opportunity of controlling, restraining, and directing it. So was it with the actors in the first French Revolution; never were there such extravagant praises of the rights of reason; never so signal, so horrible a profanation of them. They cried, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," and then proceeded to massacre the priests, and to hurry the laity by thousands to the scaffold or the stream.

Far other is the wisdom of the Church. It is plain, if only to prevent the occurrence of persecution, she must—to use a phrase of the day—head a movement, which it is impossible to suppress. And in the course of eighteen hundred years, though her children have been guilty of various excesses, though she herself is responsible for isolated acts of most solemn import—yet for one deed or severity with which she can be charged, there have been a hundred of her acts repressive of the persecutor and protective of his victims. She has been a never failing fount of humanity, equity, forbearance, and compassion, in consequence of her very recognition of natural impulses and instincts, which Protestants would vainly deny and contradict; and this is the solution of the paradox stated by the distinguished author I just now quoted, to the effect, that the religion which forbids private judgment in waters of revelation is historically more tolerant than the religions which uphold it. His words will bear repetition: "We find, in all parts of Europe, scaffolds prepared to punish crimes against religion; scenes which sadden the soul were everywhere witnessed. Rome is one exception to the rule; Rome, which it has been attempted to represent as a monster of intolerance and cruelty. It is true that the Popes have not preached, like the Protestants, the universal toleration that the acts show the difference between the Protestants and the Popes. The Popes, armed with a tribunal of intolerance, have scarce spilt a drop of blood; Protestants and philosophers have shed it in torrents."

COBBETT'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.
Real Cause of the Protestant Parsons' Enmity to Catholics.

This, at first sight, seems out of nature; but, if we consider, that this Church of England felt conscious, that its possessions did once belong to the Catholics, that the Cathedrals and Churches and the Colleges, were all the work of Catholic piety, learning, and disinterestedness; when we consider this, can we be surprised at these new possessors, who had got possession by such means, too, as we have seen in the course of this work; when we consider this, are we surprised that they should do everything in their power to prevent the people from seeing, hearing, and contracting a respect for those whom these new possessors had ousted? Here we have the true cause of all the hostility of the Church of England clergy towards the Catholics. Take away the possessions, and the hostility would cease to-morrow; though there is, besides that, a wide, and, on their side, a very disadvantageous difference, between a married clergy and one not married.—The former will never have an influence with the people, anything like approaching that of the latter. There is, too, the well-known superiority of learning on the side of the Catholic clergy; to which may be added the notorious fact, that, in fair controversy, the Catholics have always triumphed. Hence the deep-rooted, the inflexible, the persevering and absolutely implacable hostility of this Established Church to the Catholics; not as men, but as Catholics. To what else are we to ascribe that, to this day, the Catholics are forbidden to have steeples or bells to their chapels! They, whose religion gave us our steeples and our bells! To what else are we to ascribe, that their priests are, even now, forbidden to appear in the streets, or in private houses, in their clerical habiliments, and even when performing their functions at funerals? Why all this anxious pains to keep the Catholic religion out of sight? Men may pretend what they will, but these pains argue anything but consciousness of being right on the part of those who take those pains. Why, when the English nuns came over to England, during the French Revolution, and settled at Winchester, get a bill brought into parliament, (as the Church clergy did) to prevent them from taking Protestant scholars, and give up the bill only upon a promise that they would not take such scholars? Did this argue a conviction in the minds of the Winchester parsons, that Bishop North's was the true religion, and that William of Wyckham's was the false one? The Church parsons are tolerant enough towards the sects of all descriptions: quite love the Quaker, who rejects baptism and the sacrament; shakes hands with the Unitarian; and allow him openly to impugn that, which they tell us in the prayer book, a man cannot be saved if he do not firmly believe in; suffer these, ay, even Jews, to present to church-livings, and refuse that right to