

PARNELL'S POSITION.

LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WALSH

In Reply to a Question Relating to Parnell's "Marriage" with Mrs. O'Shea.

His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin has addressed the following letter to the "Irish Catholic."

Archbishop's House, Dublin,

5th August, 1891.

DEAR SIR.—A question, which I am informed is looked upon by some Catholics as an embarrassing one, has been put to me.

I am asked whether the recent "marriage"—that is to say, the agreement recently entered into in the Registry Office at Steyning between Mr. Parnell and the former Mrs O'Shea—has in any way altered the moral aspect of the situation that resulted from the revelations in the London Divorce Court in November.

In connection with this, my attention is directed to the fact that a certain Dublin newspaper, directed and controlled by a number of more or less prominent Catholics of this city, keeps on proclaiming that the recent "marriage" has made everything right, and implying that it is but narrow-minded intolerance in the Bishops of Ireland to go on taking the same view of the case as before.

Now as to all this, one thing at all events is certain. But for the partial demoralization that has been brought about by the circulation of the Freeman's Journal—the newspaper referred to amongst our people, the need of my answering such a question never could arisen. Whatever may be the standard of morality by which Mr. Parnell may choose to regulate his course of life, no section of the Catholics of Dublin and of Ireland, if their Catholicity had not been dragged into stupor by the poisonous doses administered to them from day to day in the columns of the apostate journal, could stand in need of any words of mine to teach them these two things—first, that adultery is a grievous and a shameful sin; and, secondly, that the guilt of it, so far from being washed away, is but deepened and blackened, when the sinners, instead of turning from their evil ways, deliberately enter into a public compact to continue their sinful career.

That, in plain language, is the nature of the compact entered into in the Registry Office at Steyning by Mr. Parnell and his partner in guilt. And that is the compact which the present responsible editors of the *Freeman's Journal*—unchecked, if not encouraged, by the present directors of the paper—inform the people of Dublin and of Ireland, is to be looked upon as having set everything to rights!

But then we are called upon to bear in mind that Mr. Parnell is a Protestant, not the Protestant Church, at all events in these countries, fully recognise the validity of a divorce such as that which was granted in the case of Captain and Mrs. O'Shea, and as a natural consequence, give its sanction to a subsequent marriage of the divorced wife with another husband?

The conductors of the *Freeman's Journal* have, I understand, been successful in leading a large section of their readers into the belief that the answer implied by this question represents, in fact, the teaching of the Protestant Church. Surely, the emphatic denunciation of divorce and re-marriage recently delivered by an eminent Protestant divine from the pulpit of one of the principal Protestant churches of this city, and subsequently published in more than one of our Dublin newspapers, ought to have rendered it unnecessary for me to deal with the point. But the *Freeman's Journal*, it seems, had carefully excluded from its columns all reference to that noteworthy evidence of the agreement, so far, of Protestant with Catholic teaching. It is not likely indeed that this letter will be transferred to the columns of your contemporary. Still, my present reference to that decisive statement cannot but have the effect of bringing the true state of the case under the notice of many from whom it has hitherto been successfully concealed. I am not without hope, then, that what I have now written may in this way contribute in some degree to the growth and spread of the happy change, now in such rapid progress, by which so many of the dupes of the *Freeman's*—and, through the *Freeman's Journal*, of Parnell—are coming at length to see how shamefully they have been misled for months.

But my main object in writing is to direct attention to a still more weighty exposition of Protestant doctrine upon the point.

Three years ago, a solemn assemblage of the Episcopate of what is known as "the Anglican Communion"—including the Protestant Churches of England, Ireland, Scotland, the United States of America, and the Colonies and Foreign Settlements of the British Empire—was held in the Palace of the Archbishops of Canterbury at Lambeth.

Especially as regards the Protestant Churches of England and Ireland, the assemblage was a most thoroughly representative one. This may be seen from the following list, which I transcribe from the "Official list of the Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference, arranged according to Provinces":

His Grace then quotes at length the names and titles of fifty-one Archbishops and Bishops of England and Ireland and proceeds:

Then follow the names of 6 Bishops from Scotland, of 29 from the United States, of 9 from British America, of 8 from Australia and New Zealand, of 5 from India, of 6 from Africa of 7 from the West Indies, and so on, to the number of 145 in all.

The Synod in its deliberations dealt with a number of questions of religious and social importance, and, amongst the rest, with the question of the Sanctity of Marriage in relation to Divorce as recognised by civil law. Upon this subject, the Encyclical Letter issued by the Bishops, at the close of the proceedings, to the faithful of their Communion throughout the world, contains the following passage:—

"In view connection with the promotion of purity is the maintenance of the

Sanctity of Marriage, which is the centre of social morality. This is seriously compromised by facilities of Divorce which have been increased in recent years by legislation in some countries. We have therefore held it our duty to reaffirm emphatically the precept of Christ relating thereto, and to offer some advice which may guide the Clergy of our Communion in their attitude towards and infringement of the Master's rule."

"And a ain:

"The sanctity of marriage as a Christian obligation implies the faithful union of one man with one woman UNTIL THE UNION IS SEVERED BY DEATH."

To the Encyclical Letter of the Synod are appended certain "Resolutions" setting forth in detail the teaching of the assembled Bishops on various points with which the Letter deals only in general terms. Of these Resolutions, three have reference to the question of Divorce.

The first of the three, to a certain extent, is expressed in the vague and halting language so strongly characteristic of the doctrinal utterances of the Anglican theological system. It touches upon the question of how far "the sanction of the Christian Church" can in any case be given "to the marriage of any person who has been divorced" contrary to the law of Christ, during the life of the other party.

But the second and third Resolutions are expressed in terms of unusual definiteness. These Resolutions distinguish in the clearest possible terms between two cases, the case of "the guilty party" and that of "the innocent party"—the terms "guilty" and "innocent" being understood in reference to the illicit acts on account of which the divorce has been granted by a civil Court.

As regards the "innocent" party, the assembled Bishops—influenced by what they term a "difference of opinion" as to whether Our Lord "meant to forbid marriage to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery,"—abstained from issuing any instruction to the Clergy to refuse the Sacraments or other privileges of the Church to those who, under civil sanction, are thus married.

But as regards the "guilty" party, the Resolution adopted is of the most uncompromising character. It was as follows:—

"UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES OUGHT THE CULPT PARTY, IN THE CASE OF A DIVORCE FOR ADULTERY, TO BE REWARDED, DURING THE LIFETIME OF THE INNOCENT PARTY, AS A FIT RECIPIENT OF THE BLESSING OF THE CHURCH ON MARRIAGE."

That, then, is the solemnly-recorded teaching of the Anglican Church in all its branches throughout the English-speaking world, as to the view to be taken of a subsequent "marriage" in a case such as that which has resulted from the decision of the London Divorce Court in the suit of Captain O'Shea against his wife and Mr. Parnell.

It would seem, then, to be established that the theologians of the *Freeman's Journal* are in no way more trustworthy guides when there is a question of Protestantism, than when there is a question of Catholic theology.

I remain, Dear Sir,
Most faithfully yours,
WILLIAM J. WALSH,
Archbishop of Dublin.

BURDOCK BLOOD BITTERS for the blood.

BURDOCK BLOOD BITTERS for the blood.