

☞ All letters and remittances are to be forwarded, free of postage, to the Editor, the Very Rev. Wm. P. McDonald, Hamilton.

## THE CATHOLIC.

Hamilton, G. D.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11.

☞ Letters and Remittances will be acknowledged upon the return of the Editor from Eastern Canada.

From the Dublin Review.

- ART. II.—I. The Standard of Catholicity, or an attempt to point out in a plain manner certain safe and leading principles amidst the conflicting opinions by which the Church is at present agitated. By the Rev. G. E. Biber L. D.
2. Dr. Biber's Standard of Catholicity Vindicated, being a reply to the notice of that work contained in No. 57 of the British Critic.
3. An Appeal in behalf of Church Government, addressed to the Prelates and Clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland: being remarks on the Debate in the House of Lords respecting that subject, on the 26th of May, 1840. By a Member of the Church.
4. A Letter to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Ripon, upon the State of Parties in the Church of England. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D. D., Vicar of Leeds.
5. Catechetical Instructions upon the Doctrines and Worship of the Catholic Church. By John Lingard, D. D.

[CONTINUED]

Neither the archbishop of Canterbury, nor even the bishop of Oxford, nor indeed any other ecclesiastical "authority," appears to have considered it any part of his or their duty to take any public notice of such a state of affairs, or to give so much as an authentic public manifestation of their opinions upon any of the subjects in question. As the matter stands, we have the regius professor of theology declared heterodox by a "tumultuous assembly" of divines possessing no ecclesiastical judicial authority, and scarcely any acquaintance with theology: which assembly was convened by other divines in the University, which other divines are condemned as heretical by the hebdomadal board of the same University; which board has as little authority over the subject matter as the conveners against whom they pronounced sentence of condemnation; which condemnation of the board would be condemned by the convocation, if they were only summoned together for the purpose: whilst the persons who are colloquially called the heads of the Church, appear to have either no authority or no inclination to interfere, even to the smallest extent, in such extraordinary proceedings. The gentleman who is the avowed author of the Tract No. 90, which the board condemned affirms, (*Times*, 17th March,) "that [notwithstanding the resolution of the board] his opinion remains unchanged, as well of the truth and honesty of the doctrine maintained in the Tract

as well as of the necessity of putting it forth." Whilst Mr. Sewall, the professor of moral philosophy in the same University, affirms in the postscript in his letter to Dr. Pusey, that Mr. Newman is "entitled to the gratitude of the church for having revived many most important truths which "the church" had, as we suppose, allowed to go altogether to sleep. Another of the Tracts, which have proceeded from the same quarter, has the following passage: Let the Church [i. e. the Church of England] go on teaching with the stammering lips of ambiguous formularies and inconsistent precedents." (Letter of a Protestant, in the *Times* of Tuesday, March 9.) In the same letter it is stated that Mr. Froude hated the Reformers, liked Bonner, and thought Bishop Jewel an irreverent dissenter; and that Mr. Newman said that "he looked upon the communion service with grief and impatient sorrow;" and such or similar must be taken to be the sentiments of the members of the convocation, who would condemn the board, which had condemned the tractarians, who had convened the assembly of divines, who condemned the regius professor of theology, in the University of Oxford; whilst, in the same paper, it was stated a few days before, (6th March, 1841) that the Tractarian sect originated at a meeting held in the summer of 1833, at the house of the domestic chaplain of the archbishop of Canterbury. The letter in the *Times* names the bishops of Exeter, Chester, Chichester, Winchester, London and Salisbury, as having issued injunctions warning the clergy against the doctrines of the Puseyites. The leading article of the *Times* of the same day, alleges, however, that some of these same bishops have seconded the teaching of the same divines upon controverted points of the "greatest importance," and appeals to the candor of the writer of the letter in confirmation of the fact.

Such are a few of the outward and sensible symbols of unity which we discovered in one department of the Anglo-Hibernian establishment.

A considerable number of clergymen, of a different class from the preceding ("of conservative politics and evangelical sentiment"—*Times*, March 9,) petitioned the House of Lords, in the course of the last session, for a change in the liturgy, articles, and canons (to a new stock, lock, and barrel;) and the bishop of Norwich observed in the course of the debate, that "among the numberless clergymen with whom he had spoken upon the subject, he had never yet met a single one who allowed that he agreed in all points to the subscription which he took at ordination" (*Appeal*, p. 16;) that is to say, who really believed what he professed to believe: whilst the bishop of London stated in the same debate, "that he had never met with a single clergyman who did not express his unqualified belief in the whole"—*Ibid.* p. 25;) declaring at the same time, that he should, for his own part, consider himself as "eating the bread of the church unworthily if he were to subscribe to any articles which he did not implicitly believe." (p. 25) From which it is quite evident that the bishop of London has never had

as he expressed it, "the misfortune to meet a single one" of the numberless clergymen with whom the bishop of Norwich is acquainted; or with the petitioning clergy of 1833 or 1841, who stated that some of the canons were inexpedient, and some of them impracticable (whilst all were obligatory upon the clergy, who were obliged to profess an adherence to the whole;) and that some deviations from the authorised forms and positive obligations of the Church, were found to be so advisable, that such deviations had already been actually carried into very general practice. (*Appeal*, xii.) Whilst, again, the author of the *Appeal* declares that "it is admitted that our canons neither are nor can be enforced; that our clergy are not compelled to observe them except by the diocesan, and that our bishops are not under any obligation to enforce them" (p. 127;) and that it is notorious, "that neither our clergy are punished for transgressing them, nor our bishops for neglecting to enforce an obedience to them" (p. 129.) And we learn from the same source (p. 133,) that a "publication used as a text-book in the Universities for the instruction of even candidates for orders, expressly maintains the doctrine that subscription to the articles implies no more than the party subscribing will not enter into any controversy upon the points to which the articles relate."

The Bishop of Norwich declared that the Church of England was founded upon liberty of conscience, and the right of private judgment (*Appeal*, p. 14.) But the Bishop of London calls the declaration "a libel upon the church," [*Ibid.* p. 20.] and says that the only way in which the "church could maintain itself at all, was by keeping true to the one point of the theological compass" (*Appeal*, p. 22.) In our attempts to hit off this one point, we have not been more successful than in the other parts of the enquiry.—The Bishop of London himself told us nothing about it, whilst the author of the *Appeal* acknowledges that not only the point of the compass, but the whole compass itself is a mere nonentity. He comically adds, that there could not be so much disputation about the direction of the course to which it pointed, if the compass, to say the least of the matter, were not very much out of repair; and he concludes by stating that "we have nobody able to mend it" [*Ibid.* p. 73.] Nobody at all seems to contemplate such a thing as a capacity anywhere to correct the variations of the compass, even if it ever should be repaired. The petitioners tell us that the clergy are understood to be bound to the observance of all the canons, although some are "confessedly inexpedient, and some are absolutely impracticable" [*Ibid.* p. 12.] But the Bishop of Lincoln tells the House of Lords, as he had previously told Mr. Wodehouse, that the fact of Mr. Wodehouse's entertaining difficulties about the Liturgy and the Athanasian Creed, constituted no obstacle to his admission to holy orders: (*Ibid.* p. 7) and that a similar opinion was given to Mr. Wodehouse by other prelates whom he consulted:—whilst, in another place, we are told, with reference to the authority and practice of the Bishop of London, "that no conscientious bishop is satisfied with an unexplained subscription to the general standard; that he requires, or ought to require, every candidate for orders to stand one examination as to the meaning of that which he subscribes" (p. 120.) The Bishop of Norwich himself made some very natural reflections upon the insincerity of "confessing with our lips what we do not confess with our hearts:" whilst the condemnation of No. 90, by the Hebdomadal Board, proceeded expressly upon the ground that the tract reconciled subscription to the thirty nine articles with the adoption of errors which they were designed to counteract. As a repli-

cation upon this position of the Board, it may be stated in the words of Mr. Sewall, that "the thirty nine articles were not intended as a dogmatical teaching, or as a system of theology, whose reception was to be imposed by authority;" although Bishop Burnett had informed us that the aforesaid articles contained "the sum of our doctrine, and the confession of our faith."

The party however, who consider that "it would be a serious evil to treat those articles as a regular system of theology, or confession of belief, to be enforced by the ecclesiastical power," are spoken of in the following manner, by a high authority:—

"Their teaching has now sunk deeply into the heart of the church of England; it has acquired not merely a numerical, but a moral power and influence, which must henceforth make it impossible for any statesman to despise or overlook, and highly indiscreet for any political party unnecessarily to alienate this element in the constitution of society. The younger clergy are said to be very generally of this school; it has no want of advocates among their seniors; it has penetrated into both Houses of Parliament: and we are confidently informed that it has met with countenance from the bishops themselves. It has completely succeeded in awakening in the church that vital spirit of re-*action*, the necessity for which called it into existence.—We hear nothing now of a demand for the admission of dissenters into the Universities, of proposals to abolish subscription to the thirty-nine Articles, or of contemplated changes in the Liturgy; or, if we do still hear of them, the manner in which they are received, as contrasted with their popularity in 1833, illustrates the completeness of the victory still more forcibly."—*Times* of March 6th, 1841.

The most comical part of the transaction is, that a polemical combination, which was formed for the purpose of preventing those alterations in the prayer book "which were called for by many of the clergy and laity," (*Times*, 6th March, 1841,) and which has had the effect, as we are told in the same place, of preventing proposals for abolishing subscription to the articles, should be condemned by the University to which they belonged, for advocating an interpretation of the articles which "reconciled a subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they were designed to counteract," and that the champions of resistance to all contemplated alterations in the liturgy of the church were loud in proclaiming to the world, that the said church effected its "teaching" through "stammering lips" by "ambiguous formularies" and "inconsistent precedents."

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

### Number of Catholics in Great Britain.

A correspondent inquires the number of the Catholics in England, Scotland, and Wales. We believe there are no data for answering the question exactly. The laity's directory of last year, stated the total number in Great Britain at under two millions; and gave the following approximate calculation of the undermentioned towns:—London and its vicinity, 200,000; Liverpool, 80,000; Manchester and Salford, 60,000; Glasgow and its vicinity, 50,000; Preston, 17,000; Edinburgh 14,000; Newcastle and Gateshead, 12,000; Paisley, 10,000; Birmingham, 9,000; Leeds, 8,000; Blackburn, 7,000; Bolton, 6,000; Sheffield, 6,000; Dundee, 6,000; Wigan 6,000; Derby, 5,000; Norwich, 5,000; Huddersfield, 5,000; Bristol 5,000; Bath, 4,000; Hull, 4,000; York, 3,000; Greenock, 3,000; North and South Shields, 3,000; Aberdeen, 2,500; Dumfries, 2,000.