

331.) and archbishop Parker did homage in these words : " *Matthew Parker, D. D., acknowledge and confess to have and to hold the said archbishopric of Canterbury, and the possessions of the same entirely, as well the spiritualities as temporalities thereof, only of your majesty and crown royal ;*" to which document is added as an appendix : " *We also whose names be under written, being bishops of the several bishoprics within your majesty's realm, do testify, declare, and acknowledge all and every part of the promises in like manner as the Right Reverend Father in God, the Archbishop of Canterbury has done.*" In a word, the Church of England, at the period of the Reformation, distinctly recognised the civil sovereign, not merely the supreme governor, but also as the sole fountain of ecclesiastical jurisdiction ; so that, to use the words of Lord Coke, " *all the Church's laws are aptly and rightly called the king's ecclesiastical laws of England,*" or, as Lord Chief Justice Hale has it, " *her jurisdiction is from the crown, and her laws are under its laws—lex sub graviore lege.*"

Now what was the admission of this discipline, but a distinct relinquishment of all claim to authority as derived from the apostles, and the acceptance of it, at the hands of a power altogether different ; a breaking off, in fact, of the Church of England from that universal Church of which the successors of the apostles are the appointed rulers, to make it a mere appendage to a particular state, with the crown for its source of jurisdiction and centre of unity ; thus subordinating the ecclesiastical to the secular, the spiritual to the natural, the divine to the human.—For though you may say that the state is a divine ordinance as well as the Church, " *there is no power but of God, the powers that be ordained of God ;*" yet you cannot deny that it is a distinct ordinance, and instituted for ends altogether different ; and (which is the particular point we are now considering) when our Lord gave his commission to his apostles, so far from directing them to the powers of this world for its ratification, He distinctly warned them it must be executed in direct opposition to those powers, even unto death. And we know from history that it has been so executed ; St Peter and St Paul sought not at the hands of Nero the gift of spiritual jurisdiction, before they preached the gospel in his dominions ; St Athanasius was not slack in the fulfilment of this commission because of the opposition of princes ; St Ambrose (Church of the Fathers, pp 8, 21.) bade the emperor not embarrass himself with the thought that he had emperor's right over sacred things, for that he was not over the Church, but within it ; St Bernard was not more subservient to the Duke of Aquitaine, nor our own St. Thomas of Canterbury to the second Henry.

In the Church of England on the contrary, even since the Reformation, subservieney to the State has been one of its most eminent characteristics ; it has been a living energetic principle, growing and spreading itself abroad unchecked, and producing all those moral consequences, which one would have naturally expected from it. Look at the declaration of " *the judicious Hooker,*" (Book v. Preface.) that " *it ought to be the true description, style or title of all churches as yet standing within this realm, By the Goodness of Almighty God and His servant Elizabeth we are.*" Look at the dedication to James the First, still prefixed to the English Translation of the Bible, in which that Queen is styled " *the bright occidental star,*" and his Majesty " *the sun in his strength,*" titles which to Catholic ears sound almost blasphemous ; look at the State services ; that for King Charles the Martyr, for instance, in which the cause of the king is absolutely identified with that of our Lord, the Gospel selected being that parable of the husbandmen in the vineyard, who slew their master's messengers, and then his son ; or that for the fifth of November in which thanks are given to God for " *bringing his Majesty King William for the deliverance of our Church and Nation,*" to preserve us from the attempts of our enemies to bereave us of our Church and laws," " *our religion and liberties,*" &c. And in that for the 29th of May, there is the same perpetual union of " *this Church and Kingdom,*" " *the Monarchy of God's Church,*" " *true religion and worship together with our former peace and prosperity,*" just in the same temper as King Charles the second's first parliament declared the episcopal government to be " *most agreeable to the word of God and most suitable to Monarchy.*" (Collier viii. 486.) See also

in the Litany, after the prayer for the Holy Church Universal, comes the prayer for the Queen and the Royal Family, before that for the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and it is the same in the order of Morning and Evening Prayer. You will say perhaps, that these forms, or at least the State Services, are imposed on the Church by the State, and do not indicate any thing of the spirit of the Church herself, but look further at the religious biography of England since the Reformation, I mean especially of the High-Church party. Read the history and writings, for instance, of Archbishop Laud, whom you would yourself cite as the very type of the mind of the Church of England in the 17th century : is not his love for the Church indissolubly bound up with his love for the King, or rather are not the two ideas so fused together in his mind as to be identical ? In fact, with him and some others, one would almost think that this intense devotion to the Crown had been one main obstacle in the way of their receiving the Catholic Faith, towards which they were, on many points, inclined : it seems as if they could conceive of nothing more sacred than the " *divinity which doth hedge a king*" and as if the very idea of the Church involved that of the throne as its central point of vitality ; so that all the religiousness of their nature, so to speak, was concentrated and dried up in this worship of the Cesar. Well might the good Bishop Andrew c. pray to be kept from " *making gods of kings*" (Pree Quot. p. 190. ed. 1827.) And even now, though enthusiasm for the crown is no longer the form it assumes, the same national and secularising spirit is the leading principle in the main body of the Church of England, the many cling to it, because it is the Church by law established, the church of the wealthy and the educated, the Church of the English nation, as such, " *Church and State have become in their minds a blessed idea, and thus " they uphold the Church" from an instinctive feeling of loyalty,—not to the " dynasty of the apostles" but to the State of England.*

You will answer that, be this as it may the Roman Church is, after all, in this country an intruding Church ; that the whole English Church accepted the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth, and continued conformable until the famous bull was issued in 1570, when a certain party detached themselves from it, that the National Church continued its succession of bishops unbroken, and in undisputed possession of the ancient sees, while the Roman party in process of time, gathered round certain foreign priests and bishops, sent from Rome with no English sees, who are therefore in the position of intruders, they and their faction having separed from the National Church, not it from them.

Now, in the first place, it cannot be truly said that the whole English Church did receive the Reformation, seeing that when the oath of supremacy was tendered in Queen Elizabeth's reign, every single bishop, excepting one only, refused to take it. (Collier vi. 250.) and were all in consequence ejected from their sees ; surely this protest of her episcopate, together with their consequent deprivation, seems much like the death-pang of the church ; or rather like the mysterious sounds " *Let us depart*" which boded the downfall of the ancient temple. The convocation too had drawn up a catholic profession of faith, (Lingard, vol. v. c. 3. p. 153. ed. 4.) which was subscribed by both universities, and together with a protest against the royal supremacy, presented to the House of Lords ; and though the inferior clergy, for the most part afterward conformed, yet it must be remembered that, by so doing, they broke the vows of canonical obedience to their bishops. Moreover, very many of them only confirmed provisionally as it were, hoping that things would take some favorable turn ; and not a few went so far as to continue saying mass in private, while they used the communion service in public. Perhaps, too, you are hardly aware how far the complacency of the nation was the result of coercion and violence ; nor by how stringent a system of persecution, the Catholic spirit was crushed down for many generations. As early as 1560, (that is, ten years before the bull in question was issued,) a penalty of £20. (equal of course to a much larger sum now,) was already exacted from all who were not present at worship after the established form ; and an act had been pass-

\* Cobbet says equal to £250. those who could not pay were imprisoned or banished.