

it would spread even amongst the congregation of St. Peter's.

But this, you will say, proceeds from an erroneous popular mode of speaking. The name, it will be added, means nothing, it never can give, or take away the reality. This, sir, to a certain extent I will admit, and therefore will suggest that it is unnecessary, as it is vain for you to endeavour to deprive us of a name by which we have been known every where and at all times, or to appropriate the same to yourselves. We call one set of gentlemen orthodox; another, puritans, others again, disciples of Christ, or any thing else they please; they are but names, and the use of them with regard to religious sects, no more implies a belief of these sects possessing what these words express, than the names we give to quack medicines, imply a conviction of the wonderful powers which these big words convey. But as it would be a kind of imposition for any vender of nostrums to give his own specific a name already in use and well defined, relying merely on its etymological force, so it is a kind of fraud for one body of men to claim a name which the world had given to, and has been long enjoyed by, another body that existed before they were thought of. Any new name you select, even "of learned length and thundering sound," we will readily give you; but we cannot consent to part with a name by which we were always known, much less to exchange it for nicknames which you are pleased to form for us, even abstracting altogether from the etymological arguments, on which you rest your right to christen us.

But there is something, I do acknowledge, in this name of *Catholic*, which renders its use by us of serious inconvenience to modern pretenders. It is the name that was given to the Christian Church in the most ancient times, to distinguish it from the various sects that were daily springing up. Like modern Protestants, these men were condemned by the very principle of their existence, to perpetual change; and each class was thus necessarily local. This name of *Catholic*, or *Universal*, was given to the great Church, which was spread, and was always to remain spread, throughout the world; which by this quality and name, was always to be known from the various heresies which the Apostle had foretold would ever exist, and which at their birth would find it necessary to take some other name by which they might be distinguished,—derived either from their founders, their tenets, or some other peculiar circumstance. By this provision, the dispute between the true Church of Christ, and the sects that claim the title, will always assume the form of a contest between old Christianity and a new invention which its supporters try to palm on the world in its stead. In this dilemma, few persons imbued with proper notions of the very elements of religion, will find any difficulty in knowing which side to follow, without being obliged, at the call of every mountebank, to search the Scriptures from beginning to end, a difficult task for many, even though their labour be lightened (!) by offering them, as you do, the ponderous folios

of the Greek and Latin Fathers, to aid them in their studies; and then telling them to judge for themselves!

Your own name is an instance of this. By the word "Protestant" you indicate that you belong to the number of those who, at Luther's call rallied against Rome; by the word "Episcopalian" you designate that, in which you differ from your other Protestant brethren—your adherence to the episcopal form of church-government. By these two words, *Protestant Episcopalian*, you are known to the world. But each one of us can yet say with St. Pacian—"Christian is my name, Catholic is my surname," we need no other appendages to be known all over the world. If it follows from this that we are the same old church which received this name from the beginning, and you, a new body sprung up in the 16th century;—if it follows, that the question between our church and yours as with all other sects, is a question between the old Christian family and a new denomination; the dispute assumes this complexion in consequence of the intrinsic nature of things: the judgment of the whole world expressed in its familiar language, has placed it on this footing, not any arbitrary or wanton effort of ours.

[Conclusion of CATHOLICUS next week.]

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

CHURCH AND STATE.

The last October number of the Westminster Review, the great quarterly exponent of radical sentiment and doctrine, contains a forcible attack on the union of Church and State, in a review of a late Tory work, by W. C. Gladstone, M. P., entitled, "The State in its relations with the Church." According to the theory of Mr. Gladstone, so far at least as can we gather his opinions from the Review in question, the great preventive or remedy for the obduracy, selfishness and rapacity of the human heart, is to be found in a "Collective Religion," exhibited, in its lesser division, in the family union; and in a more comprehensive manner in the "Collective Religion of the State;" and to the Collective religion there naturally belongs the incident of the "Collective Conscience" of the State, before whose judgment of right or wrong in religious matters, all individual convictions of truth or falsehood, must be made to disappear. Against this "Collective Conscience" of the State, the Reviewer indulges in the following vigorous invective.—*Freeman's Journal*.

"We have an instinctive aversion to a 'collective conscience.' The conscience of the State in Judea crucified the Saviour. In England it has burned his followers, now Catholic, now Protestant. It allotted to almost all offences death or exile—to women the punishment of death by fire.* It called in council representa-

* Blackstone, vol. iv., p. 93, after describing the brutal punishment of treason—"In coining, the punishment is milder for male offenders; being only to be drawn and hanged by the neck till dead. But in treasons of every kind the punishment for women is the same; for as the decency due to the sex forbids the exposing and publicly mangling their bodies, their sentence, which is to the full as terrible to sensation as the other, is to be drawn to the gallows and there to be buried alive."

tives of old walls and pasture lands, whilst it refused to six millions of human beings the lowest privileges of citizens, and still refused to receive the votes of a vast majority of the kingdom. In the spirit of 'collective religion' it robbed the altars of that grand body, which had preserved for it the little learning it had, and wasted the spoils upon the ungainly revels of the court.

When we return from many a vale once sounding to the bell of the cathedral, yet magnificent in ruin, to stare at the well-pewed, whitewashed barns of the new establishment, where the sign of the kings arms outshines the cross, and the lion and the unicorn stand instead of the apostles, we begin indeed to appreciate the taste, wisdom and gratitude of the remorseless State. Chopping and changing with every paroxysm of lust, love, divorce and divinity, in the arch reformer Henry VIII., the conscience of the State at last elapsed into the care of the new church of England, by act of Parliament established, under a primate who sneaked into his see by taking an oath to himself not to keep his oath to the Pope, and illustrated his Protestantism by subscribing six several recantations.

Church and State danced disposedly together to the music of persecution with the virago Elizabeth. They revelled next with their great head, "the wisest fool in Europe," and paid his captain of the cockpit the salary of two secretaries of State; solved the knotty point, "why the devil did work more with ancient women than others,"† by statutes to end the old damsels on the gallows; or diversified their sports by burning Unitarians, or burying them in a dungeon for life. They told many a lie with his "hopeful seed"‡ Charles; and though they got some rough knocks from Old Noll, had their revenge by leaving him out of their chronicles, and taking a wider swing at the restoration. Then flourished the pious Titus Oates.—Then came the Test and Corporation Acts, the Five-mile Act, and other such crumbs of comfort. Then were public morals mended by a palace that was a brothel, and a peerage set off by the mistresses and bastards of the king—the pensioner of France. The Church was grateful, and would have gone some length to serve her captain. When he, despairing of legitimate issue, yet considering his faultiness to his Queen in other respects, "thought it a horrid thing to abandon her," a learned clerk "saw nothing so strong against polygamy as to balance the great and visible imminent hazards that hung over so many thousands if it were not allowed."§ Succeeding princes have been less nice, and Bishop Burnett pined too soon. The second Charles defender of the faith, unfortunately died in the communion of Rome; but then his brother, for belonging to the same new school, was swindled of his crown to the tune of a church juggle and *Te Deum*. There is no need to trace how the "con-

science" was handed down, through the Dutch William and the German Georges, to her present Majesty, who is far better and more happily occupied in the duties of maternity, than in convocation.

"The conscience of the State," not unaided by the votes of the church, plunged the nation into debt, and spent its blood in desolating wars. It endured and perpetuated slavery until indignant humanity swept the crime away; and then, when the work was done, when men had gone down to their graves worn out by the toil, the "brave peers of England, pillars of the State," princes and courtly prelates, and old ladies, bustled aside the survivors, and appropriated to themselves an emancipation in which they had no share except that they had seen it won in spite of them. Reminiscences of this kind do not whet the edge of our affections to the incorporated Dual."

Further on, in answer to the interrogatory "how are the jealousies, seditions, rebellions, murders, massacres, the whip the rack, the sealed dungeon and the flames, which were the offspring of the Union of Church and State, to be repressed?" The reviewer says:

"We answer, by the spirit of 'common life,' which teaches men the value of civil liberty, and that it is more great to combine than to coerce; by knowledge earned by labor and travel, which, by the difficulty they have had in working it out, and by the experience they have gone through of the multitudinous forms of men, their thoughts, habits, and institutions, shall teach them a lesson of humility in that it has been so very arduous a task for them to understand (if they can venture to say they do not yet understand, a portion of the spirit of their brother man. The more truly they have earned this knowledge, the less will they dream off repressing by "system," other than the example of persuasive love, the errors that are round about them; and the firmer their faith that religion is the mystery solely between man and his Creator, the more profound will be their conviction, that "it is impracticable for public law to stand upon distinctions of pure doctrine or opinion."

PERSUASIVE SPIRIT AND GRANDEUR OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

[Immediately following the above extract, (says the Freeman's Journal) is the annexed eloquent passage contrasting the spirit of the ancient Catholic Church in the realm of Britain, with the work of human hands that succeeded to her place, and which though tricked out with all the insignia of power, wanted yet the soul, the divine spirit that gave dignity and life to the Church of the olden time, and won for the sublime dogmas of her faith, and the stern but pure morality of her law, the willing obedience & affectionate reverence of the national heart & mind. The writer states]—

When the Catholic Church shone in the full blaze of noontide splendour, the rays of her magnificence fell upon and were reflected back from the hearts of the people. She had at least the common sense to identify herself with the sources of her power. Deriving her wealth from the

* Sully's opinion of James I.

† Lingard, James I., chap. iii., p. 323.

‡ See dedication of the new translation of the Bible to James I.

§ Lingard, Charles II., chap. iii., p. 211.