

carry the work on to the bitter end, until every Huguenot had recanted or perished. It is hard to believe that these things can excite in the bosom of the most fervent Ultramontane that sort of admiration or assent that displays itself in action. If they do not, then it cannot be truly said that Catholics forfeit their moral freedom or place their duty at the mercy of another.

There is waste of power by friction even in well-constructed machines, and no machinery can enforce that degree of unity and harmony which you apprehend. Little fellowship or confidence is possible between a man who recognizes the common principles of morality as we find them in the overwhelming mass of the writers of our Church and one who, on learning that the murder of a Protestant Sovereign has been inculcated by a saint, or the slaughter of Protestant subjects approved by a Pope, sets himself to find a new interpretation for the Decalogue. There is little to apprehend from combinations between men divided by such a gulf as this, or from the unity of a body composed of such antagonistic materials. But where there is not union of an active or aggressive kind, there may be unity in defence; and it is possible, in making provision against the one, to promote and to confirm the other.

There has been, and I believe there is still, some exaggeration in the ideal form of the agreement in thought and deed which authority can accomplish. As far as decrees, censures, and persecution could commit the Court of Rome, it was committed to the denial of the Copernican system. Nevertheless, the history of astronomy shows a whole catena of distinguished Jesuits; and, a century ago, a Spaniard who thought himself bound to adopt the Ptolemaic theory was laughed at by the Roman divines. The submission of Fénelon, which Protestants and Catholics have so often celebrated, is another instance to my point. When his book was condemned Fénelon publicly accepted the judgment as the voice of God. He declared that he adhered to the decree absolutely and without a shadow of reserve, and there were no bounds to his submission. In private he wrote that his opinions were perfectly orthodox and remained unchanged, that his opponents were in the wrong, and that Rome was getting religion into peril.

It is not the unpropitious times only, but very nature of things, that protect Catholicism from the consequences of some theories that have grown up within it. The Irish did not shrink from resisting the arms of Henry II., though two Popes had given him dominion over them. They fought against William III., although the Pope had given him efficient support in his expedition. Even James II., when he could not get a mitre for Petre, reminded Innocent that people could be very good Catholics, and yet do without Rome. Philip II. was excommunicated and deprived, but he dispatched his army against Rome with the full concurrence of the Spanish divines.

That opinions likely to injure our position as loyal subjects of a Protestant sovereign, as citizens of a free State, as members of a community divided in religion, have flourished at various times, and in various degrees; that they can claim high sanction; that they are often uttered in the exasperation of controversy, and are most strongly urged at a time when there is no possibility of putting them into practice—this all men must concede. But I affirm that, in the fiercest conflict of the Reformation, when the rulers of the Church had almost lost heart in the struggle for existence, and exhausted every resource of their authority, both political and spiritual, the bulk of the English Catholics retained the spirit of a better time. You do not, I am glad to say, deny that this continues to be true. But you think that we ought to be compelled to demonstrate one of two things—that the Pope cannot, by virtue of powers asserted by the late Council, make a claim which he was perfectly able to make by virtue of powers asserted for him before; or, that he would be resisted if he did. The first is superfluous. The second is not capable of receiving a written demonstration. Therefore, neither