

Christians, having or claiming Episcopal power, are so many branches of an imaginary Catholic Church. But he forgets that these local establishments have not, and cannot have, communion with each other. The Greek Church looks upon the Anglican heresy, just as the Roman Church does, except as regards the single question of the Pope's supremacy. The Church of England returns this judgment by joining the Pope against the Greek schismatics, on the question of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. Both of them have bishops, so called; but both bear the stamp of the province in which they originated, for which they were designed, and beyond which they are incapable of development. One may be the ecclesiastical slave of the Russian, and the other of the British monarch; but union or communion between them is utterly impossible. In what part of the world, then, can the prelates of the English establishment, or those of the same order in this country, expect to be recognized on the grounds of Catholicity, except in the secular province to which they belong?

Our contemporary in his last article, regards the Church as a corporation, or "corporate body, the powers of which have been equally vested in all the apostles, and their successors in office." Even then, there should be some representation of the head, for the purpose of order and subordination. But has our contemporary forgotten his New Testament? To which of the Apostles did Christ say, "to thee I will give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," except to Peter alone? To which one besides did he say, "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren?" To which of them did he say, "feed my sheep?" These were privileges conferred on Peter alone. Either then, they were applicable to all the apostles, or they conferred on Peter personal and singular prerogatives which destroyed the imaginary equality of the *Churchman's* Episcopal corporation. Which of the Episcopal bishops can discharge the office of St. Peter in confirming his brethren? In fact they all feel the necessity, without having the authority, for the exercise of such power. Hence, the irregular interference of certain roving bishops in the internal affairs of diocesan administrations, over which they have no jurisdiction. By this equality, which the words of our Saviour to St. Peter proved him never to have intended, our Protestant Episcopal prelates claim to teach in opposition to each other; and exhibit to the world the spectacle of a house divided in itself and which must therefore, fall.

Our contemporary had stated, that even Catholic writers acknowledged the possibility of a Catholic Church in the absence of communion with the Holy See. This of course we denied, and called for his authority. He refers to two, taking them second hand from Mr. Palmer—the one Delahogue, and the other, Dupin. It is difficult to conceive how any one could give a quotation to prove a proposition, then he himself must know that the quotation proves no such thing. Delahogue

merely states that during the great western schism, whilst all adhered to the principle of communion with the Holy See, some identified that principle with one competitor, and some, with another—presenting one form of those physical hindrances to which we had referred; inasmuch as they could not know which individual was the true successor of St. Peter. Delahogue himself, in the very quotation which the *Churchman* introduces, remarks that none of those obediences were involved even in schism. How then can the *Churchman* pretend to prove from this quotation, that Catholicity is possible where communion with Rome has been broken? The other witness, Dupin, does not pretend in the passage cited, to write as an historian, but only as a casuist. His unsoundness, both in faith and morals, should render him in the eyes of the *Churchman*, as of all honest men, a suspected authority on Catholic doctrine. His intercourse with Archbishop Wake of Canterbury, showed but too clearly how ready he was to betray Catholic truth for sake of the advantages which he anticipated from the spurious union of the two creeds. Neither does he bear the *Churchman* out. He does not give any facts, but merely expresses an opinion of his own, which, even if it were correct, would not be to the purpose in hand. But we have had no opportunity of verifying the quotation as it stands.

Again we repeat, therefore, that to imagine a part of the Catholic Church not in communion with the Holy See, has ever been, and is now, a contradiction. Take any period of the Church, from the beginning down to the commencement of the Anglican schism, and our statement is borne out by universal testimony. The Arians called themselves Catholics in their day, as the Protestant Episcopalians do in ours. Will the *Churchman* agree that they were Catholics? And if not, how can he claim the title for his own contracted and modern denomination?

But he says that our doctrine is held only in those churches which are in communion with Rome. So this we reply, that it was held by all Churches at the beginning of the sixteenth century—that it was true, then, and that the apostasy of Geneva, or Canterbury, has not rendered it false since. Those who have revolted against the Church, and violated her unity, may enjoy the advantages of such a course, but as an offset, they must remember the privileges they have forfeited by the act; of those privileges every just claim to the title of Catholic may be placed at the head. He says next, that if all Catholic churches were in communion with Rome, the communion might be merely voluntary, and that hence our argument would not prove it to be necessary. We answer to this, that all Catholic churches are in communion with Rome, that the communion is voluntary, though founded on the conviction of its being necessary, in order to comply with the requirements of our Saviour, in the institution and organization of His Church. What we have here stated to show the necessity of communion with Rome, in order to be entitled to the

claim of being Catholic, is entirely a matter of historical fact, which the *Churchman* may confute from history if he can. In order to avoid this difficult task he turns aside to place the issue on a matter of principle, and says that it would require the See of Rome to be infallible. To this we reply, that no decision of the church has declared the Pope to be other than infallible. Neither has it declared him to be infallible. And yet, the fact of communion with that See has ever been an indispensable condition of Catholicity. In this all the Christian world had been agreed, until after the rise of each successive schism and heresy, when the universal body rejected the rebellious members and deprived them of the title which was theirs previous to their rebellion.—This, we contend, is history; and we call on the *Churchman*, to show one single exception to the rule.

Apparently comprehending the difficulty of such an undertaking, he has referred us to a correspondent, and we are sorry that the latter is not without his capacity to mislead the incautious reader. Without going at length into a review of his article, we shall mention one or two historical references, in which truth is sadly perverted for the purpose of upholding an unsound system. He says that "the African Bishops, finding that the novel pretensions of the Roman See were unsupported by ecclesiastical authority wrote a letter to Pope Celestine, in which, after alluding to the independence of the African church in the matter in question, they say," &c. &c. Then he gives a quotation from Fleury's Ecclesiastical history. Is it not strange that the *Churchman* could allow the publication of such a statement, when in fact neither the African bishops nor Fleury say one syllable about the independence of the African Church, nor about novel pretensions; but on the contrary Fleury himself intimates that the bishops of Africa had been accustomed to the exercise of the power against which they remonstrated, and "declared that they would suffer it no more." So that what is, in history and in truth, a usage "no longer," as they contend, "to be borne with," is perverted in the *Churchman* to a novel pretension. They were preparing the way for an African, instead of a Catholic Church. Where is the African Church now?—and where will the English Church be in a century from this?—whilst the Catholic Church was from the beginning, and will be to the end, universal and in communion with Peter's successors. But after all, the proceedings of the African bishops are by no means inconsistent with a full recognition of the Pope's supremacy. They had excommunicated an unworthy priest named Apollonius. He appealed to the Pope. The Pope restored him to communion, and sent him back to Africa with Faustinus, a bishop, who had been the Legate of Pope Zosimus in that country. On his arrival, the bishops assembled in council, complained of the proceeding, and during the debates the priest acknowledged his guilt; and, says Fleury, "drew sobs from the council, but remained forever deprived of

the exercise of his ministry." The council then remonstrated with the Pope on the subject, and "conjured him," (in the language of Fleury) "not to restore those whom they had excommunicated." We have known in this country a case somewhat similar. A clergyman is suspended by his bishop. He goes to Rome, and on his own representation of the case is restored. He comes back with letters of recommendation from the Holy See to his bishop, and his bishop immediately suspends him again. All this, without the slightest disrespect toward the Holy See, or the slightest censure to the bishop for what he had done. These things are understood in the Catholic Church, and perfectly consistent with a recognition of the supremacy in the successor of St. Peter, without which the idea of a Catholic Church is a pure fiction. This is the only part of the layman's communication which could be of service to the editor's argument, and we have just seen that it does no credit to either.

We advise the *Churchman*, then, to give up all claim to the word Catholic, or else to qualify himself to be the thing which that word means. Let him be a Protestant if he will, and call himself by his proper appellation. In either case, although there is a great difference, yet he will be consistent. But whilst he is a Protestant in fact, his yearning after the title "Catholic" will be looked upon by persons of all denominations as a harmless but somewhat ludicrous affectation. Neither will bad reasoning, or perverted history, help the matter. It is so, by the inevitable and controlling influence of truth, which has within itself a force, and a direct bearing, that no sophistry, no talents, no perverted ingenuity, will ever be able to withstand.

"HOLY SACRED AND ROLL DIVINE AND BOOK.—Such is the blasphemous title of a book that has been produced within a few months among the Shakers, purporting to have been dictated by an angel from Heaven to one Stewart, as supplementary to the revelation of the Bible, and an improvement thereon!! A delegation from the society, in Union Village, Warren county, Ohio, waited on us with a copy during the past week. The Shakers wisely pretend to offer no evidence of the inspiration of this curiosity, but content themselves with bewailing the unhappy fate of all "in mortal clay" who when they read will not taste and see that the book's inspired! Its divine MOTHER ANN LEE, assumes that sixty years of existence of her sect should convince the world that she was not fed with new milk through the key-hole of a prison, in England, for nothing, and denies a future judgment and the resurrection of the body. What with the books that have been torn out of the Bible, and the forced interpretations put on those that remain, by sectarians, the golden book of Mormon, or Joe Smith, and Holy Sacred and Divine Roll of the Shakers, and we shall see the necessity of some such unerring security as the wisdom of the Saviour has provided in the Catholic Church. Tell the Shakers, indeed, that Mother Ann Lee was not greater than Moses and Paul, and that the 'Roll' does not taste more divine than the Gospel?—*Catholic Telegraph*.

PAYMENTS RECEIVED.

Hamilton—Mr. McCurdy, 15s.
Petersborough.—Rev. Mr. Butler 87;
being for C. Crowley, 10s., Charles McCarthy, 15s., Bernard Boyd, 7s. 6d., and balance Cr. 2s. 6d.