

ART.	PAGE
VII. DOCTOR PUSEY'S LECTURES ON DANIEL	189
<p>1. Daniel the Prophet. Nine Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford, with copious Notes. By E. B. Pusey, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church. Oxford: Parker. 1864.</p> <p>2. The inspiration of the Book of Daniel and other portions of Holy Scripture, with a correction of profane and an adjustment of sacred chronology. By W. R. A. Boyle, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister. London: Rurston. 1863.</p> <p>3. Fulfilled Prophecy a proof of the truth of Revealed Religion. Being the Warburtonian Lectures of 1854—1858, with an Appendix of Notes, including a full investigation of Daniel's prophecy of the Seventy Weeks. By the Very Rev. W. Goode, D.D., Dean of Ripon. London: Hatchard. 1863.</p>	
VIII. THE MEXICAN EMPIRE AND THE CANADIAN CONFEDERATION	206
<p>Le Mexique Ancien et Moderne. Par Michel Chevalier, Membre de l'Institut. Paris: Hachette.</p> <p>La Politique Française en Amérique. Par M. Henri Moreau, Paris: Dentu.</p> <p>L'Expédition du Mexique. Par Le Prince Henri de Valori. Paris: Dentu.</p> <p>L'Empire Mexicain et Son Avenir. Paris: Dentu.</p> <p>Speeches and Addresses on British American Union. By the Hon. T. D'Arcy McGee, Minister of Agriculture in the Canadian Government. London: Chapman & Hall.</p> <p>Parliamentary Debates on the subject of Confederation. Printed by order of the Legislature. Quebec: Hunter, Rose, & Co.</p> <p>Papers relating to the Conferences between H. M. Government and the Executive Council of Canada. By Command. London: Spottiswoode.</p>	
IX. FOREIGN EVENTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST	227
X. NOTICES OF BOOKS.....	256
<p>Canon Morris's Last Illness of Cardinal Wiseman—The Bishop of Clifton's Remarks on the Encyclical—Mgr. Parisi sur les Libertés Publiques—The Bishop of Agnola's Discours sur la Nature du Mal actuel—Dr. Murray's Tractatus de Ecclesiâ Christi—F. Harper's Claims of the Anglican Establishment to be the Representative of the Primitive Church—Mr. Oxenham's Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement—The Life and Revelations of Saint Gertrude, Virgin and Abbess of the Order of Sts. Benedict—Vie de Madame Geoffroy, Religieuse du Sacré Cœur, décedée à Lyon en Odeur de Sainteté—Cardinal Wiseman's William Shakespeare—S. Martha's Home; or, Work for Women—The Month—A. May Pageant, and other Poems—Quarante Huites d'été à la Cour de Turin—Bishop Dupanloup's Remarks on the Encyclical—God and His Creatures—Catechism made Easy.</p>	

THE

DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY, 1865.

ART. I.—PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION.

1. *Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to enquire into the Revenues and Management of certain Colleges and Public Schools, &c.* With Appendix and Evidence. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1864.
2. *Butler Burke at Eton.* By BRACEBRIDGE HEMYNG. London: John Maxwell & Co. 1865.
3. *The Public School Calendar.* Rivingtons. 1865.

THE question of public school education is not merely a question of immense interest, but of immediate importance. It is a question which sinks deep to the root of England's nationality, and spreads itself abroad like a net-work of nerves through her political life. Directly or indirectly—from the turrets of Windsor to the back-slums of Westminster, from the peer to the peasant, from Belgravia to Billingsgate—from the highest to the lowest—in a word, wherever English blood is to be found, there does the action make itself felt of that great propelling power in the nation—its system of public schools. It is a question which has to do with Law, and Physic, and Divinity; that stretches itself out to sea wherever our "wooden walls" can spread their sails, or our iron fortresses move like magic through the waters, and that throbs in every British vein on board, from the most reckless and impudent midddy to the admiral of the fleet: it is a question which runs down our rank and file like a word of command, having an intimate connection with the stern, stubborn, dogged hardihood of the British soldier; it is a question which affects us in politics, in morals, in religion; and not only strikes down to the root of the character of the man, but is most intimately blended with the genius of the race.

The Royal Commissioners have been intrusted with a delicate, an arduous and responsible task.

cholera had broken out in the neighbourhood of the Abbaye; and though she did not fear death, she had a peculiar horror of that dreadful pestilence. But her flight was vain; the scourge pursued her, and fell with sudden violence on her enfeebled frame. The day before, Ampère and Madame Salvage had dined with her, and on the morning of her seizure her niece's daughter Juliette had been reading to her the Memoirs of Madame de Motteville. During twelve hours she suffered extreme torture, but spoke with her confessor, and received the sacrament of extreme unction. Continual vomiting prevented the administration of the Eucharist. Ampère, Paul David, the Abbé de Cazalès, her relations and servants, knelt around her bed to join in the prayers for the dying. Sobs and tears choked their voices, and "Adieu, adieu, we shall meet again; we shall see each other again," were the only words her agony allowed her to utter.

Madame Récamier breathed her last on the 11th of May, 1849. The terrible epidemic, which generally leaves hideous traces behind it, spared her lifeless frame, and left it like a beautiful piece of sculptured marble. Achille Devéria took a drawing of her as she lay in her cold sleep, and his faithful sketch expresses at the same time suffering and repose.

Such was the end of her who, without the prestige of authorship, was regarded by her cotemporaries as one of the most remarkable women of her time. We will not indulge in any exaggerated statement of her piety. Great numbers, no doubt, have attained to more interior perfection. Her ambition to please was undoubtedly a weakness. Religion did not make her what she was; yet she would never have been what she was without it. It was the ballast which steadied her when carrying crowded sail. It was the polar star that directed her course amid conflicting currents and adverse storms. It raised her standard of morality above that of many of her associates. It taught her how to be devout without dissimulation, a patroness of letters without pedantry, a patriot and a royalist without national disdain or political animosity. It made her charitable to the poor, kind to the aged and sorrowful, gracious and unassuming with all, at the very time that the proudest of emperors invited her presence at his court, and his brother Lucien made her the idol of his verse. Its golden thread guided her aright through the intricate mazes of social life—through a matrimonial position equally strange and unreal—an engagement to a royal prince who was the foe of France—through friendships with Bernadotte and Murat on their thrones, with the Queens of Holland and of Naples when fallen, and with the third Napoleon when plotting

to regain the sceptre of the first. It so lifted her above intrigue and cabals that she could give her right hand to the disaffected General Moreau and her left to the devoted Junot—could be made the confidante of all parties without betraying the secrets of any. It inclined her to be chary of giving advice, but to make it, when asked for, tell always on the side of virtue. It enabled her to exhort the sceptical with effect, and dispose the philosophic to accept the faith.*

Her autobiography has unfortunately been destroyed by her own direction, because blindness would not allow her to revise it and cancel its defects. But many fragments of it have been preserved, and a thousand personal recollections, collected from those who knew her, have been wrought by her niece and other biographers into a lasting monument.

ART. V.—ROME, UNIONISM, AND INDIFFERENTISM.

L'Encyclopedie et les Evêques de France. Paris: Dentu.

A Letter on the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom.
By Right Rev. BISHOP ULLATHORNE. London: Richardson.

Experiences of a 'Vert.' Reprinted from the *Union Review* for the Editor.
London: Hayes.

Christendom's Divisions. By EDMUND S. FFOULKES. London: Longman.

Theology of the Nineteenth Century (Fraser's Magazine for Feb., 1865). By
the DEAN OF WESTMINSTER. London: Longman.

IN order that our readers may appreciate some of the works named at the head of our article, we must once more advert to a matter on which we have of late been laying considerable stress: we must speak once more on the fundamental erroneousness, the violently anti-Catholic character, of that opinion, which would limit the Church's and the Holy Father's infallibility to actual definitions of faith. In addition to various arguments which we have already urged on this matter, we would entreat our readers' attention to the following considerations:—

(1.) F. Perrone's lectures (whatever criticism may otherwise be made on them) have beyond question a greater value than any other work that can be named, in this respect; viz., in showing what is the view of Catholic doctrine inculcated at this moment on theological students, by the great

* See her letters to Ampère in the *Correspondant*, 1864.

majority of bishops throughout the world. Now in his dissertation on the Church, he lays down a certain elementary doctrine on infallibility, as "held by Catholics and denied by all others." He does not speak of it as of one Catholic view among many, but as of the one Catholic doctrine; nor does he so much as hint that among Catholics any other can possibly exist. We cannot better express this doctrine than in his own words:—

While the Church fulfils the office of teaching, she performs a threefold duty; viz., that of witness, of judge, and of guide (magistræ). Of witness, in proposing those truths of the faith which she has received from Christ; of judge, in deciding controversies which either touch the faith or have reference thereto; lastly of guide, in that daily ministry whereby through her oral and practical teaching (vivâ voce et praxi) she instructs the faithful in all those matters which conduce to their being trained in pure doctrine and morality, and whereby she leads them as it were by the hand along the path of eternal salvation. Catholics contend, all non-Catholics deny, that Christ has endowed His Church with infallibility for performing each of these duties.—De Locis, n. 347, 8.

Now it is plain on the surface, that those who limit the Church's infallibility to her definitions of faith, admit indeed her infallibility as "testis;" and to some limited extent as "judex:" but that they deny infallibility to her altogether, in her capacity of "magistra." No such view, however, is so much as known to approved theologians. According to their unanimous teaching, the Church is infallible, not only in witnessing and in judging, but in practically guiding her children to salvation.

Now let our readers consider at their leisure—though indeed it requires very prolonged consideration to exhaust the subject—how much is implied in this pregnant statement, that the Church is infallible in her "juge magisterium." Take the obvious illustration of a parent; and suppose it were revealed to me that my mother's guidance is infallible in every particular of moral and religious training. That I should accept with unquestioning assent the very least detail of her explicit instruction, is but a small part of my submission to her authority. I should be ever studying her whole demeanour in my regard—her acts no less than her words—in order that I may more fully apprehend her implied principles of conduct, and gather those lessons of profound wisdom which she is privileged to dispense. Perhaps indeed at the present time no more important contribution could be made to scientific theology, than a full exposition of the Church's infallible "magisterium;" so that this great doctrine may be cleared

of possible misconception, and vindicated against plausible objection.

(2.) This infallibility of the Church's "magisterium" is also testified by the "sensus fidelium." He who holds that the Church is infallible only in her definitions of faith, studies divine truth by a method which we must maintain to be characteristically Protestant. He takes for his principles these definitions (as contained *e. g.* in Denzinger's small volume) and manipulates them according to his own private views of history and logic, with no further deference or submission to the living Church. Now such an extravagance as this is by absolute necessity confined to highly educated intellects: the ordinary believer has no more power of proceeding by such a method, than by the more openly Protestant maxim of private judgment on Scripture. A few unsound Catholics, we repeat, may be led astray by intellectual phantoms or blinded by intellectual pride; but the great mass have imbibed one and one only method of acquiring Catholic truth. The Church, as they have been taught, in her full practical exhibition, is their one infallible guide. They well know that, if they would learn their religion, they must open their heart unreservedly to the Church's full influence; study for their guidance those manuals and spiritual books which she places in their hand; listen with docility to the instruction of her ministers; practise those duties which she prescribes in the very form in which she prescribes them; labour in one word that that great body of truth may sink silently and deeply into their heart, which her whole system of practice and discipline inculcates and implies.* Now it is a principle of Catholicism that wherever the body of the faithful has unanimously imbibed one impression of fundamental doctrine, a strong presumption arises of such impression being the true one.† But even otherwise—is there any one who would openly say that there is a "royal road" to religious truth? that the highly cultivated intellect is to seek it by a method essentially different from that accessible to the ordinary believer? that far less deference is due to the Church's practical guidance from the former than from the latter? An

* "As the blood flows from the heart to the body through the veins; as the vital sap insinuates itself into the whole tree, into each bough, and leaf, and fibre; as water descends through a thousand channels from the mountain top to the plain; so is Christ's pure and life-giving doctrine diffused, flowing into the whole body through a thousand organs from the Ecclesiâ Docens."—Murray, de Ecclesiâ, disp. XI., n. 15.

† *E. g.*, "In questione fidei communis fidelis populi sensus haud levem facit fidem."—Charmes, quoted with assent by Perrone.

affirmative answer to this question is involved in the opinion which we are combating; but such an answer is so obviously and monstrously anti-Catholic, that no one will venture expressly to give it. The legitimate benefit to be derived from intellectual cultivation is not (we need hardly say) that men should be less loyal and submissive to the Church; but on the contrary that their docility to her, while remaining formally the same, may become materially far greater, from the far more extensive knowledge opened to them, of her true mind, of her implied teaching, of her multifarious traditions.

(3.) According to that ultramontane doctrine which (as we shall presently urge) is alone defensible, the Pope's infallibility is precisely co-extensive with that of the *Ecclesia Docens*. Now if it be granted that the Pope is infallible in his constant and abiding "magisterium," in all his implied and practical teaching,—much more must he be infallible in that large body of explicit instruction, which he is constantly putting forth for the guidance of all his spiritual children. We are here referring of course, not to definitions of faith alone, but to such Papal acts as are recounted, *e. g.*, in the recent Syllabus. Acts of this kind are put forth, as the Pope himself says, in virtue of his office as universal teacher, and they are published for the guidance of his flock; but they vary indefinitely in the forms which they assume: sometimes they are consistorial allocutions, sometimes encyclicals, sometimes letters addressed to this or that individual pastor. Being intended, however, as instructions to the whole Church, it is plain that they form a part of the Holy Father's "juge magisterium;" and those who admit him to be infallible in the whole of this latter office, must admit him to be infallible inclusively in such doctrinal declarations. On the other hand, and conversely, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that those who hold this latter infallibility, and act consistently with this belief, will be practically in the same position as if they held the former also. And at all events it is absolutely certain, as men of every party will admit, that all those who accept thoroughly either of the two above-named doctrines, will accept the other also: that all who regard the Pope as infallible in his various doctrinal declarations, will regard him as also infallible in his "juge magisterium;" and vice versa. For all practical purposes, therefore, the question which we are now discussing is equivalent to that which we have been treating in our recent numbers, on the infallibility of those Papal declarations which are not definitions of faith.

The present, then, will be a very good opportunity for executing a purpose which we mentioned in April; *viz.*, the placing before

our readers some sufficient sample of the extraordinary unanimity with which the French Episcopate has recognized the infallibility of the recent Encyclical with its appended Syllabus. No errors are therein formally condemned as heretical, and against several of them no one even alleges the charge of heresy. If, therefore, the Pope is infallible in all his doctrinal declarations addressed to the whole Church, and not merely in those which are definitions of faith. Yet we shall see that the French bishops not only recognize with one voice this infallibility,—but also regard such infallibility as an elementary and familiar portion of Christian doctrine, held as a matter of course by the whole body of believers. We quote from the work named first at the head of this article; and the peculiar importance of the point at issue will plead our excuse, if our quotations run to a considerable length.

The Bishop of Nantes:—

[The parish priests of my diocese] will not allow the faithful to forget (ignorer) *what the Catechism has taught them from their infancy*, that a doctrinal instruction emanating from the Supreme Pontiff *should be the rule of their belief* as of their moral conduct; and they will have recourse to this venerable monument [the Encyclical] to resolve all the questions which shall be submitted to them on these subjects (p. 107).

The Bishop of Arras:—

In the Bull "Quantá Curá," as in the Syllabus, everything is doctrinal and even dogmatic. . . . For us dogma . . . is the divine truth itself, *eternal, sovereign, unchangeable as God*; consequently to ask of the faithful to contradict it, and of pastors to conceal it, is to ask what is impossible, *because it would be the sacrifice of eternal salvation*. . . . You will say to me perhaps . . . that all the condemnations pronounced by these two last declarations of the Holy See are not articles of faith. As regards some of them, I admit that they are not, in such sense that those who should not admit them would not on that account be formally heretics; but not in such sense as that [Catholics] may reject them without becoming *greatly culpable under the head of faith*. . . . All the bishops of France at this day believe or profess that the Pope has received from God the special and supreme power of . . . feeding both shepherds and flocks with the bread of divine truth; because to Peter alone and his successors it has been promised that they should never teach error (p. 109).

The Archbishop of Sens:—

We adhere entirely, sincerely, simply, without distinction, without reserve, to all decrees teaching the Church's doctrine which have been put forth since the beginning of Pius IX.'s reign. We account it a duty in all the faithful entrusted to our charge to adhere thereto *in spirit and in heart*, and to make thereof the rule of their faith. From whence will come to us the light which

shall guide us in the midst of that thick darkness which encompasses us? It is from the height of Peter's chair that such light is given us to show us our path. Let us enter on that path . . . without fear of ever losing our way. Let us follow it with confidence; it will conduct us to salvation (p. 137).

The Archbishop of Bourges :—

Since the Church has received from our Lord the sacred deposit of doctrine, and the mission of communicating it to men with supreme and infallible authority, she has the right to count on her children's docile and respectful submission. Whether she exercises this power by means of general councils which the Sovereign Pontiff convokes . . . or by dogmatic constitutions addressed from Rome to the bishops and faithful, the obligation is always the same; for it is always the same authority which speaks—the authority of the Church; authority holy, sovereign, infallible in doctrinal matters, to which we all owe obedience, unless we would renounce (à moins de renoncer) our title of Catholics. . . . We adhere therefore fully and entirely to the Encyclical of Dec. 8; we reprobate and condemn all the errors which are there reprobated and condemned, in that sense and manner in which the Pope reprobates and condemns them. . . . We know but one sole judge in faith, but one sole doctrinal authority—the Church—the Church expressing herself by the mouth of our revered head. . . . Rome has spoken, the cause is decided (pp. 143, 146).

The Bishop of Puy :—

If the dogmatic and infallible teaching of Pius IX. contained in the Encyclical and Syllabus cannot . . . at this moment . . . be duly promulgated in ordinary form . . . it is not the less obligatory, the less sacred, for all; it does not the less bind every Christian conscience; we receive none the less, with a religious and entire submission of spirit and heart, all the oracles which it proclaims (p. 166).

The Bishop of Versailles :—

What must we see in the Encyclical? We must see in it condemnations pronounced at different epochs by an infallible authority; then, theories and principles laid down by the same authority as a basis for general instruction. How ought we to receive the Encyclical? We should receive it as a symbol, as a credo, with the most perfect submission (pp. 178, 179).

The Bishop of Soissons :—

The faithful of your parishes . . . know that every Catholic is obliged to adhere in conscience to the doctrinal decisions which [the Encyclical] contains (p. 218).

The Cardinal Archbishop of Lyons :—

You have read this writing [the Encyclical] with that respect and veneration which we owe to the words of the Vicar of Jesus Christ: you have adhered from the bottom of your heart to that which he teaches us: you have condemned all which he condemns, and this Encyclical will have been for you . . . the oracles which must be listened to and believed (p. 244).

The Archbishop of Toulouse :—

The recent documents, emanating from the authority of the Holy Apostolic See . . . contain a doctrinal instruction; and on matters of doctrine the Vicar of Jesus is the first and only judge (p. 10).

The Bishop of Nîmes :—

The doctrines proclaimed by Pius IX. in the Encyclical . . . have been already promulgated more than once; the errors which he mentions have been previously condemned. Nay more, as to the eighty propositions contained in the Syllabus, the Holy Father expresses no [new] censure; he does but refer to his previous allocutions, individual letters, or encyclicals. All those acts which he recounts have been in our hands for a greater or less period; the instructions which they contain under the form of dogmatic exposition or condemnation are accepted by the whole Church; they have the force of law within the Church (ils y font loi); and neither the circular of your Excellence nor the decisions of the State Council can exempt Catholics from the obligation of submitting to them. This is an incontestable doctrine even according to the ancient maxims of the Catholic Church (p. 17).

The Bishop of Limoges :—

The word of Christ speaking through the Apostolic mouth is always faithful and worthy of all acceptance, to which word belief is given in the heart to justification, and confession with the mouth to salvation. The unswerving oracle of truth was to me a matter of greater consolation Therefore as to all the propositions censured in the aforesaid Syllabus and Encyclical, and other Apostolic letters, I profess that all without exception are to be rejected and condemned in the sense and mode which the Apostolic See intends. Likewise of all the documents of the Encyclical, as far as rests with me one iota or one point shall not pass away, but that it shall be taught and believed in my whole diocese (p. 19).

The Bishop of Poitiers :—

We declare that we adhere fully in spirit and in heart to all the doctrinal judgments and affirmations, to all the rules of belief and conduct, enunciated by our Holy Father Pius IX., from the beginning of his Pontificate to the present day; and we pronounce that it is the duty of all orthodox Christians to submit themselves to the said instructions with an humble and filial docility of their understanding and will (p. 31).

The Bishop of Beauvais :—

If you ask of us what line you should yourselves follow (vous devez suivre vous-mêmes), our answer will be easy. . . . In regard to doctrine, full and perfect adhesion of spirit and of heart to the instructions, decisions, condemnations, which emanate from the holy Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches (p. 38).

The Bishop of Fréjus :—

The Encyclical, which does but renew the condemnation of propositions

already condemned with the unanimous consent of the Episcopate, becomes a rule of faith which every Catholic is bound to accept (pp. 55-6).

The Bishop of Saint Dié :—

[The Encyclical contains] the instructions of him "*whose faith cannot fail*," and who has been appointed to "confirm his brethren." . . . At the same time and to satisfy our *duty* as son and bishop of the holy Catholic Church Apostolic and Roman, surrounded in spirit by our well-beloved clergy who, especially at this moment, make but one heart and one voice with their bishop, we condemn all which is condemned in the Encyclical of Dec. 8, 1864; we reprobate all which it reprobates, and in the sense in which it reprobates and condemns (p. 70).

The Bishop of Algiers :—

In the presence of a *dogmatic and moral bull ex cathedra*, emanating from him who has received of Jesus Christ the *full and entire mission of teaching the Universal Church*, the bishops could not in any manner believe themselves dispensed from the *docility of mind and heart which they owe to it* (p. 75).

The Bishop of Bayeux :—

The sentiments of profound veneration and *perfect obedience* wherewith you are animated in regard to the Sovereign Pontiff, impose on us the duty of letting you know *with what submission of spirit and heart* we have received the sacred words of the Vicar of Jesus Christ (p. 79).

The Bishop of Langres :—

Now it is in spirit and in heart, . . . *with our whole soul and without reserve*, that we adhere, *we and all of you with us*, to the great and salutary instructions of the Encyclical; and that we reprobate and condemn everything which the Pope reprobates and condemns, and in the same sense in which he condemns it (p. 115).

The Bishop of Gap :—

This word of the Supreme Pontiff, of *him who is "teacher of all Christians"* (Conc. Flor.) . . . has reached you by all the organs of the press. After the example of your first pastor, you will receive it with all the respect *due to it; with the most entire submission of mind and heart. This is an imperative and sacred duty for you and for all true Catholics* (pp. 121-2).

The Bishop of Quimper :—

[The Supreme Pontiff] is appointed by God to *direct [men's] conscience*. . . Far from us the thought as regards this solemn document of either adding aught to it or taking aught from it: *we adhere to it fully and without reserve* (p. 158).

The Bishop of Chartres :—

When the Church speaks, all should hear her, *if they wish still to claim the name of Catholics*. . . We declare that the Sovereign Pontiff's letter, dated Dec. 8, prescribing the jubilee, as well as the catalogue of condemned

errors annexed to it, should be the rule *which shall direct our minds and conduct* under present circumstances (p. 168).

The Bishop of Périgueux :—

We adhere emphatically (*hauteinent*), in your name as well as in our own, with submission and love to all the instructions given to the Church and the world by our Holy Father Pope Pius IX., during the whole course of his Pontificate, and particularly on that ever memorable day, Dec. 8, 1864. *We approve, affirm, and believe all which he approves, affirms, and believes; and all which he rejects, reprobates, and condemns, we reject, reprobate, and condemn.* Such is our faith, such is yours; and *with God's help it shall ever be the same as the faith of Peter's legitimate successors* (p. 187-8).

The Cardinal Archbishop of Chambéry :—

For many years past the venerable head of the Church has condemned some of these most dangerous errors; these condemnations have been successively published without exciting any protest. They have been recapitulated and put together in a Bull, published Dec. 8 last . . . and addressed to all the bishops of the Catholic world *that it may serve as a rule of belief to the faithful*. . . It is absolutely necessary that the head of the Church may make his voice heard by his children, that he may teach them *what they must believe and practise to be saved* (p. 191, 2).

The Bishop of Angoulême :—

The Bull Unigenitus subsists and will always subsist, venerated in the entire world as a *rule of faith*, from which *no one could deviate* without ceasing to be a Catholic. *It will be the same with the new Bull* (p. 201).

We have prolonged these extracts at the risk of wearying our readers, because no general account of them would suffice for the impression which we wish to convey. Some Catholics seem to think, that even if that doctrine be true which we have maintained on the infallibility of such papal pronouncements, at least the question is an open one, and one on which good Catholics may freely take either side. But the French bishops speak of our doctrine as quite rudimental; as familiar to all Catholics; as contained in the very Catechism.*

* It is interesting to English Catholics, that their own bishops use the same explicit and unmistakable language. What can be more express than this from the Bishop of Shrewsbury?—"We cannot indeed but think that we are calling such men [those who "have presumed to question not only the expediency but the soundness" of the Encyclical and Syllabus] by a wrong title when we give them the name of Catholic. For does not that name imply in its essential meaning that we submit ourselves, *our views, our judgment* in all matters of faith or morals to the voice and decisions of the Church? . . . Nor let them pretend *with that false refinement which the spirit of insubordination suggests* to draw too nice distinctions. . . The word that has gone forth is not the word of man but of the Pontiff; and in that word we revere the teaching of Him by whose power it has been uttered."—Pastoral of April VOL. V.—NO. IX. [New Series.]

Another inference is at once deducible from the passages which we have quoted. Benedict XIV., in his well-known letter to the supreme inquisitor of Spain, says that the Pope's infallibility, in his teaching *ex cathedrâ*, is received everywhere except in France.* Now the extracts just given show most clearly that this exception no longer exists. The Bishop of Arras's testimony, *e.g.*, is express on this head, and no one has attempted to contradict it:—"All the bishops of France at this day," he says, "believe or profess that to Peter alone and his successors it has been promised that they should never teach error." The Catholic Episcopate then is now unanimous in this particular, and Gallicanism under present circumstances slays itself. If we start from the Gallican premiss, that the bishops are infallible when united with their head;—we are led to the ultramontane conclusion, that their head is also infallible when speaking alone. Never had ultramontanes so much right to say (and we do most confidently say it) that theirs is the only doctrine consistently tenable by a Catholic.

(4.) The French bishops teach, then, that the Holy Father is infallible in all his doctrinal declarations, and not exclusively in his definitions of faith. That which they say on occasion of the Encyclical, he had already said in the Encyclical itself. We showed this in our last number (pp. 445—447). He teaches therein that the Pope is in the habit of putting forth certain "judgments" which "do not touch the dogmata of faith and morals," and which assuredly, therefore, are not definitions of faith. He teaches, further, that the Pope is infallible in these judgments; and that interior assent cannot be refused to them "without sin," and without a certain "sacrifice of the Catholic profession." Every one at all acquainted with theological language will admit that "sin" here means

25th. The *Church Review* of April 29, in noticing our own statements to this effect in our last number, says, "We do not so wrong the majority of our educated brethren of the Roman persuasion, as to suppose that the above *farrago of nonsense* in the least represents what they believe on the subject." The writer shows by his tone that he wishes to use conciliatory language towards the general body of English Catholics; and he thinks he shall best accomplish that purpose, by calling the judgment of their bishops a "*farrago of nonsense*." Let him name, if he can, one single Catholic bishop throughout the world, who has either stated or implied that the doctrinal decisions of the Encyclical and Syllabus are fallible.

* Totum [Bossueti] opus versatur in asserendis propositionibus à Clero Gallicano firmatis in conventu anno 1682. Difficile profectò est aliud opus reperire, quod aequè adversetur doctrinæ extra Galliam ubique receptæ de Summi Pontificis ex cathedrâ definiendis infallibilitate; de ejus excellentiâ supra quodcunque concilium œcumenicum; de ejus jure indirecto, si potissimum religionis et Ecclesiæ commodum id exigat, super juribus temporalibus principum supremorum.

"mortal sin;" but all possible doubt on the subject must be removed, by the "sacred invitation" which the Cardinal Vicar of Rome issued under the Pope's own eyes, as a pastoral instruction to the Pope's own diocese. For Cardinal Patrizi says expressly that the Encyclical and Syllabus are to be received "as the very word of God;" and that he who "listens not" to the Pope so speaking has "no longer a right to the eternal inheritance of heaven" (see p. 449, note).

From these various considerations then (to which very many others might easily be added), we unhesitatingly draw our conclusion. No doctrine which is not explicitly *de fide* is more irrefragably certain, than that the Pope's infallibility is not confined to his definitions of faith, but that it extends over his whole practical "magisterium;" and inclusively, therefore, to all those declarations which he authoritatively puts forth for the instruction of the universal Church.

As we are presently to speak of the Unionists, it will be desirable, before quitting this part of our subject, to consider an allegation which is frequently in their mouth. They love to speak of the great evils which have accrued to the Church, from the separation of England, *e.g.*, and to so large an extent of Germany, from the Roman See. Now as to the great majority of Unionists—those who are non-Catholic—they may most consistently say this: for they believe that the Church has been actually divided. If the Church could be divided at all, it would be impossible (no doubt) to exaggerate the calamitousness of such an event. But the question which we wish to consider concerns Catholics. How far and in what sense can Catholics truly say that the Church has suffered injury, through the lamentable defection which has taken place from her body?

Firstly, of course, the loss of so many souls, which might have been saved within visible unity, but which will not in fact be saved externally to that unity, is a grievous injury to the Church's interests: for her highest interest is the salvation of souls.

Then, further, an active intellectual process has been exercised within the Church from the first, on the deposit of faith. Great thinkers have busied themselves in every age, whether with analyzing some individual doctrine; or harmonizing various doctrines in their mutual relation; or carrying them forward to their legitimate conclusions, theological and philosophical; or penetrating the depths of Scripture; or exploring the treasures of tradition. All this has been done under the vigilant supervision of the Holy See; which has carefully guarded the purity of this doctrinal development, and provided

against the danger of unsound opinions taking root within the Church. Now the intellectual labour of which we have spoken has conferred inestimable services; and at no period has it been more needed than in the three last centuries. It has no doubt, therefore, inflicted very serious injury on the Church, that men of genius and learning, who (had they been Catholics) might have taken a prominent part in the work, have wasted or worse than wasted their power, by devoting it to the service of a false religion. Germans, *e. g.* (whatever their intellectual faults) are perhaps exceeded by none in critical acumen, and again in philosophical profundity. The Church then has sustained a severe detriment, from so many Germans being Protestants; in that she has lost the benefit of such important services as they might have rendered her.

The Church then, we say, has been negatively a great sufferer by the Protestant apostasy; but no good Catholic can admit that she has positively suffered thereby. It is necessary to insist on this, because we are inclined to fear that, through confusion of thought, much unsound speculation has found access to the mind of certain Catholics. It has been implied in fact—unless we misunderstand the meaning of various expressions which have been used—that she has actually suffered in the purity of her teaching, through the defection of Protestant England and Germany; that Rome's authoritative lessons (apart of course from definitions of faith) are less simply orthodox in tendency, than they would have been had all Europe remained Catholic. Such a notion simply inverts the Church's whole constitution. God teaches the Holy See, and the Holy See teaches the Church; it is Peter whose faith fails not, and who in his turn confirms his brethren: whereas, according to the above notion, he would not be simply the Church's teacher, but in part her disciple. Rome, let it never be forgotten, is commissioned to teach England and Germany, not England or Germany to teach Rome. So far as any Englishmen or Germans are at variance with what is authoritatively inculcated in Rome, they are infallibly in error. Rome no doubt may often wish to correct her impressions of *fact* by special communication, *e. g.*, with England; but she cannot, without abandoning her essential claims, seek correction from any source on matters of doctrine or of principle.*

* "This Roman chair of the most blessed Peter, which, being the mother and guide (*magistra*) of all Churches, has always preserved *whole and inviolate* the faith delivered by Christ the Lord, and faithfully taught it, showing to all men the path of salvation and the doctrine of uncorrupted truth . . . Where Peter is, there is the Church; and Peter, through the Roman pontiff,

Now as to the anonymous pamphlet named at the head of our article, it is little to say that its writer is removed in the farthest possible degree from accepting such principles as we have been laying down: he does not seem ever to have heard of their existence. He professes Catholicism, indeed; or, in other words, he professes that the Catholic Church was ordained by God to teach him true religion: and one would have thought it therefore a matter of the simplest common sense, that he should place himself at her feet in the position of a humble disciple: yet his tone implies throughout, not only that he has nothing to learn from her, but that she has everything to learn from him. He begins by saying (p. 3) that she would seem to have "duped" him "upon a point affecting his highest interests."* Presently he adds (p. 9) that he would not have been educated a Catholic "for the world."† He cannot accept the Church's doctrine, that Anglicans are schismatics and treated by God as such (p. 10). Indeed, he considers his "own happy country at the head of the whole civilized world in all that can make a nation great, prosperous, and intelligent" (p. 11); so that the Catholic faith has no tendency, in his view, to make a nation great, prosperous, and intelligent. Nor is this wonderful; for a "well-educated, well brought-up" Protestant "Englishman" "would undoubtedly see many things" in Catholic churches abroad "that he would bless God his own Church had either never known or had discarded" (p. 12). Then the author holds, that the English bishops and the Congregation of Propaganda have committed a simple impertinence, in presuming to interfere on the question of Catholics going to Oxford or Cambridge. "It is purely a question that concerns our laity; above all, our gentry"

furnishes truth of doctrine (*præstat fidei veritatem*) to them that seek it."—(Encyclical "Qui Pluribus.") "In which [Roman Church] always remains the infallible *magisterium* of the faith, and in which, therefore, apostolic tradition has been ever preserved."—(Encyclical "Nostis et nobiscum.") "In which [Roman Church] alone religion has been inviolably preserved, and from which all other Churches must borrow the tradition of faith."—(Bull "Ineffabilis.")

* "It will seem to have been my fate to have been twice duped in the course of my life upon a point affecting my highest interests. I do not say so myself—God forbid—but there is something in it that is beyond me to explain to my own satisfaction. . . . The Church of Rome . . . professed to receive me into the Holy Catholic Church, but on my reception it was to the Roman Catholic Church that I was made to promise obedience."

† "I would not part with my Anglican education, or with my knowledge of the Bible in particular, for the world." The author's egotism may perhaps excuse the egotism of another. The present writer is also a convert. His testimony is, that his Protestant education—emphatically and specially his public school education—has been the one crushing calamity of his life,

(p. 19). "Our laity," in fact, "are becoming too numerous and too highly educated to be kept any longer in leading-strings, or tied to the aprons of their spiritual guides" (p. 20)* "Let not our laity," then, "any longer hesitate to *insist* upon having a class of schools and a system of education pursued in them, in which the ecclesiastical element shall be neither predominant nor, except for teaching theology and performing divine service, indispensable" (p. 21).† At all events he, for his part, will set a spirit-stirring example to his brethren of independence and rebellion. Whatever heresies and errors are contained in the Protestant version of Scripture, still it is expressed in good English. "I will never part with my *Anglican Bible for any other in the same language*, till I can be supplied with one at least as good in this respect" (p. 22). The principle, he seems to say, put forth by Catholic bishops, is truly monstrous; viz., that pure doctrine is more important than good English; and if they have nothing better than this to allege, I totally deny that God has given them any authority to control me in the matter. I am a free-born Englishman; and I will stick to that English Bible, which *is* English.

We cannot be surprised at such a Catholic thinking (p. 29) that "our own bishops" will never, as now trained, "attain to that manly, vigorous, and decisive type of character which is the only one likely to command respect ever with *Englishmen*." His national vanity, by the way, is really ludicrous: he speaks as though an unmanly, feeble, and indecisive type of character might be influential enough among French or Italians; among cardinals or monsignori; but that it is the high prerogative of Englishmen to estimate such a character at its true value. Never then, in his opinion,

* Through that confusion of thought which so remarkably characterizes this pamphlet throughout, it is somewhat difficult at first sight to ascertain the author's precise meaning here: for in one sentence he speaks as though it were only on matters purely literary, that he complains of the clergy exercising "surveillance" (as he calls it) over Catholic publications. But he cannot really mean this: he cannot imply that Catholic bishops and clergy, as such, claim any kind of authority on such a question, as the relative poetical excellence of Wordsworth and Tennyson, or the merit of Mr. Carlyle's style. He refers then certainly to matters which, indirectly at least, bear on faith and morals; and he must be understood to advocate the detestable tenet, that on such matters the *Ecclesia Docens* has no legitimate authority over her children.

† "That method of instructing youths can be approved by Catholic men which is disjoined from the Catholic faith and the Church's power, and which regards exclusively, or at least principally, knowledge of the natural order alone and the ends of social life on earth."—(Prop. xviii. condemned in the Syllabus.)

will Catholic bishops rise above that degrading and un-English standard which does well enough for foreigners, "if they are so thoroughly bound hand and foot to the judgment of a *foreign court—never too popular in this country from the time of the Conquest downwards—that they can never venture to speak and act for themselves like men*" (p. 29). To revolt, then, against the authority set over them by God, is "to speak and act for themselves like men." The successors of St. Peter, to whose services exclusively England owes so much of the Gospel as she still retains, constitute "a foreign court." And the ingratitude with which Englishmen have repaid the inestimable benefit conferred on them by Rome, is cited,—not as a fact truly disgraceful to their character;—but, on the contrary, as a reason why even Catholic bishops should join their heretical compatriots, in slighting the Vicar and one earthly representative of Him who died to save them.

Such is the author's attitude of mind towards his spiritual pastors; and his general opinions are such as might have been expected from the fact. Thus (p. 7) he is convinced by his own past internal feelings—by "the glow of pure happiness" which "passed over him" when he was ordained by the Bishop of Oxford—that Anglican ordinations are valid: and this, "though for one that upholds there may be ten that sneer at Anglican orders in the Church of Rome;" and thousands, at all events, that totally deny the validity of those orders. "In deference to ecclesiastical authorities," he would "submit" (!) "to further ordination," but their judgment would in no respect alter his private opinion.

We have referred already to that confusion of thought which so singularly characterizes the whole pamphlet: out of so many instances we will select two. In page 9 these statements occur in close proximity—"I have been as great and constant a sinner since my reception into the Church of Rome, as I ever was in the Church of England;" "the practice of confession, obligatory as it is with us, has greatly tended to purify and to brace my conscience." It is for him to explain, how his conscience has been greatly purified and braced, while, nevertheless, he remains (we sincerely hope he is mistaken here) as great and as constant a sinner as before. Then, secondly, in various passages he implies that those are gravely culpable who remain in "*what they suspect . . . to be schism or heresy*" (p. 10). "I have no business to stay in what I even *imagine* to be wrong" (p. 10). I would not pass judgment on those "who have never had one *misgiving*" on their Church's position (p. 13). But only turn over the page, you find a very different

and most startling view. "Let no one venture to quit the Christian calling in which he has been placed *without a direct summons* from Him who placed him in it . . . it will come" (if it comes at all, for "in innumerable instances" it does not come at all) "in a way and with a force that he cannot mistake. . . . Let him reject it at his peril: *let him anticipate it at his peril likewise*" (p. 14). This extraordinary doctrine is altogether inconsistent with the former: for could it be maintained, it would follow that you are bound "at your peril" to remain a Protestant—however serious your "suspicions" and "misgivings"—until a direct summons come to you which you cannot mistake.

The author's ignorance of Catholic dogma is truly remarkable in one who comes forward as a teacher and a reformer. We have already seen, that not merely he does not himself admit the "*Ecclesiae iuge magisterium*," he seems never to have heard of it. We should have very much to say again concerning his doctrine, just cited, on the unmistakable "summons," and the inculpability of schismatics who have not received that summons; but that it is impossible to treat adequately this extraordinary and heretical delusion, without writing at far greater length than our limits will permit. Then in page 12 he maintains (as we understand him) that the dictum, "*nulla extra ecclesiam salus*," is no longer true, since the "separation" of "East and West:" a tenet which is beyond all possible question heretical.* Further (pp. 8, 9), he implies that baptism may be valid, though there be no "proper intentions on the part of the officiator."† Lastly, his language here and there makes it almost impossible to doubt—what, nevertheless, it is almost impossible to believe—that he is totally ignorant of one among the most elementary truths of Catholicism: the distinction between actual and habitual grace; between the "*auxilia gratiæ*" on the one hand, and "*gratia habitualis, semen gloriæ*," on the other. We must enlarge a little on this strange confusion, to explain our meaning. Thus he says (p. 30)—

"There is a 'pendant' to the dogma, '*nulla extra ecclesiam salus*,' which *Roman Catholics are far too apt to slur over*; and it is this. In the celebrated Bull of Clement XI. (*Unigenitus*), one of the propositions condemned as heretical ‡ by that Pope . . . is '*extra ecclesiam non conceditur gratia*.'"

* See, e. g., Denzinger's various references.

† We are very unwilling to press the author too hard; and we must ever remember his great mistiness of thought and expression. Perhaps at last he only means here, that the minister need not believe in baptismal regeneration, in order to validity of the sacrament.

‡ The author never can contrive to be accurate, even by accident. No

What Catholic on earth can have the slightest temptation to "slur over" this censure? Why no one could accept the condemned thesis, without falling into the most patent heresy: for he must hold either that heretics and schismatics can be converted without grace, or that they cannot be converted at all. But the author seems to regard the Pope as here deciding, that those external to the visible Church may possess *habitual* grace, and so be under God's favour and acceptance. Now, in what sense this doctrine may be *true*, we are not here considering: * but the merest tyro must know that the censure before us does not bear on it ever so remotely; that the censure would be equally deserved, even if it were a revealed verity that no single individual can be in God's favour who is external to the Church's visible communion. So in page 8, "We may think it ever so fitting"—he means "extreme and bigoted Catholics may think it ever so fitting"—"that the members of a Church that can be proved to be in schism, should be *denuded of all grace*." What Catholic ever dreamed of so preposterous a notion, as that the members of a schismatical society are "denuded" of the *auxilia gratiæ*? On such a hypothesis not one of them could possibly submit to the Church. A few lines later he implies that the not being "*denuded of all grace*," necessarily involves the possessing *habitual* grace. Whereas, had he any acquaintance with the distinction between these two kinds of grace, he must see, of course, that no state is more easily imaginable (as, indeed, none unhappily is more common) than the being "*denuded*" of habitual grace, while visited by actual: the being under God's wrath and displeasure; while He solicits the soul, by the *auxilia gratiæ*, to return into His favour and into the possession of *gratia habitualis*.

As to the main drift of his pamphlet, it would appear that there are two propositions which the author is mainly desirous of upholding: the one, subjective; the other, objective. He wishes (1) to impress on the Catholic world, as a matter of his own personal experience, that Catholicism at last is not so very superior to Anglicanism; and he wishes (2) to impress on the English Catholic bishops, as a matter of doctrine, that their constant reference and unremitting subordination to Rome are un-Catholic. Now, as to the first of these propositions, what can his experience possibly be worth? No one can have had

propositions are separately condemned in the Bull as *heretical*; but the propositions are condemned *in globo* as heretical, erroneous, scandalous, &c., &c., respectively.

* See on this head, our last number, pp. 459-461.

experience of a religion, who has not practised it; and how can it possibly be said that this writer has practised Catholicism? To do so, is to sit at the Church's feet as a disciple; to accept humbly her practical lessons concerning faith and the spiritual life; to act diligently on the knowledge thus acquired. No one, holding our author's opinions, can have any more conception of what Catholicism really is, than a man born blind can have a true idea of colour. When such a person gravely speaks of instructing the world by his "experiences," and when he calls on us to believe on his word that Catholicism is not that noble and divine thing which we know it to be;—he does but remind us of the well-known worthy, who announced to a large circle of eminent mathematicians, that he for his part once went through two pages of the "Principia," and found Newton to be at last a very ordinary and common-place mortal.

As to the author's second proposition, it indicates quite amusingly his characteristic ignorance and mistiness, that he simply begs the entire question at issue. The Holy Father and his chosen counsellors are "ecclesiastics," it seems, "whose vision is bounded on the north by the Alps, on the south, east, and west by the tideless Mediterranean" (p. 29). Certainly, if the Holy Father's vision is thus bounded; if he has not some very special insight into matters which stretch, not merely beyond Alps and Mediterranean, but altogether beyond this earth; if he be not gifted immediately by God with infallible judgment in teaching the Church on matters of doctrine and principle; if he have not received the commission of imparting to other bishops and Churches that light which he divinely receives;—then (no doubt) the English bishops pursue an imbecile course, in their eager longing for his instruction, and their earnest deference to his judgment. But on the other hand, if the above-named doctrines are true and not false,—in that case it is no less unquestionable that the English bishops act in the only way consistent with straightforwardness and common sense. The whole question, beyond all possible doubt, turns solely and absolutely on this doctrinal controversy, concerning the nature and extent of Papal infallibility. Will it be credited, that the pretentious writer before us not merely makes no attempt to argue this controversy, but does not ever so distantly allude to its very existence?

It will be seen, by a correspondence printed at the end of this pamphlet, that Mr. Ffoulkes was very generally supposed to be its author; and that he has declined either to confirm or repudiate the supposition. He has now published a volume in

his own name, from which we made a few extracts in our last number. These extracts we here repeat:—

"The whole Church," at a certain period of her history, "delegated to" the Pope "the same executive powers over Christendom generally, that had been already delegated to metropolitans over provincial, and to patriarchs over diocesan churches" (p. 19).

"There were some specious grounds, at all events, for deciding as she did" (p. 12).

"The" Church's "second stage towards monarchy had been actually attained before the conversion of Constantine" (p. 16).

"The headship of emperors is a thing that has been tried and laid aside: what therefore remains, but that of the Pope?" (p. 35, note).

"Had Christianity never encountered a world-wide empire at its birth . . . it is quite possible that the idea of a supreme earthly head of the Church would have never occurred at all to its professing members" (p. 37).

"I sincerely believe myself that a Church . . . without any supreme head . . . but One who is there worshipped in faith as ever present, is the loftiest and most Evangelical idea of a Church by far; and that, to a certain extent, this was actually exhibited in . . . the three first centuries" (p. 35).

"If His Church was to have a supreme head at all upon earth," Christ "vested that dignity in S. Peter and his successors" (p. 37).

"The principle of a supreme earthly potentate" was not "conceded without reproof . . . 'Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence to me; for thou savourest not the things of God, but those that be of men,' said our Lord to that very S. Peter whom He had just before designated as the rock on which He would build his Church; neither can one passage be applied to his successors without the other" (p. 36).

"Through the instrumentality of" S. "Peter's successors, one part of His Church" was "bound together in a compact mass" (p. 37).

"The Church of England . . . and the bodies that spring from it . . . are . . . destined, perhaps, to play an important part in any future schemes for re-union of the whole Church" (p. 34).

"Where" Popes and Cardinals "have discharged" their appointed "task faithfully and efficiently, there is no class of men entitled to more respect and honour at our hands. . . . Where they have not discharged that task, or made it subservient to their own interest or aggrandisement, there can be no greater enemies of the whole human race. . . . It would be unjust and contrary to fact to insinuate that nothing else but their rivalries and backslidings . . . have caused our divisions" (preface, pp. xiii, xiv).

The last of these passages we cited for the purpose of showing the intolerable disrespectfulness with which Mr. Ffoulkes permits himself to speak on the Vicar of Christ. On looking, however, at the passage again, we find it may possibly be so interpreted, as to include within the criticised "class of men," not "Popes and cardinals" alone, but "bishops and archbishops." This is not indeed its more

obvious interpretation; but as we have now reason to believe that the author intended it, and as the passage is certainly far less offensive if so explained, we have pleasure in withdrawing this particular count from our indictment. The remaining extracts, however, oblige us to bring against him no less severe a charge than that of actual heresy. That the Pope's authority over the whole Church was conferred on him immediately by God, is no less essential a portion of the Faith than is the Trinity or the Incarnation. If it be worth while on so plain a matter to adduce any ecclesiastical definition, we will refer to the well-known "*Auctorem Fidei*," of which there has never been any doubt that it was accepted by the Catholic Episcopate. "That proposition," says the Bull, "thus explained, viz., that the Roman Pontiff receives, not from Christ in the person of Blessed Peter, but *from the Church*, the power of ministry whereby he rules in the Universal Church as successor of Peter, the Vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church [so explained this proposition is] *heretical*" (Denz. n. 1366). Now this proposition so explained is precisely Mr. Ffoulkes's, and we are compelled to say in consequence that he has committed himself to actual heresy.

Mr. Ffoulkes, indeed, protests against this conclusion and has written a reply in his own vindication. We are most happy to insert it; and we entreat our readers, in justice to the accused, to give it their most careful attention. We have neither put any words into italics, nor in any other way touched what Mr. Ffoulkes has written.

DEAR SIR,—Some extracts from my book, as given in the last number of the DUBLIN REVIEW, seem calculated to produce very erroneous apprehensions both of its meaning and of my own principles in general. Allow me therefore to state explicitly, that I hold the Papacy to be of Divine institution, and interpret our Lord's words to S. Peter, "I say unto thee that thou art Peter," &c., literally and unequivocally, as conferring upon him and his successors those prerogatives which are implied in it. And it is in no spirit of disloyalty to that belief that, as a student of ecclesiastical history, I have endeavoured to arrive at a true solution of some difficulties which present themselves as facts that cannot be set aside, and in my humble opinion have not as yet been interpreted consistently with that belief. One of these is that for the first three centuries or more the power of the Popes remained in suspense, and exercised no active influence over the Church. It is but vaguely hinted at in the countless canons that were passed by successive councils respecting Church government. My explanation of that phenomenon is derived from the analogy which the historical books of the Old Testament supply. God foresaw that the Israelites would desire a visible king. He therefore foreordained and foretold Judah as the patriarch from whose descendants that king was to be taken when the time came. Christ in like

manner foresaw that His Church would desire a visible earthly head. He therefore foreordained and foretold S. Peter as the apostle from whose successors that visible Head was to be supplied. Thus both the kingdom under the law, and the Papacy under the gospel, were divine institutions, and neither of them the work of man; though men may be said to have asked for them in either case. This, in the case of the Jews, is stated in so many words to have taken place. Samuel carried their request before the Lord. But if we turn to Church history, the creation of metropolitans, primates, and patriarchs by express canons of general councils in the first three or four centuries may be taken to be as explicit a declaration on the part of the Church in favour of a supreme earthly Head, to which post the successors of S. Peter had been already foreordained by Christ himself. In this way, too, is met the objection so frequently urged against the Papacy by its opponents, namely, that it was founded in a series of violent and overbearing acts against the liberties of every local church; whereas my explanation shows that it had been accepted in principle by the actual course of Church legislation from the first, so that the whole Church was a consenting party to it. Another of these difficulties is found in the history of the Papacy itself, and as distinct from the personal character of the Popes themselves, which is a further question. I mean, that there are certain facts from time to time associated with the Papacy which are not in harmony with our Lord's words, "Upon this rock I will build my Church." In many senses the Papacy has never ceased to fulfil them in all time; there are senses in which I am unable to reconcile them with its actual history.

As a guardian of doctrine, to my mind, the Papacy has been unimpeachable. As a guardian of discipline I should say the same in many centuries. But when I look at the Papacy during the 9th and 10th centuries, and part of the 15th, I am met by facts which I cannot get over; and when I look at the Papacy at Avignon, and during the great schism of the West, the thought is forced on me, in spite of myself, "Can this indeed be the rock on which Christ has built His Church?"

Therefore, were there no other passage of Holy Scripture to appeal to, I should feel sorely perplexed how to reconcile Christ's words with actual facts. But when I remember that those words formed the answer to S. Peter's confession of faith, "Thou art the Christ," and that the very next act of S. Peter, after he had been named the Rock, was to *deprecate the idea of His Lord suffering*, for which the immediate reply of His Lord was, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" I find every difficulty removed: because I see those facts in the history of the Papacy rebuked by anticipation in the rebuke thus read to S. Peter so soon after the confession of his faith, and for the very first of his subsequent acts. Therefore, the pomp, pride, and luxury, which has been charged against the Papacy by Protestants, and against the Court of Rome by saints of the Church, as S. Bernard, or doctors, as Gerson, Cardinal d'Ailly, and others, however melancholy, is by no means irreconcilable with the words of Christ to S. Peter, when both His speeches are brought into juxtaposition, and made joint interpreters of the entire history of the Papacy. But to measure it by the first of His speeches exclusively, I feel I must either disparage that speech or else ignore facts. Let me illustrate this by a case in

point which all can appreciate. S. Paul says, in one epistle, "What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, who is in you, which ye have of God?" Were there no other qualifying passage in his epistles, how sorely should we not be puzzled to apply this verse to Christians generally, living in the world and not unfrequently led away by their passions. How difficult to interpret this verse intelligibly, and yet not overlook facts. But when, in another epistle, we hear the same Apostle representing Christendom in his own person, and saying, "I see another law in my members . . . bringing me into captivity to the law of sin" . . . we are at once relieved from any difficulty; and both passages together explain both our privileged and our actual state—the gifts which we have from God, and the acts which we nevertheless commit as men. I have, therefore, merely tried to explain difficulties to the best of my ability, in a way consistent with facts and with Holy Scripture, without by any means doubting, or meaning to suggest a doubt, that the Papacy is of divine institution. My explanation may or may not prove the true one. And the Church in communion with the Pope I hold to be the Catholic Church in unbroken unity now, as in times past. But I look upon all baptized Christians as forming part of one general Christendom, which, though unhappily not now synonymous with the Catholic Church, may still in some sense be called the Church; and I use such terms as the Church of England, the Greek Church, &c., as conveying a definite meaning which it would be difficult to express in other words.

The penultimate of our original extracts implied that "the Church" is now not corporately "united;" and we are glad therefore to find Mr. Ffoulkes rejecting that particular tenet. But as to all the rest, it will be seen at once that this letter leaves the matter exactly where it was. It is of faith that Christ gave immediately to S. Peter, and to his successors, supremacy over the whole Church. Mr. Ffoulkes, in opposition to the Catholic Faith, holds the following tenets: (1) that Christ did not in any sense give supremacy over the Church to S. Peter and his earlier successors; (2) that, had Christians preserved the "most evangelical" idea of the Church—the idea, therefore, most in conformity with Christ's wishes—none of S. Peter's successors would have had such supremacy; (3) that Christ, however, gave to the Church the power of appointing a supreme ruler whenever she might please; requiring only (4) that if she appointed any ruler at all, it must be S. Peter's successor. This is exactly the view of Mr. Ffoulkes's doctrine which would have been derived from our extracts; and his letter has confirmed it in every particular. He holds in his own sense no doubt, that "the Papacy is of divine institution;" *i. e.*, that God has appointed the Pope to be supreme ruler, *on the hypothesis* that the Church chooses to have a supreme ruler at all: but there

is no Catholic theologian in the world who will doubt that this whole doctrine is directly heretical.

We would not deny, however, that the case is imaginable of a writer who might, from ignorance or inadvertence, admit some heretical proposition into his work, while yet the main scope of that work might be edifying and Catholic. But it is abundantly plain that the tenet above mentioned, if held at all, must pervade throughout the whole texture of a treatise, written on such a subject as Mr. Ffoulkes has chosen: and since the tenet is heretical, the whole treatise is throughout leavened with heresy. That doctrine which Mr. Ffoulkes denies, if it be indeed true—and all Catholics are required to hold it as actually of faith—must of necessity be the one fundamental principle of the Church's constitution: and he, therefore, who with Mr. Ffoulkes rejects it, whenever he speaks of the Catholic Church, must speak of her, not as a Catholic speaks, but as a heretic.

One particular illustration of this is worth mentioning. The Unionists love to contemplate the Pope becoming a "constitutional king" as an end to be greatly desired. On Mr. Ffoulkes's theory this is perhaps intelligible: the Church, he may think, which delegated the supremacy, may withdraw or modify it. But then this theory is a heresy. It is an integral portion of the Catholic Faith, that Christ Himself commands all members of the Church to obey the Pope absolutely and unreservedly in the spiritual order. The Pope, then, could not possibly become a "constitutional king" in spirituals,—*i. e.*, could not recognize his spiritual power as rightfully limited by any earthly authority whatsoever,—without teaching his flock to violate directly the very commands of Christ. He has no more power of becoming a "constitutional king" in spirituals, than he has of abolishing the episcopal order, or of changing the matter or form of a sacrament.

The work before us then is simply the violent assault of a heretic (material or formal) against the Church which in fact condemns him. Nothing can be more exquisitely ludicrous than to speak, as the *Union Review* speaks, of the "candour" with which Mr. Ffoulkes admits the Church's past corruptions or palliates England's present schism (May, 1865, pp. 310, 316). We really cannot be surprised at the "candour" of a heretic—we sincerely hope and believe a merely material heretic—in denouncing that Church to whose Faith he is an alien.

On the value of Mr. Ffoulkes's general argument, one circumstance will throw sufficient light. He assumes throughout

as the very basis of his remarks—as an admitted axiom with all whom he addresses—that Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, form no part of “Christendom;” while Photians,* Anglicans, and Protestants are included in that category.† Of course there is no possible sense of the word “Christendom” in which any Catholic can admit this statement. If by “Christendom” be meant those who adhere to that one religion which Christ founded, it includes Catholics and Catholics alone. If those be meant who sincerely regard Christ as founder of their religion, it includes (no doubt) Nestorians, Anglicans, and Protestants; but it also includes Photians, Arians, and Unitarians.

Mr. Ffoulkes’s book shall be mentioned once more before we conclude; but we reserve its main treatment for a future article. It ranges over a large portion of historical ground, and our present limits would not permit us to give any adequate impression of its extraordinary unfairness and inconsecutiveness. Moreover at last there is little satisfaction in exposing an opponent, unless some counter-view be at the same time exhibited of those facts which he may misapprehend. But no such counter-view can possibly be attempted, without devoting a whole article to the question; and this we hope to do in an early number.

If Mr. Ffoulkes is thus profoundly ignorant on the most elementary doctrines of that religion which he believes himself to have embraced, it is no matter of surprise that men avowedly non-Roman are equally ignorant. We will merely record the fact, therefore, that a writer in the March number of the *Union Review* (p. 141) stigmatizes as “the extremest ultramontane theory” that doctrine, which regards the visible Church as precisely co-extensive with the Roman obedience: the simple fact being, that no one who holds any other “theory” is received by the Pope into his communion at all; and that even Mr. Ffoulkes admits it in the letter which we have just inserted. He who denies the doctrine in question is regarded, we

* Photians, some of our readers may be glad to know, are those schismatics of whom the Russian Emperor is one; and who are called by Tractarians “the Greek Church.”

† “As long as controversy turned principally on those articles of the creed which related to God, Christendom on the whole maintained its unity. Its breaches commenced and have gone on widening ever since it engaged in questions relating to man.” That is, by a purely arbitrary and unmeaning use of words, Mr. Ffoulkes chooses to give the name of Christian to those who schismatised on the latter class of questions, while he refuses it to those who schismatised on the former. We do not here inquire how Mr. Ffoulkes can allege, that the Photian schism turned on theological “questions relating to man.”

say, as a heretic (material or formal) by every Catholic throughout the world; and, as we now understand, by Mr. Ffoulkes himself. The Catholic doctrine, indeed, does not deny (as has of late been strangely supposed), that individuals may be saved, both baptized and unbaptized, though they die out of visible communion with the Holy See. On this head we would refer to our remarks in April, from p. 459 to p. 469. But the Catholic doctrine undoubtedly does assert that such individuals, though pertaining to the soul of the Church, are separated from her body; and that Photians and Anglicans are no more within the visible Church than are Unitarians and Deists. To this doctrine all Catholics are required to yield the assent of divine faith; and we fully agree with the writer whom we are now noticing, that “it forces its upholders,”—i. e., all Catholics throughout the world,—“into a rigorous antagonism to all desire and labour” for that extravagant project which he heretically calls “Catholic reunion.” We will now give one or two reasons for agreeing with him in this proposition.

We are inclined to believe that the immense majority of non-Catholic Unionists are profoundly ignorant of that elementary Catholic doctrine, on which we have been speaking: though such ignorance might at once be removed by their consulting any Catholic theologian, however extremely Gallican. Certainly no Unionists have attempted to meet those obvious objections to their whole movement, which the doctrine in question necessarily presents. They are putting forth certain efforts and prayers “for the reunion of Christendom;” which at all events must include their own reunion with the Holy See. We would address them thus. The one fundamental principle of Roman Catholicism, as a doctrinal system, is the Church’s infallibility: are your efforts and prayers addressed, or are they not, to the end that Catholics may abandon that principle? Look the question, we entreat you, in the face, and answer yes or no. If you make the former reply, you reply in fact that your movement is directed simply against Roman Catholicism; that you aim, like Dr. Cumming or Mr. Spurgeon, at inducing Roman Catholics to abandon their religion. In that case you can no more expect Roman Catholics to regard you as their friends, than they so regard those extreme Protestant divines just mentioned.

You will reply, therefore, that you do not desire Roman Catholics to desert their religion; that you are but labouring for re-union with them on its basis. You have no wish at all, then, that they shall abandon their belief in the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church. But this infallibility is com-

mitted, as we have seen, to the doctrine, that Christ has directly imparted to the Pope supremacy over all Christians; you are labouring therefore, according to your own statement, for union with Roman Catholics on that basis. Now there is one way possible, and only one, for union on that basis: *viz., your own belief in that vital doctrine.* For consider. *Until* you believe it, the Pope cannot possibly admit you into his communion, because he cannot admit heretics thereto; but *as soon as* you believe it, it binds you at once, *ipso facto*, under pain of formally committing mortal sin, to give the Pope that unqualified and unreserved submission which Christ enjoins. To promote re-union on the basis of Roman doctrine, is neither more nor less than to propagate the doctrine that Christ requires all baptized men to obey the Pope in spirituals absolutely and unreservedly. Do you at this moment yourselves believe this doctrine? Again we entreat you to look the question in the face, and answer yes or no. If you do believe it, you are meriting hell every moment you delay your resolve of submission; and if you die during that delay, or without repenting of that delay, you will be eternally lost. But if at this moment you do *not* hold the doctrine in question, then you are perpetrating the unequalled absurdity, of labouring and praying for the propagation of a doctrine which you do not yourselves hold.

Meanwhile, never was anything more preposterous than your attempted justification of yourselves, by your appeal to historical instances of attempted corporate union with Rome. In all such cases a certain number of leading men, emperor or bishops, profess themselves to be in search of further light. They profess themselves to be in serious doubt, whether the Roman See possess really by divine appointment supremacy over all Christendom. Since the difficulties and circumstances of these men are much the same, they think it probable that combined consultation with Roman Catholic authorities will be their most hopeful road to truth; while Rome on her side may well judge, that certain seasonable concessions in pure discipline may remove many prejudices and open a wider avenue for the entrance of truth. Then, since the mass of their fellow-countrymen is supposed to repose the greatest confidence in their judgment, the idea of corporate re-union may be far from a wild or improbable dream. But the whole procedure turns on this, that such men profess themselves to be in search of clearer light; to have, at least, grave misgivings on the tenableness of their present position. Point, if you can, to one single instance, in which the Holy See has lent a favourable ear to any society approaching it in *your* mental

attitude. You hold confidently, you say, that you are now within the Church's visible pale; but you seek re-union with the Holy See, as a means of strengthening, elevating, and instructing your "Church." Name, if you can, one single instance in which such overtures have been made to Rome, and she has answered otherwise than as in the recent decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition.

No; if you would bring yourselves even approximately within the shelter of such precedents as you allege, we must imagine some such case as this:—A very considerable and influential number of Anglicans—headed, perhaps, by a Scotch "bishop," or, at least, by an archdeacon or two—would profess most serious doubt, whether you are not external to the Catholic Church while out of communion with the Holy See. You profess, nevertheless, that while you recognise the vast weight of evidence in Scripture and Tradition for Rome's divinely given supremacy, you are still oppressed with certain difficulties as to this or that doctrine which she teaches. You entreat of her, therefore, a full and free conference with her authorities, in order that you may either be rescued from misconception of her real teaching, or else may receive fresh theological and historical evidence, for certain dogmata which have hitherto staggered you. Meanwhile, you make the humbling confession that you cannot trust your own fairness and impartiality of judgment, so long as submission to Rome involves certain ritual sacrifices which you are unwilling to make. You beseech her, therefore, in compassion of your infirmities, to grant certain dispensations: to permit, *e. g.*, communion under both species, or to permit certain vernacular offices unconnected with the Mass. Under such circumstances (could we imagine them) it would not be incredible that Rome might make such concessions; that those converts who chose might be allowed the unenviable privilege, of separating themselves from the common rite of their fellow-Catholics, and being admitted to the Chalice; and again, that Vespers, and perhaps other parts of the Divine Office, might be chanted in English in some few chapels, which the new comers might frequent as long as their crotchet should continue.

It must be observed, however, carefully, that such concessions would be of pure discipline. You would be allowed, *e. g.*, to gratify your idiosyncrasy by communicating under both species: but you would be obliged, under pain of anathema, to believe interiorly with the assent of Divine faith, that the reasons were legitimate which prevailed with the Catholic Church to introduce the opposite discipline; and,

moreover, that Christ is received Whole and Entire, though under the species of bread alone.*

And there is one concession of discipline which most assuredly would never be made: a concession to which disgusting prominence has been given in the *Union Review*. We refer, of course, to clerical celibacy. The Holy Father has recently, as you know, published a "Syllabus," "embracing the chief errors of our age which are branded" in various censures put forth by him during his reign. These censures, moreover, claim, under pain of mortal sin, the interior assent of every Catholic. Now, this "Syllabus" refers us to a judgment put forth by the Pope in his first Encyclical on the celibacy of the clergy; and we beg for this judgment the particular attention of those few unhappy and degraded Catholic priests who have printed their revolting sentiments on this matter in the pages of the *Union Review*:—

To this appertains that most foul conspiracy against the sacred celibacy of clerics, which, grievous to relate, is fostered even by some ecclesiastics, who, miserably forgetting the dignity to which they have been raised (*propria dignitatis misere oblit*), permit themselves to be overcome and seduced by the blandishments and charms of pleasure.

It is little to say that, after specially drawing attention to this judgment, Pius IX. will most assuredly not act in an opposite direction. The simple truth is this. Every one, not excused by invincible ignorance, is required under pain of mortal sin to accept interiorly this solemn judgment; to believe interiorly that the conspiracy against clerical celibacy which was proceeding in 1846 was "most foul," and that the priests who fomented it miserably forgot the dignity of their sacred office. No one, we suppose, will allege any important difference, in this respect, between the Europe of 1846 and the Europe of 1865; and the Pope indeed rules to the contrary, by now republishing his earlier decision. We can only infer, therefore, that the opinion against clerical celibacy, to which the *Union Review* gives such shocking currency, is in itself mortally sinful.

And now as to those Catholics in general who have unhappily joined the A.P.U.C. It has been flippantly and ignorantly said that the Roman Congregation made a mistake, in stating that these Catholics sanction the heretical doctrine of the Church's divisibility. A very few words will suffice to expose this incredible fallacy. Let us put a case. Let us suppose that English-

* Conc. Trid., Sess. xxi., can. 2 and 3. At last it may well be doubted whether the Holy See would ever grant to such men communion "sub utraque." Why should they desire it, unless (unknown perhaps to themselves) they are unbound as to the above-stated doctrine? On this matter emphatically the Church's discipline protects the Church's Faith.

men are at this time jointly engaged in prayer against cholera; and Frenchmen in prayer for success in some just war. A man would be mad who should say, that, as regards these respective petitions, the two nations are *united* with each other in prayer. To be united in prayer, all would at once reply, signifies that those so united are praying for the same object. Now an association starts up, of which far the larger portion is not Catholic; and these non-Catholics, as members of the association, give themselves to prayer, that the "divided branches of the Catholic Church" may be "reunited." Every one who chooses to look must see, that no one can *unite* himself to such prayer, except by praying for the same object; in other words, by implying that there are "divided branches" of "the Catholic Church." Catholics will pray most acceptably, as Cardinal Patrizi's letter reminds us, that certain heretics and schismatics may submit to the one undivided and indivisible Church; but such a prayer is no more *united* with the Anglican's, than an Englishman's prayer against cholera is united with a Frenchman's prayer for success in war. We do not deny—nor does the Roman Congregation deny—that certain Catholics may have joined the A.P.U.C. without observing this circumstance; but we do maintain that such as we have mentioned is the one legitimate significance of their act. A Catholic member of the A.P.U.C. is in effect—whether he intends it or no—a traitor to his faith and a deserter of his religion. And now that Rome has so clearly spoken, no room is surely left for ignorance or inadvertence.

Good Catholics cannot be too grateful to the Bishop of Birmingham, for the lead which he has so successfully taken against these enemies of the Church; and for the zeal and perseverance with which he has persisted in exposing the real nature of their scheme.

We have reserved to this place a very singular passage in Mr. Foulkes's preface. The italics are our own:—

What would be thought of the scholarship of that man who professed to lecture on the speeches in Thucydides, the choruses of *Æschylus* and *Euripides*, the satires of *Persius*, or the annals of *Tacitus*, while betraying every now and then his inability to construe and parse plain easy sentences in Latin and Greek Delectus? *But this is surely just what Christendom has been doing, for some time past*, by its inspired classics. It has been disputing and expending a vast amount of apparent learning upon some passages of acknowledged intricacy, respecting the Infallibility of the Church, the Supremacy of the Pope, Apostolical Succession, Inherent or Imputed Righteousness, Original Sin, Baptismal Regeneration, and the Real Presence—in all which, undoubtedly, there is a right interpretation to be upheld,

and a wrong interpretation to be condemned; one view which is true, and another view which is false; one line of action which is in harmony with the commands of Christ, and another line which is not. Still, as undeniably, when all those passages have been brought together, and enumerated and contrasted, they will be seen to be either few in number, or recondite in meaning; *our conclusions will be found in each case to be based either upon the literal sense of two or three isolated texts, or upon deductions from a number of texts mutually supporting or balanced against each other.* They are, on the whole, like the obscure passages, or unique constructions, or terms of rare occurrence, to be met with in Thucydides, Æschylus, Persius, and other classical authors. Meanwhile, there are some simple sentences for beginners occurring over and over again in the *New Testament* which it would seem from our practice we are unable to parse or construe; though, with the help of grammar and dictionary, there must be few incapable of penetrating to their full meaning. "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. . . . If ye love me, keep my commandments. . . . This is my commandment, that ye love one another. . . . Owe no man anything, but to love one another. . . . Love is the fulfilling of the law" . . . and so forth. Is not the grammar of these sentences sufficiently clear? Is there one word in them which is ambiguous? "Good Master," said one, "what shall I do that I may have eternal life?" And Jesus answered—first repeating the question, that there might be no mistake about it—"If thou wilt enter into life"—and then employing, in His reply, the very terms in which He afterwards laid down the true criterion of our love to Him—"Keep the commandments."

In all other cases, common sense forbids our ever indulging in the sophistry that by keeping one commandment we may break another, and not incur punishment. Those who steal are not let off because they do not commit murder as well; those who give way to their lusts, without violating truth, are not supposed to escape with impunity. Therefore, when I contemplate Christendom obstinately quarrelling over its more recondite obligations from age to age, and yet so notoriously unmindful of this primary and most undoubted one, I can only suppose that we are all of us bad scholars (*capr' ἀκούοντες*), unable to construe and parse those plain and easy sentences which recur so often in the course of the *New Testament*, and whose construction and whose terms are so trite that they can have but one meaning (p. vii.-ix.)

It is impossible to exhaust the various reflections suggested to a Catholic by this strange piece of writing; yet we cannot avoid making on it some little comment. And we will begin with this: either the passage is altogether unmeaning—just as nonsense verses are unmeaning—or else it expresses the Protestant rule of faith; it contains a denial of the Catholic rule, and an affirmation of the Protestant. Mr. Ffoulkes's argument is this: "One particular doctrine is most manifestly contained in Scripture; certain other doctrines are but obscurely there contained; hence the former doctrine

is very far more certain than these latter." If the author holds the Protestant tenet,—viz., that Scripture was given as the one instrument for imparting knowledge of doctrine—this argument is valid and forcible; but if he follow the Church's teaching, the whole paragraph is a simple string of absurdities. Firstly, the Council of Trent receives Scripture and Tradition "with equal affection of piety, and [with equal] reverence" (Sess. 10). However obscurely, then, any doctrine might be expressed in Scripture, if it were clearly contained in Tradition, it would be just as certain to every Catholic as though it were expressly stated in Scripture. But, secondly, all Catholics are required to regard the *Ecclesia Docens* as infallible in every definition of faith. Supposing, therefore, a doctrine to be defined by the Church which is not clearly contained either in Scripture or Tradition (as e.g., the Immaculate Conception), they must regard it as not less absolutely certain, than those which Scripture and Tradition most irrefragably testify.

The next comment which we must make carries our conclusion still farther. Nothing can be more certain than that the *Ecclesia Docens*—the Catholic Episcopate in communion with the Holy See—has consistently pursued the very course which Mr. Ffoulkes denounces. She has anathematized those whom she accounts heretical on "The Infallibility of the Church, the Supremacy of the Pope, Original Sin," or any other revealed matter; and by the very fact of thus anathematizing them, she has separated them by an impassable barrier from those whom she regards as free of heretical taint. It appears, then, from the two last sentences of the preceding extract, that, in Mr. Ffoulkes's opinion, the *Ecclesia Docens* has for many centuries instructed Christ's people "to quarrel obstinately over their more recondite obligations," and meanwhile entirely to forget the "primary and most undoubted" obligation of all. Now the *Ecclesia Docens* claims to be in all spiritual matters Christ's one representative on earth. Plainly, a body which, in Christ's name, has acted so consistently and energetically against Christ as Mr. Ffoulkes supposes, must deserve no less severe a censure than violent anti-Catholics allege; she must be anti-Christian, and a type of Antichrist. We are far from being unfair enough to imply, that so misty and inconsecutive a thinker as Mr. Ffoulkes really masters the consequences of his own statement; but such as we have said is its consequence, though he may fail to perceive it.

That such opinions as these should be expressed by a writer who sincerely believes himself a Catholic, is a fact (we imagine) without precedent in all the annals of puzzle-headedness and

bewilderment. And we really hope the exhibition may be of permanent service. Many men are under the practical impression—some excellent Catholics are not quite free from it—that intellectual revolt against authority, however *morally* censurable, implies at all events the presence of great *intellectual* power. Mr. Ffoulkes's example must undeceive all such men. It must show them that there is no imaginable amount of intellectual feebleness and confusion, which affords a guarantee against any imaginable amount of intellectual lawlessness and rebellion.

And what can be poorer than the author's attempt at a Scriptural argument in the passage just quoted? He applies himself with great pretension to give Scriptural proof for the opinion, that Catholics should love those who hold erroneous doctrines. Was there ever, then, a Catholic in the world who denied this? Was there ever a Catholic who denied the obligation of loving heretics and schismatics? But even when Mr. Ffoulkes holds a true opinion, he seems unable to give a good reason for it. He quotes our Lord's injunction, *e.g.*, that His disciples should love *one another*. Were any of His disciples, then, heretics or schismatics? Our Lord, by exhorting them to mutual love, teaches Catholics in every age to love their fellow Catholics; to love those who accept doctrine from the same infallible oracle, and who obey the same spiritual authority. But by what possible interpretation can such texts be made to inculcate the duty—unquestionable as that duty is—of loving those who are *not* fellow disciples; who do *not* yield submission of intellect and will to the same spiritual authority? If heretics and schismatics were lineal descendants of Christ's disciples, Mr. Ffoulkes's text would be to the purpose; but since all Catholics hold the reverse of this as a fundamental principle of their religion, and since he addresses his argument to Catholics, it is difficult to make out what he can be dreaming of.

The author's argument further assumes, that to excommunicate heretics is inconsistent with loving them; and that the whole *Ecclesia Docens* has, consequently, from the very moment of her original foundation, violated habitually and on principle the fundamental law of Christian love. As he merely assumes the truth of this frightful charge against the Church, without one argument in its behalf, he leaves nothing for Catholics to do, except to deny the charge as peremptorily as he makes it.

* Pius IX. has often expressed this duty in the strongest terms. "Let our faith," he says, "be exclusive, but our charity expansive." See also the passage quoted in our last number, p. 460.

We will say no more, however, on the contradictoriness between Mr. Ffoulkes's opinions and his position: we will take him as being, what he really is, a Protestant; and we will consider his argument on its own merits. It will furnish then a fresh illustration of that close affinity between unionism and indifferentism which has been noted by the Roman Congregation, if we observe his striking resemblance to Dean Stanley in general spirit and drift. It is for this reason, as well as for its own intrinsic importance as a sign of the times, that we have mentioned at the head of our article a paper, read by this most amiable and accomplished writer to a meeting of his clerical brethren. In this essay the Dean states or implies (to mention no other particulars) that "the theology of the nineteenth century" affords a far truer and more Christian bond of union than is supplied by the Church's organization and authority; that the spirit of Dr. Dollinger and other "liberal" Catholics is really more in accordance with that of the "Essays and Reviews," than with that of the *Encyclical and Syllabus*;* and that the real barrier to perfect sympathy between enlightened Catholics and Protestants, is not Catholic doctrine in itself, but the dogmatizing and domineering spirit of existing Catholic authorities. We have no space to consider the essay as a whole; yet before we join issue with the argument in which he unites himself to Mr. Ffoulkes, we will criticise one or two other statements which he puts forth in opposition to Catholic doctrine.

For instance. "Is it possible," he inquires (p. 256), "that we can now return from this *higher* knowledge of the Bible to the grooves of the 'summa theologiarum'?" Is it possible, one may as sensibly ask, that now railways are invented, men can fall back on simple beef and mutton? Scientific theology aims at one end, scriptural exegesis at another; each is good in its place. Of course the Dean thinks quite otherwise; but the objection which we make is this: he is addressing his argument to Catholics as well as to Protestants; yet he takes no pains to remember—it is really possible he may not know—the most elementary rudiments of the Catholic religion. The Church teaches that Christ imbued the Apostles with a vast body of doctrine, which was to be the animating principle of their lives; that while they expressed a greater or less part of this doctrine more or less clearly in Scripture, they handed down the whole of it in its integrity by means altogether independent of Scripture; that a science has started into existence, under the Church's watchful guidance, for the purpose of giving to intellectual men an accurate knowledge of this

* Dr. Dollinger will not thank the Dean for this implication.

doctrine, in its contents and bearing; while it is admitted by all that S. Thomas holds the highest place among the doctors of this science. How can any Catholic, then, possibly say, without virtually denying his faith, that exegetical criticism will give man a "higher knowledge of the Bible" than is derivable from scientific theology? The Apostles, in every word which they uttered bearing on faith and morals, were influenced by one vast, definite, profound, harmonious, mass of doctrine. What key, then, to the true sense of their words is even comparable in efficacy with a scientific study of that doctrine itself?

The Dean says, indeed, that an ordinary student of the nineteenth century has a far greater "enjoyment" of the Song of Deborah and the Book of Job than fell to fathers and schoolmen. But the real question is, which of the two classes is more able to penetrate the full depth of our Lord's sacred utterances, or to seize the correct sense of S. Paul's teaching. The Dean, of course, denies that Catholic theology is a sure guide to doctrinal truth; but we are here speaking of Catholics who know the contrary. Surely it can need no argument to prove, that those who already possess a full and scientific acquaintance with doctrine in general, will be immeasurably keener than any others, in appreciating the sense and scope of any one doctrinal statement in particular.*

What can possibly be Dean Stanley's meaning, then, when he says (p. 257) that "French Catholics and French Protestants, and German Catholics and German Protestants . . . are employed in studying the same Book (the Bible) on the same general principles"? How can any two principles in the world be more irreconcilable than the two before us?—the Protestant, on the one hand, which says that our knowledge of doctrine is purely derived from our knowledge of the Bible; and the Catholic, on the other hand, which leads to the immediate conclusion, that our doctrinal apprehension of the Bible must be altogether based on our scientific study of theology? The Dean is sanguine enough to imagine (p. 257) that Roman Catholic and Protestant are nearer to a mutual understanding than at any previous time. Certainly if he is to be taken as a sample of Protestants, facts directly contradict him: for the most commonplace Protestant controversialist has a truer apprehension of Catholic doctrine, than any which he has displayed.

* On the inappreciable importance of studying scholastic theology, we would refer to some most admirable remarks in the "Civiltà Cattolica," which were analyzed by us in a recent number. See our number for July, 1864, pp. 207-212.

But the Dean, flying off into an opposite extreme, implies (p. 253) that the recent Encyclical opposes itself to exegetical criticism altogether. We cannot imagine whereon he bases such a fancy, unless it be on prop. xiii., censured in the Syllabus. Now, what is that proposition? "That the method and principles of scholastic theology are unsuited to the necessities of our time." Surely it is most possible to reject this proposition energetically, and to hold, nevertheless, that exegetical and linguistic criticism has also its own place of usefulness. To approve the one is not to condemn the other. Every Catholic, no doubt, must in consistency hold that scientific theology (and there is no scientific theology *except* the scholastic) is absolutely requisite for any trustworthy doctrinal exposition of Scripture. But when strictly subordinated to this science, critical study may produce very valuable results, and the Church ever encourages its active prosecution. Nor do we at all deny, but distinctly admit, that on a number of questions, subordinate indeed yet highly important, Protestant inquirers have supplied, by the result of their labour, invaluable materials for a Catholic's use. Yet there is one important remark here to be made. Take any one of those scripture texts which may be called emphatically doctrinal. Compare, on the one hand, such an exposition of it as would be supplied by Catholic theology; compare, on the other hand, the very best which Protestant criticism can furnish. The purely linguistic and exegetical critic must admit (if we could suppose him impartial) that the former presents, of the two, a far deeper and more germane comment on the passage; attaches a far more profound, satisfying, and adequate sense to the sacred words. Just as the Catholic Church alone authenticates Scripture and attests its inspiration, so she alone can furnish the real key to its doctrinal significance and drift.

In a similar spirit Dean Stanley states in effect (p. 262), that scientific theology gives a less true and vivid representation of our Most Holy Redeemer, than would be obtained by an independent and critical study of the four Gospels. Now, let us look at the case as it stands. A long series of most touching acts and words is recorded concerning Christ. Who is He who did those acts and spoke those words? Is He, on the one hand, a most pure and spotless creature, sinless and incapable of sinning, filled with the treasures of Divine wisdom and knowledge, entrusted by God with an all-important revelation? Or is He, on the other hand, the Eternal Creator Himself? The distance is not less than infinite between Christ as conceived in these two respective ways; nor can any end,

therefore, be more important (here we thoroughly agree with the Dean) than that the Gospels shall be studied with a true apprehension of Christ. If the speeches and actions therein recorded are meditated under the deep practical impression, that in literal truth they are the very speeches and actions of Almighty God—no meditation can tend so powerfully to elevate and supernaturalize the mind. If they be read under a different impression, they lose their one characteristic charm; the salt has lost its savour; it is good for nothing any more but to be cast out and trodden on by men. How, then, you may ask, does the Catholic Church secure their being rightly contemplated? But this is not our precise question. We are not here asking by what means she obtains the desired result for *her children in general*; though on this we shall presently have a word to say: but we are here asking what *study* she recommends in this view to the educated and intellectual. The answer is simple: she recommends a mastery of the scientific doctrine on Christ's Person and Natures; nor can we conjecture what other intellectual means is even imaginable. Dean Stanley, however, considers such intellectual exercises as "more or less barren both for speculation and edification" (p. 262); and we are the more curious, therefore, in inquiring what he would substitute in their place. Strange to say, no answer is forthcoming. He says again and again that we should study "the character of His acts down to the minutest details;" that we should strive to "delineate" Him "morally and historically;" in fact, that we should throw our whole mind on the Gospel narrative. But all this is beside the question. His acts and words may be studied, either as those of a perfect creature, or as those of the Almighty Creator; and we are asking what provision the Dean suggests, in order that a student may carry with him throughout a true practical impression, on this unspeakably momentous alternative. The Dean regards scholasticism as an unsuitable means for this. We ask what study does he recommend in its place? The question is simple and elementary enough; but we have read the essay carefully from beginning to end, without finding the remotest suggestion of an answer.

We should expect, then, *à priori*, that Protestants would suffer most serious mischief in their study of the Gospels, from their ignorance of scholastic science: nor was there ever a case in which theory was more amply confirmed by experience. The great majority of Protestants sincerely believe themselves to hold the doctrine of Our Lord's Divine Personality; but we believe that there is not one in a thousand who practically holds what he has speculatively accepted. We are not speaking here

of the Tractarians; whose exception, indeed, emphatically proves the rule, because they do study scientific theology. Apart from them, certainly that class of Protestant religionists in England which might be expected most firmly to grasp this vital verity, would be the Evangelicals; for they rest their whole scheme on the Atonement. Yet it was shown many years ago in the "Tracts for the Times" that Jacob Abbot, whose book was welcomed with enthusiasm by Evangelicals both here and in America, exhibited a picture of Our Lord intermediate between the Arian and the Socinian. Passing to the present time, and to take the first which occurs out of a thousand instances, no Protestant has studied the Gospels more accurately, more laboriously, with greater critical power, in a more reverent spirit as far as intention goes, than Professor Lange. He announces that "Christ miraculously attained to full consciousness of His calling as the Redeemer, at His baptism in Jordan."* The Omniscient God, it seems, having taken our nature to redeem us, after many years of comparative ignorance, at the age of thirty arrives miraculously (!) at a knowledge of what it is which He has come upon earth to do. What can be the practical impression of him who thus writes,—what can be the practical impression derived from his work by those who unsuspectingly read it,—except that Jesus Christ is something less—and if something, then infinitely less—than the Creator?

We are not unmindful of a logical reply which may be attempted to our accusation: it may be alleged that Lange speaks of our Lord's human knowledge; and that the language quoted is compatible with a belief, that He possesses a Divine and Infinite Knowledge concurrently. We answer confidently—and we are sure all impartial persons will agree—that no one, practically impressed with the conviction that Our Lord is the Omniscient Creator, could possibly have so written, without, at the same time, *expressing* the supplementary truth of Christ's Infinite Divine Knowledge. It is even more obviously indubitable, that the impression made on unsuspecting readers must be such as we have described; while yet no murmur of dissent has been heard from the Protestant world or from the Protestant translator. But we are not sorry that the supposed reply has occurred to us, because it will give us opportunity for a few words on an important subject. Scholastic theology has not merely analyzed with great accuracy the doctrine of the Incarnation; it has also explored a supplementary body of truth, on the endowments of

* "On S. Matthew," Clark's English Translation, p. 312.

Christ's human soul: nor is there anything which more claims the attention of intellectual men, who would study the Gospels with full fruit, than a study of this whole exposition. We cannot here refer to other portions of it; but we will speak of its pronouncement on Our Lord's human knowledge. The Church attaches so great importance to true judgments on this head, that she has actually anathematized as heretics those who have held that Our Lord, even in His human nature, was ignorant concerning "the day and hour" of Divine Judgment.* Theology teaches, in accordance with this, that Christ's human knowledge was from the first complete and perfect in its sphere; that at the very moment of His soul's creation, it knew and actively apprehended all which it knew and actively apprehended at any subsequent time; consequently, that neither in the earlier period was there imperfection, nor at a later period addition. Our first and most obvious remark on this doctrine is in opposition to Dean Stanley. If this doctrine be true, it is plain that Catholics who study the Gospel history under its light, possess an immeasurably clearer and truer view of what they read than is accessible to Lange, however inferior they may be to him in linguistic knowledge and exegetical skill. But, further, we would suggest that this doctrine is, *in practice*, a necessary supplement to the doctrine itself of the Incarnation. In speculation, no doubt, a thinker may hold that Our Lord's Divine knowledge is Infinite, while His human knowledge, during His stay on earth, was rising from the poor and imperfect to a fuller and more perfect state. But let us imagine any one to set about studying the Gospels under this belief. He would find it impossible, we are persuaded, to retain the *practical impression*, that he is studying the words and acts of Almighty God; though his speculative belief in that doctrine might remain unaltered. We cannot here treat the subject thus opened, proportionately to its interest and importance; but as it has in some sense obtruded itself on our attention, we have thought it better not entirely to pass it over.

Then the Dean makes another attack on scholasticism. "In older theology," he says (p. 260), "there seems (of course with brilliant exceptions) to have prevailed this general defect, that endless controversies, and defences and attacks, have gone round and round these sacred terms [which express dogma] *without even asking what they mean.*" There is no need for replying to such a statement; we may safely leave it to the amazement of those, who possess the most superficial acquaint-

* See "Petavius de Incarnatione," L. xi, c. 4, 15.

ance with scholastic writers. Nor, again, can we profess surprise at any density of ignorance displayed on such matters by a Protestant divine. But we confess we do a little wonder how it happened, that Dean Stanley, who must have been profoundly conscious of his own ignorance, was rash enough to commit himself so deplorably.*

Perhaps no part of the paper before us is more singular, than that in which the author contrasts the "calmness" of the new school with the "alarm and vehemence" of the more orthodox. Firstly, we would submit to him (we mean no offence by the illustration), that a burglar has no difficulty in keeping his temper; but that when the master of the house, on rising, finds himself to have sustained grievous loss, he deserves no small praise if he bear that loss with perfect patience. In like manner, when an assault is made on the object of a man's dearest attachment—the body of definite and divinely revealed truth—he is, of course, tempted to anger and excitement; though he should undoubtedly fight against that temptation. But the other party is on the aggressive; it has taken up a new theory, and is labouring to spread that theory. Such men are tempted, not to harsh language, but to other faults instead; to inconsiderateness towards simple piety, to random assertions, reckless insinuations, flippant sophistry, and the like. How far they have been even as successful as their opponents in guarding against their peculiar dangers, we shall not here attempt to decide.

But now what are the instances given by Dean Stanley of this "vehemence," which he regards as so sure a mark of the false and losing cause?† Among members of his own com-

* Presently the Dean quotes this solemn warning from a Protestant Professor (p. 261): "Consider the havoc which must needs follow if people, without having clearly perceived the meaning of 'Nature,' without having agreed among themselves on the strict meaning of the word, enter on a discussion on the 'Supernatural.'" Such, the Dean implies, was the habit of scholastic writers. We wish the author would accept at our hands a penance for his random allegations. We should enjoin him to study accurately the careful consideration to be found, in Ripalda's great work "De Ente Supernaturali," on the various senses of the word "nature," for the purpose of explaining the scope of his own immediate subject (l. i., d. 3). And we should also enjoin the Dean not to bring any more of his theological speculations before the public, till he could pass an examination on Ripalda's argument.

† The author at times uses these two epithets as almost synonymous. Thus (p. 266) he inquires which of the two contending parties "feel most assured that truth and victory are on his side." One of these parties is the Pope; the Dean therefore seems really to think that Pius IX. is not confident in his heart on the justice of his own cause! But what we are especially pointing out, is the author's matter-of-course assumption, that in this corrupt and fallen world the side of truth is certainly the side of victory.

munion, he cites Dr. Pusey, in his commentary on Daniel; a work for which that learned Professor has earned the warmest gratitude of every good Catholic, and in which, for ourselves, we are quite unable to see any expressions of undue severity towards the Indifferentist party. But the author's principal instance is Pius IX.'s recent Encyclical; which he denounces as filled with "cries, lamentations, hyperbolic rhetoric, imprecations, and adjurations" (p. 265). Before meeting this monstrous charge, we must seriously complain of Dean Stanley's great inaccuracy: which is the less excusable, because it gives a most false impression on the nature of Pius IX.'s act. He says that Dr. Dollinger and Sir J. Acton were "the special objects so furiously attacked" (p. 266). The special objects! Why, in the Encyclical neither of them is directly touched at all; and as to the Syllabus, is it Dr. Dollinger and Sir J. Acton who hold that there is no God; that Jesus Christ is a mythical fiction; that any wicked or flagitious action is to be extolled, if done for love of country? Such are the tenets which Pius IX. denounces as "monstrous portents of opinion." Would the Dean give them a softer name? As to Dr. Dollinger and Sir J. Acton, we are not aware of any propositions which can be supposed directly to concern them, except props. xii., xiii., and xxii. It appears then, at starting, that the "special objects, so furiously attacked" in the Encyclical and Syllabus,—are not mentioned in the former at all, and in the latter only occupy three propositions out of eighty. And it appears further on inspection, that these three propositions are all extracted from one original document, viz., the Munich Brief; and that this Brief, so far from containing a "furious attack," is worded throughout in terms of most guarded courtesy. The Dean himself, at all events, is by no means averse from that "hyperbolic rhetoric" which he ascribes to the Vicar of Christ.

But is it indeed at variance with the true Christian spirit, to speak with extreme severity—with what an opponent may choose to call "hyperbolic rhetoric"—against doctrinal error? The error was not uncommon in Apostolic times, that the Jewish law is of permanent obligation. No one acquainted with Dean Stanley's writings will doubt what judgment he would have formed on that error. He would have said that none but the narrow and uncharitable could regard it as an obstacle to Christian union; that the Judaizers accept all the essentials of Christian doctrine and morality (see p. 259); and that they are fellow-heirs of heaven with the rest. St. Paul's judgment, however, differs from the Dean's. He teaches that these miserable men have been removed into

another gospel; that they who preach such a gospel are under an anathema; that "as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse;" that if Gentiles "are circumcised Christ shall profit them nothing" (Gal. i. 6, 8; iii. 10; v. 2). Had the Dean then lived, would he not have stigmatized all this as "hyperbolic rhetoric"? Then consider again such passages as the following; from which, indeed, some of the Holy Father's strongest expressions are textually taken.

But these men, as *irrational beasts*, naturally tending to the snare and to destruction, blaspheming those things which they know not, shall perish in their corruption, Receiving the reward of their injustice, counting for a pleasure the delights of a day: stains and spots, flowing in delights, rioting in their feasts with you, having eyes full of adultery and of sin that ceaseth not: alluring unstable souls, having their heart exercised with covetousness, *children of malediction*: . . . These are fountains without water and clouds tossed with whirlwinds, to whom the mist of darkness is reserved. For, speaking proud words of vanity, they allure by *the desires of fleshy riotousness* those who for a little while escape, who converse in error: promising them liberty, whereas they themselves are the slaves of corruption. For by whom a man is overcome, of the same also he is the slave!—2 Peter ii. 12—14, 17—19.

But these men blaspheme whatever things they know not: and what things soever they naturally know, like dumb beasts, in these they are corrupted. Wo unto them, for they have gone in the way of Cain: and after the error of Balaam they have for reward poured out themselves, and have perished in the contradiction of Core. These are spots in their banquets, feasting together without fear, feeding themselves, clouds without water, which are carried about by winds, trees of the autumn, unfruitful, twice dead, plucked up by the roots, *raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own confusion*, wandering stars; to whom the storm of darkness is reserved for ever. Now of these Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying: Behold, the Lord cometh with thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to reprove all the ungodly for all the works of their ungodliness, whereby they have done ungodly, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against God. These are murmurers, full of complaints, walking according to their own desires, and their mouth speaketh proud things, admiring persons for gain's sake.—Jude 10—16.

We ask the Dean in all seriousness one simple question. Are these passages to be accepted as the accents of the Holy Ghost? or, on the other hand, are they to be ridiculed and denounced as replete with "cries, lamentations, hyperbolic rhetoric, imprecations, and adjurations"? It is not to his honour, if he will refuse plainly and publicly to answer this plain and public question.

He may possibly reply, indeed, that these writers were Apostles, commissioned by God to teach and govern the

Church, and who might well therefore use a freedom of speech which in others would be condemnable. We fully concur in such a statement; but entreat him to remember that Pius IX. claims the very same jurisdiction which was possessed by S. Peter, and a higher than that possessed by S. Paul and S. Jude.

If anything could be more wonderful than the author's censure of the Pope, it would be his eulogy of Sir J. Acton. Sir John's "farewell," he thinks, was "manly and high-spirited," his "attitude calm, dignified, and respectful" (p. 266). We wish our readers would refer to a few extracts from this "farewell" which we gave last July (pp. 66-69); here we can but give a brief selection. "Authority may be protected," he says—he means that ecclesiastical authority is protected—"by its subjects being kept ignorant of its faults and holding it in *superstitious admiration*." "*The twilight of opinion* enables it to assume the *halo of infallibility*." "Its arts are simply those of all human governments which possess legislative power, *fear attack*, deny responsibility, and therefore *shrink from scrutiny*." This, forsooth, is a "calm, dignified, and respectful attitude" towards the authority, which Sir John admits to have received from God the keys of the Kingdom, and the promise that whatever it binds on earth shall be bound in heaven.

It is the main drift, however, of Dean Stanley's essay, with which we are mainly concerned: and in its bearing on Catholicism this drift may be stated as follows:—"There is no important difference of interior character between a Catholic and a Protestant. That familiar and friendly intercourse between the two, which is so called for by the spirit of Christian love, is impeded only by mutual misunderstanding, and by the un-Christian stress laid on doctrine as such." This is the phase of indifferentism which is just now most fashionable among educated English Protestants; and there is much reason for regret, that the existing works of Catholic controversy supply little or no protection against its insidious assaults. When these works were written, not indifferentism but dogmatic Protestantism was the enemy in the field. In Ireland this is still the case: in England, again, dogmatic Protestantism exercises most powerful sway over multitudes of vulgar minds, both in the upper and the middle class; but we doubt whether it now influences one single person of real thought and cultivation. Meanwhile, according to the fable of the sun and wind, many unsuspecting Catholics, who would be proof against the onslaughts of open hostility, are charmed and sent to sleep

by the voice of professing friendship; and under the specious delusion of pursuing Christian charity, lose all the freshness, simplicity, and energy of Christian faith. No more grievous intellectual need exists in England, than a full exposure of indifferentism, in itself and in its innumerable ramifications. We can here of course attempt no more than the merest skeleton of a reply to our author; and what little we do attempt will be addressed exclusively to Catholics. How to make the Catholic reasoning intelligible to Protestants, is an important question, on which, however, we have no space to touch.

At starting let us suppose, merely for argument's sake, that in one or two exceptional cases the Dean's supposition held good; that here or there a Catholic might be found whose interior character * differs in no important respect from that of a Protestant. Still we must maintain that this fact is, firstly, his own fault; and, secondly, his unspeakable misfortune. It is precisely our wish that this misfortune be not indefinitely extended—our wish that the purity of faith and of Catholic instinct may not suffer more grievous and extensive injury,—which leads us to protest with our whole soul against the detestable theories of Dean Stanley and Mr. Ffoulkes. We will begin, then, with reciting some principal doctrines and authorized usages, tending most powerfully to influence the interior character, which are integral portions of the Catholic religion, and to which all Protestants are more or less strangers; and we will afterwards draw various inferences from this enumeration. Moreover, as we must carefully consult for brevity, we will not consider the case of Photians and other Eastern heretics or schismatics; but only of European Protestants and English Tractarians. Lastly, we confine our examination to matters which directly and importantly affect the interior character; there being other doctrines, truly momentous in various other respects, on which we do not touch.

(1.) Catholics practically hold, no less than speculatively believe, that He who died on the cross is the Eternal God. We have already stated that, putting aside the Tractarians, we believe the number of Protestants to be extremely small who practically hold this doctrine; though the great majority of them consider themselves to believe it. And we shall see the reason of this, when we consider the principal means whereby the Catholic Church secures its true presentation to the mind of

* It can hardly be necessary to warn our Catholic readers, that in the following discussion the word "character" has its ordinary and popular meaning; totally distinct from that theological sense, in which it is said that certain sacraments impart a "character."

her children. We do not here speak on books of meditation, nor again of scientific theology; because these, though instruments of signal efficacy, are available, of course, only for the educated classes. Nor again do we speak of the Catechism; which is amply sufficient for engendering speculative belief in the great doctrine, but not always for ensuring its full practical apprehension. The means whereby the great body of Catholics is duly trained in this respect, seem to us mainly two;—devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, and to Our Lady: and since Protestants, in their blindness and ignorance, have abandoned both, it is no matter of surprise that the treasure has escaped from their grasp. The belief that, by a stupendous miracle, the Redeemer is personally present in every Tabernacle, impresses the mind with a sense of His indefinite greatness; while the divine worship, internal and external, which Catholics offer to the Blessed Sacrament day after day, preserves in their mind the fresh and vivid impression of His Divine Personality. Then as regards devotion to our Blessed Lady. The practice, so peculiar to Catholics, and at the same time so universal among them, of uniting themselves with Mary in the contemplation of Jesus, unspeakably elevates their conception of His Divine Majesty. Yet we cannot wonder that Protestants reprobate devotion to our Lady altogether; for their own practical conception of Christ rises hardly (if at all) above the Catholic's conception of Christ's purest creature.

(2.) Firm belief in the Real Presence, and the habit of frequent communion, as is known by all who try the experiment, produce in the mind a profound and incommunicable effect of their own.

(3.) Devotion to our Lady is the peculiar heritage of Catholics. The immense majority of Protestants regard it with reprobation and horror; those more lenient, with indulgence and excuse: but Catholics cherish it as among their dearest possessions and their highest privileges. We will here appeal to those Catholics who have once been Protestants. We will suppose them to have accepted on faith that fully-developed Marian devotion which is *there* encouraged, whither all sound believers look for light and guidance—viz., in Rome; and we will further suppose that they have practised assiduously the devotion thus learnt. Let us even put the case that these men have been Tractarians; and therefore, even in their pre-Catholic days, have really embraced and practically apprehended the doctrine of our Lord's Divine Personality. These, however, no less than others, find that their devotion to Mary, while unspeakably intensifying their awe and reverence, has, at the same time, given a quality of tenderness, confidingness,

intimacy, to their love of Him, which has been an absolutely new experience; and, generally, that it has imparted a familiarity with the invisible world, a realization of supernatural truth, an unworldliness of thought and affection, a practical belief in the efficacy of prayer, a power of self-control, to which otherwise they would have been strangers.

(4.) All Catholics recognize the Evangelical Counsels; and consider that those who follow them pursue a higher and more heavenly method of life than any other.

(5.) Consider, again, the Saints of the Church: how singularly like to each other! how singularly unlike to all besides! It is part of Catholic doctrine that the Church is actually infallible in proposing these holy beings to the love and reverence of the faithful. Moreover the practice is earnestly inculcated on every Catholic of studying carefully their acts and lives, as the one highest and truest exhibition of Christianity; as presenting the one type of character most acceptable to God—the type of character, by approximating to which, and in no other way, can men become better Christians.

(6.) Whether in perusing these lives, or in studying works of ascetic theology, all Catholics are taught that the one true way of rising in true holiness is to unite diffidence in self with confidence in God; in other words, to labour energetically towards fulfilment of His Will, in the spirit of simple reliance on His strength as enabling them to do so. One school of Protestants denies this doctrine, by affirming that all our efforts for consistent obedience are vain, and, indeed, anti-Christian; and that our best acts are in God's sight but as filthy rags. The opposite school, ignoring or denying original sin, holds that we can really advance to our true end, by works done in our natural strength, and in the spirit of self-reliance.

(7.) It is an essential truth of Catholicism, that the one end for which man was created is the love and service of God; that men are more admirable, more excellent, more perfect as men, not at all in proportion as they are more intellectual, or more gifted with practical power, or more nobly descended, but exclusively as they are more morally and spiritually advanced. On no point is there more real difference than on this, between the respective morality of Catholics and Protestants.

(8.) All Catholics are required to go annually to confession; and are earnestly exhorted, both to go much oftener, and also to practise regularly and systematically a rigid examination of conscience. Moreover, in the confessional they submit themselves to the priest, both as their judge and their physician; while he is obliged to adjust his counsels and decisions by a

whole system of moral and ascetical theology, which he is authoritatively taught in his ecclesiastical education.

(9.) Catholics hold that even the smallest sin is a greater evil than any other in the world *except* sin; that for each smallest sin future suffering (in purgatory) is justly due; that efficacious repentance for venial sin is far from easy; that men cannot in this life obtain (whether by indulgences or otherwise) remission for the punishment of any one such sin, *without* efficaciously repenting it. We are not denying that after death the penalty may be shortened, or even removed altogether, by the prayers of survivors or by the indulgences which these may gain; but still the doctrine which we have mentioned stands out in startling contrast with Protestant misbelief. Even the everlasting punishment of mortal sins is fast disappearing out of the Protestant's creed; and a Catholic's sensitiveness to small offences was always unintelligible to the Protestant world. Matt. v. 17—19 may be thought to have been specially pronounced by anticipation, against those frightful heresies introduced by Luther, which have pervaded Protestantism in all its phases like a besetting plague.

(10.) Catholics have also a very real and influential belief, in the constant battle to be waged, by those who would obtain salvation, against the attacks of those evil spirits who are so crafty and sagacious, and, at the same time, such malignant enemies to God and man. Such a belief has now hardly any practical existence with most Protestants.

(11.) An English Catholic has a very far closer corporate connection with a French or Italian Catholic, than with an English Protestant. He owes immeasurably more unreserved attachment to the Church than to the State;* and holds, moreover, as of divine faith, that the Pope is by God's immediate appointment the Church's supreme ruler. Consequently his one reasonable attitude of mind towards the Holy Father is an immeasurably more ardent and (as it were) chivalrous loyalty, than was due, *e. g.*, to the Stuarts even on the highest theory of divine right.

We need not continue our enumeration further; and we are obliged to confine our remarks on it within the briefest possible space:—

I. A very little consideration will show, that a habit of pondering on those truths, and diligently practising those

* See this doctrine drawn out in our number for last October, pp. 379—382.

usages, which we have now mentioned, must necessarily engender a most peculiar and pronounced interior character—one most widely different from any other. It may be alleged, indeed, that certain extreme Tractarians, by pondering on their own doctrines, would be similarly affected; we will remark, therefore, that, though we cannot agree with this statement, its truth would in no respect affect our argument.

II. Further, God revealed Catholic doctrine for the very end that men should contemplate and dwell on it. Since, therefore, the duly-pondering on Catholic doctrine leads to a certain most definite interior character, this character must be singularly pleasing to God. It cannot be saying too much, to affirm that the production of this character is one principal end for which God revealed Catholic dogma.

III. Again, as this character would infallibly be produced by the contemplation of Catholic dogma, so the converse also holds: those who possess it will understand far better than any others the true force and bearing of such dogma; and on various matters of thought will instinctively cleave to sound opinions, while they shun those which are unsound.

IV. Indeed, this interior character may be considered as substantially identical with what are called "Catholic instincts." Those who possess it have a most special gift (supposing them to possess adequate knowledge of *facts*) of seeing on each occasion which is God's Preference, and how they can best please Him. It ranks them among a Catholic's most precious possessions.

V. Here occurs a vital question. Great multitudes have really not the opportunity or the gift of contemplating Catholic doctrines one by one. Have these men no means of acquiring this most precious possession? On the contrary, God has specially provided for their need, by enjoining that duty on which we laid stress at the outset of our article; *viz.*, docility to the Church's "juge magisterium." By unreservedly surrendering themselves to the Church's influence in every shape; by being diligent in the Catholic duties of their station; by reading those books which have the Church's sanction; by seeking the company of priests, and of those laymen who are called abroad in derision "clericals;" by avoiding familiar intimacy whether with persons of a different religion, or with unsound and disloyal Catholics; by exercising extreme caution and reserve in all intercourse with Protestants and all study of Protestant literature;—by these and a thousand similar methods all may imbibe that true Catholic spirit, which places them in real sympathy with the Church's mind; gives them the instinctive habit of obedience to ecclesiastical

authority; and constitutes them the Church's trustworthy defenders.

VI. Since the season of childhood and youth is immeasurably the most impressible of all, it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of preserving the purity of a Catholic atmosphere throughout the whole of education. Far better for Catholic youths to be in constant contact with men sick of the plague, than with men aliens to the Church.

VII. Even intellectually speaking, no result can be more contemptible than that which ensues on mixed education. There is no surer mark of an uneducated and uncultivated mind, than that a man's practical judgment on facts as they occur, shall be at variance with the theoretical principles which he speculatively accepts. Suppose, *e. g.*, a politician, who is busy in forwarding measures, condemned by that theory on political economy which he professes to accept. What would result? We should all cry out against his shallowness, and lament that he had received no better intellectual training. Now, this is the necessary result of mixed education. The unhappy Catholic who (whether from his own fault or that of others,) is so disadvantageously circumstanced, becomes a contemptible mongrel: Catholic in his speculative convictions, non-Catholic in his practical judgments; holding one doctrine as an universal truth, and a doctrine precisely contradictory on almost every particular which that universal truth comprises.

VIII. Further, we can thus discern (see prop. lxxix. of the Syllabus) the deplorable nature of that calamity which overspread Europe, when unhappy circumstances necessitated in so many countries the civil toleration of religious error. The Catholic atmosphere, instead of pervading the nation, is withdrawn, as it were, within the more purely ecclesiastical sphere: a wide and ever increasing gulf opens between the clergy on one hand, and the great body of the laity on the other: religious indifferentism eats like a cancer into the very vitals of society; a disease, perhaps, by the very reason of its impalpableness and subtlety, more perilous than almost any other by which the body politic can be affected.

IX. Lastly, as has been more than once implied, fraternization and familiar intercourse, whether with Protestants or with unsound and disloyal Catholics, tends inevitably to destroy, not indeed all speculative belief, but at least all practical apprehension, of those great truths which Christ came to teach us.

Now, men of all parties will agree, that the principles here stated, if true, give abundant reason for the detestation

and abhorrence which we feel both for Dean Stanley's views and Mr. Ffoulkes's projects. The former, indeed, is more comprehensive than the latter, as to those whom he would include; while the latter proposes more complete union with those whom he does comprehend. But both writers proceed on the same principles. Both writers are profoundly ignorant of the effect produced by true doctrine on the interior character. Both assert that the undue stress laid on distinctive doctrine is the one unhappy barrier, to that unity which the spirit of Christianity so peremptorily requires. Both virtually deny that submission is due to the "juge magisterium" of the Church. Both hold that the *Ecclesia Docens* has acted in a narrow and domineering way. Both understand, by that much-abused word "union," the "agreement to differ;" instead of using it to signify that harmony of heart, spirit, and affection, which can only be based on unity of faith.

The Catholic's answer to them both is most simple. Either Christ did, or did not, commit a large body of momentous dogma to the infallible guardianship of the Holy See and the Catholic Episcopate. To believe that He did not, is to abandon Catholicism. If He did—as every Catholic is required to believe that He did—Catholics have nothing for it but to accept with humble submission that body of dogma, precisely as it is taught them by that authority which Christ has empowered infallibly to propose it. We do not deny that there are many open questions; that various tenets, held firmly by individual Catholics, are nevertheless in no sense obligatory on a Catholic's belief; but we must maintain that no private Catholic can even guess, by his own judgment, what questions are or are not open. The good Catholic submits his judgment unreservedly to the Holy See; he holds those tenets to be respectively heretical, unsound, improbable, which the Holy Father declares to be such; he thinks independently for himself on those questions alone, which the Holy Father leaves perfectly free. Mr. Ffoulkes, we suppose, would admit (so far as words go) that the Holy See is the centre and principle of doctrinal unity: we cannot imagine what such words signify, unless they mean that precise verity which we have now stated.

It is urged by many, as an argument against denunciation of unsound Catholics, that members of the Church should at least live in union with each other, if they would succeed in their aggression on the world. No end, we reply, can be more inestimably important, than that sound and loyal Catholics—those heartily submissive both in intellect and will to the Holy See—should be bound together in firmest union. But are all Catholics such? Certain persons will reject, indeed, any

tenet as *heretical* which the Church so denounces, but will not ascribe to a proposition, as infallibly deserved, any *lesser* censure with which the Church may have branded it: nor will they accept as infallibly true those instructions of the Holy Father (such as the "Mirari Vos," or the "Quantà Curà" with its appended Syllabus) which are not definitions of faith. These men do not, therefore, actually cease to be Catholics, but they are unsound and disloyal Catholics; and they commit, moreover, as we must maintain, (materially at least) mortal sin. So far from its being desirable that a private Catholic should be in "union" with such men, his attitude of mind should be simply antagonistic to their whole position; he should regard them as mischievous and dangerous rebels. Certainly he should tenderly love them, as he should tenderly love heretics and schismatics. Certainly he should dwell admiringly on their good qualities, and give their every act the most favourable interpretation of which it is reasonably susceptible: but this again is also his duty towards heretics and schismatics. And his love for one class, as for the other, should be exhibited, not by fraternizing with them (God forbid!), but by endeavouring (if he have the opportunity) to awaken in them a sense of their error and peril. The writers in the *Union Review*, whether Catholic or Protestant, show no great "union" of heart, either with what they call "the ultramontane party" (*i.e.*, loyal Catholics), or with this REVIEW, which they are pleased to regard as its "leading organ in England."* We may be permitted, we suppose, to abhor their principles as cordially as they abhor ours.

The great mass of Catholics, as we observed at the outset of this article, have no such intellectual cultivation, as to be tempted towards that miserable disloyalty to the Holy See of which we have just spoken. And among educated Catholics there is a large and (we really believe) an increasing class, who look to Rome as to their one guiding star amid the tempests of life; who obey her every command and wish; who are docile, not merely to her smallest expressed instructions, but to her whole practical "magisterium." That these men may come more and more to know each other, to understand each other, to love each other; that those otherwise minded may be led in ever increasing numbers to see the error of their ways; that such loyal and devoted subjects may form an impregnable

* As one instance out of a thousand, the *Union Review* for March, 1865, after commenting on this REVIEW, concludes that "the advance of ultramontanism means the advance of intolerance, both political and intellectual, in the very worst sense of the word" (p. 209).

barrier of defence to the Holy See; that through their co-operation the Chair of Peter may be, in a constantly increasing degree, revered through the world as the one Chair of Truth, and as the highest seat of legitimate authority;—this is a wish and prayer for Christian "union," which we express with deep sincerity and from the bottom of our heart. Such is that "union" which alone is healthy and stable, because it is based on the principle of submission. Let those who desire union remember, that the Holy See has been established by Christ as the one bond and means of unity.

The preceding article had been sent to press, when we accidentally met with "A Few Words on the Pope's Encyclical Letter," by Rev. F. Maurice,* and with the strange statement there contained, that the Pope has now shown himself "not the uniter of Christendom," but "emphatically its divider" (p. 277). The extraordinary shallowness of this remark lies in Mr. Maurice's strange notion, that the sharp and uncompromising rebuke of error is a new fact in Papal history. Arians, Nestorians, Pelagians, Lutherans, have successively exclaimed that the Pope of their day is not the uniter but the divider of Christendom. In fact, Mr. Maurice has given to that word "religious union" the same paltry sense affixed to it by Dean Stanley and Mr. Ffoulkes—as signifying "the fraternization of men who mutually differ on doctrine and principle;" whereas the true meaning of "religious union" emphatically and prominently includes the idea of "*interior agreement* on religious questions." In the case of rude and uncultivated minds, or again of men who do not apply their cultivated intellect to religion at all, such agreement may be sometimes produced by the mere force of inertia, by the merely passive reception of hereditary beliefs. But wherever there is both activity of thought and an application of such thought to the moral and spiritual order, no mode can be imagined (not openly miraculous) for securing religious union, except a common belief in some authority, as having the gift of infallibly deciding on each question as it arises. Nothing, then, can be more intelligible, and nothing more obvious, than our statement that the Pope is the one "uniter" of Catholic Christendom, in the only adequate sense of that word. And we may here further add, that since the chief questions con-

* *Macmillan's Magazine* for Feb., 1865.

nected with religion which now agitate the human mind are not directly doctrinal—though there are important doctrinal controversies also—but rather those philosophical and political questions which are indissolubly mixed up with dogma, the Holy Father could no longer fulfil the high office of “uniter” entrusted to him by God, unless his infallibility extended to these latter questions also. But, then it does thus extend: and his recent Encyclical, therefore, has in no other sense tended to “division,” than did his predecessors’ condemnation of Arianism or Pelagianism. On the other hand the Encyclical has directly and importantly promoted “union,” because it has tended to diffuse among Catholics far greater unity of belief on various important matters, than had hitherto existed.

We cannot, indeed, for the life of us understand what special quarrel Mr. Maurice has with the Encyclical and Syllabus. We willingly concede to him, that if these were not infallible pronouncements, their promulgation would have had a mischievous and schismatical tendency. But he must surely in his turn concede to us, that, if they be infallible, it is a great blessing that the Holy Ghost has inspired them, because they give to mankind an infallible knowledge of various momentous truths. Mr. Maurice does not believe in the Pope’s infallibility, and we do; but we can really see no other point at issue.

We are very glad, however, of the opportunity to place before our readers an important line of thought, expressed by the illustrious Monseigneur Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, in a “mandement” issued shortly before the Encyclical.

“Here is interposed,” says the bishop, “an objection which has become familiar to the men of our time, even to good sort of men. If it is the Church’s duty to guard the truth, it is also her duty to save souls. Now may not too great attention to one of these duties interfere with the fulfilment of the other? Is the moment well chosen for affirming more strongly and putting forth more precise statements, when the susceptibility of men’s mind and the delicacy of their case require rather a tender treatment? Why not leave in their obscurity those practical or speculative questions which the last generation never examined very attentively? In particular, at a time when human society is sick with the one widely-spread malady of naturalism, why so accurately set forth, develope, emphasise, the principles, laws, and whole economy of the supernatural order? Is not this to widen the gulf of existing separations?”

Such was the almost universal cry during the period of Arianism; and the ambassadors of secular princes held similar language during the deliberations of the Council of Trent. “Why a new and unreasonable declaration, which wears the appearance of aggression? Why a stricter definition or more absolute symbol than in times past? Should not the Church, in order to

maintain her character of visibility and Catholicity, have regard to her numbers? * What will be the advantage of separating from the Church that multitude of vacillating minds, which might be maintained in her communion by a less explicit formula?” Oftentimes those great bishops, on whom weighed the care of sacred interests, found these protests on the lips even of friends and defenders of the good cause. Animated by the Spirit of God, which is a spirit both of love and of strength, those illustrious champions of the Church knew how to reunite that consideration which is due to the weak with that inflexibility which orthodoxy demands; and without pronouncing any decrees of exclusion which would have overpassed the end desired, maintained, nevertheless, the special word of doctrine with indomitable tenacity; and defended it with so much authority, interpreted it with so much knowledge, that the doctrine assailed shone forth in irresistible lustre.” †

“Would you know to what point learned men should by preference direct their studies? Observe on what side error directs its attacks, its denials, its blasphemies. That which in every age is attacked, denied, blasphemed, is what the same age should principally defend, affirm, profess. Where sin abounds, grace must superabound. When the world contests, then it is that the Church analyzes, fathoms, defines, proclaims. The love of doctrine, the passion of truth, are inflamed in faithful hearts; and the sacred deposit, far from undergoing any diminution, exhibits in full light the treasure of its wealth.” ‡

ART. VI.—PROPOSED MANUAL OF ENGLISH HISTORY.

1. *Abridgment of the History of England.* By J. LINGARD, D.D. With continuation from 1688 to the reign of Queen Victoria. Adapted for the use of schools by JAMES BURKE, Esq., A.B. London: C. Dolman. 1855.
2. *A Manual of British and Irish History.* By the Rev. THOMAS FLANAGAN. London: Richardson & Son. Second thousand. 1852.
3. *A History of England for Family Use and the Upper Classes of Schools.* By the Author of “The Knights of St. John,” &c. London: Burns & Lambert. 1864.

WE have not named these works as specimens, each in its respective way, of such a complete production as we desiderate; but rather the contrary. It would be both needless and invidious to give our reasons for this statement; and it is obvious, of course, that treatises may be most learned and most accurate which do not nevertheless succeed in arrest-

* Here is an anticipation of Mr. Ffoulkes.

† “Instruction synodale sur les principales erreurs du temps présent,” pp. 16—18.

‡ Pp. 15, 16.