

Rev. C. F. D. Middle
From the Author.

A LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REV. NICHOLAS WISEMAN, D.D.,

BY THE

BISHOP OF SYDNEY,

METROPOLITAN OF AUSTRALASIA.

SYDNEY:

PRINTED BY KEMP AND FAIRFAX,
LOWER GEORGE STREET.

1850.

LETTER

TO THE HONORABLE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

REPORT OF THE

COMMISSIONERS OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE
IN RESPONSE TO A RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE SENATE
ON FEBRUARY 2, 1871
RELATIVE TO THE LANDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES
IN THE TERRITORY OF ARIZONA

Sydney, 2nd December, 1850.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR,—

I write to you as a Bishop to a Bishop ; in charity you may be assured : and, if I deceive not myself, in the love of truth, and in anxiety for the peace and welfare of the Church. The occasion of my addressing you is this. A friend in this city, who has generally the best intelligence in such matters, and takes a strong and honest interest in the welfare of the Church of England, has informed me of the notice which you, in a sermon recently preached and published, have been pleased to bestow upon my ecclesiastical position as affected by the terms of the Queen's Letters Patent, by and under which the Metropolitan See, of which I am the occupant, is constituted. I have not been able to meet with the discourse itself ; but in a Roman Catholic journal printed in this place, there is an extract from it, containing, I suppose, the whole of your observations upon the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown, as exemplified in its bearing upon the past and present state of the episcopate here ; of the Diocese, first of Australia, now of Sydney. This is your chosen topic ; the Supremacy of the Crown of England as it affects the independence of the episcopal office, and assumes (so you think) a prerogative of dictating the conditions according to which the functions, even the spiritual functions, of the episcopate shall be exercised. It is a well chosen topic at the present moment. Of this you are undoubtedly aware. I may allow you credit for candour in

your polemical character. Yet there is no reason why I should seek to detract from your no less acknowledged dexterity in choosing out for attack that point in your enemy's line which seems for the moment to be most closely beset. Not that I should complain of you, as a controversialist, for thus taking up the position most advantageous for you according to your own view. I could have no right to do so, even if your argument galled me more than it does. But you will do me the justice to believe that it cannot be new to me, after having held during more than twenty years, a very extended ecclesiastical jurisdiction under the license of Letters Patent from the Crown of England, during the reigns of three successive Sovereigns. As claiming the exercise of a spiritual function in the Church, I could hardly fail to commune carefully with my own thoughts upon the position in which I was placed by this assumption, on the part of the State, of a legal power to prescribe the conditions according to which, and the territorial limits within which, the authority pertaining to my office should be exercised. I am also the better qualified to speak with decision upon this point, because it does happen that the period, during which it has been God's pleasure to call me to the exercise of government in his Church, has been precisely that which has been bringing into more direct question, year after year, the nature and extent of the privileges rightfully belonging to, and mutually claimed by, the Church and State, in the concernment of each with the other's appropriate scope of action. It is not necessary for me to mention in detail the circumstances which rendered the year 1829 a season of anxious foreboding to all who desired the real welfare and permanent security of the Church of England. It was at this precise moment that I received, under sanction of the Supremacy of the Crown, my first appointment to a station of dignity in the Church. Accept with candour Right Reverend Sir, the assurance offered with sincerity, that I entered upon this charge not without a clear perception of the altered position in which (so far as regarded the Supremacy) the

Sovereign of the Realm of England must henceforth stand towards the established Church. The events of the next succeeding seven years were not of such a character as to lull my vigilance to rest, or to abate my solicitude as to the principles upon which in 1836 the Letters Patent for my elevation to the See of Australia were to be constructed. It is against this instrument that the arrows of your wrath are discharged. Professedly your aim is at the individual who was the subject of those Letters. But it is in reality directed towards a higher quarry. Your evident intention is to thrust, through me, an additional javelin into the already too much stricken side of the Church of England. Let us proceed if you please, to notice the terms of these Letters Patent, which you represent as so objectionable; as binding the Church to nothing short of an Erastian surrender of her inherent spiritual privileges into the hands of the Crown. As the entire question turns upon the Supremacy, I will offer first of all a few observations upon that subject. Without professing approval of every part of the course pursued by our ancestors in transferring bodily as it were, to the Crown, almost the entire weight of the supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs which had been previously vested in the Pope, I must say that the *principle* upon which they acted was a right and noble principle. They had been gradually led to see how shameful an invasion it was of their national independence, and how intolerable an encroachment upon their Christian privileges, that a foreign prelate, under colour of a divine title the proof of which was altogether defective, should assume to himself the right of absolute sway in all matters ecclesiastical; and so, a degree of control approaching to absolute over the temporal affairs of an independent monarchy. I say again, it may be questioned whether in the excitement of the moment, and subject as they were to a yet unrestricted royal prerogative, the legislators of that day (ecclesiastical or civil) did sufficiently consider, or were even in a position sufficiently to consider, the extent to which the prerogatives heretofore vested in the Pope might now be beneficially vested in the

Crown. In fixing that limit, or rather in neglecting to fix it, they may have erred ; but the thing itself which they did was right. They felt, and we still feel, that the subjects of every independent Christian State form collectively a national Church, qualified and entitled to manage and direct its own spiritual concerns without interference on the part of any Foreign power, whether Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate. In their wisdom and right-mindedness the men of the English Reformation felt from the first an assurance of that which in explicit terms they afterwards expressed, that " the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England." Words certainly to be ranked among the gravest and most sententious expressions of the truth that have ever been put upon record. Well then : when they made this declaration, they were not in love with anarchy. Jurisdiction, or power to direct and regulate the internal affairs of the Church, *must* be lodged somewhere. If not to the Pope to whom then did it appertain ? My reply is, to the National Church of England, to the Church as comprehending the two great classes of clergy and laity ; each having its proper duties and its proper powers. It is in the combined will and consent of these orders that, under God, the jurisdiction of the Church is lodged. It is to the Sovereign as to the exponent of that will, and as the organ of its practical exercise, that the chief government of all estates of this Realm of England, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, is assigned by law. By law : that is to say, by the assent of all the estates of the Realm ; by authority of the King's Majesty, with the consent of his faithful loving subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons, in Parliament assembled. It was not, let me assure you Right Reverend Sir, as those on your side vainly and yet no less obstinately maintain, an Act of Parliament, assuming authority to create the Church of England, which made this settlement. The Church of England had existed long before Parliaments ; and all the power which at the time of its reformation they exercised, was by declaratory Acts to re-affirm the long forgotten truth ; that the right of

jurisdiction within the national Church was vested in the nation itself; and that the exercise of it should be in the King, as, by "the prerogative given always in Holy Scripture by God himself," the representative of, or agent for, the national Church in that respect. Such was the theory of the Royal Supremacy; and as a theory it was just and good. I might say it was even perfect. For no constitution could be devised more entirely what it ought to be than that of a Church in which the word of God should be preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered, and within which the nation itself should be comprehended. The nation and the Church, being convertible terms, had an inherent right of self-government, under no other condition than that its ruling will should be conformable to the will of that God, who had never conferred upon any foreign power a right to interfere, to interrupt, or dissolve this blessed union. If I say that this theory was good and just, I am prepared to hear you reply that, as events have shown, it was but *too* just and good for those to whom it was to be applied. And I admit the justice of the reproach if you should cast it in our teeth. We have shown ourselves unworthy of such mercy. We are enduring the penalty of that wilful spirit which has divided the nation and cast out unity from the Church; and so has dug away from under us the ground upon which alone the Royal Supremacy could firmly stand; and might and would have continued to stand as a tower of strength had things been otherwise than the nation has determined that they shall be. But lest this exposition of our state should awaken in you hopes and expectations more sanguine than experience will be found to justify, let me whisper to you that, perplexing and injurious as a state of wide-spread dissension may be, we yet feel sensible that deliverance from it might be purchased at too dear a rate. Conscious as we are of the vast evil of so many disagreements about Truth, still the thoughtful and prudent among us can discern that it would be any thing but a deliverance to exchange this, as you invite us to do, for a state of universal agreement in error.

But to return to the immediate subject, and to approach it more closely, let me observe that the Letters Patent of 1836 were drawn up in accordance with the preconceived theory of the relations subsisting between the Church and the Sovereign, or rather, the nation represented by the Sovereign. Two ruling principles prevailed with me in examining the character and effect of that instrument.—First, it was my conviction, that the ancient relation between the Church and the Sovereign—as having, under Christ, the chief government thereof, although it might have been impaired, as all systems must be by the admission of contravening enactments, had yet a sufficient remnant of truth and reality to justify the Church in continuing a party to such engagements with the Crown. Secondly, I entertained a confidence which nothing personal to myself has since arisen to shake, that there was no disposition on the part of the Crown to use its supremacy for the purpose of thwarting, oppressing, or injuring the Colonial Church.

And now let us enquire what were the terms of the compact entered into with the Crown, as the condition of its sanction to the establishment of an Episcopal See, and the nomination of a Bishop to exercise jurisdiction within the limits of it. The first observation which I find quoted from your sermon is little better than a truism ;—asserting that “if one act of supremacy can be imagined more real than another, it must certainly be that which establishes Bishoprics, names Bishops, and bestows upon them their spiritual privileges.” You will not be surprised, assuredly, to learn that I admit this as readily as yourself. Such acts as these must be the acts of one in authority ;—that is not the question ; but to whom does that authority rightfully belong ? To the Pope, as you maintain, or—as I still continue to hold—to the Church, represented by the Sovereign ? This very colony, as you may be aware, exhibits an example of each of these modes of establishment and nomination ; and you have heard, perhaps, that by a solemn and imperishable act, I have protested publicly against the application, here, of that theory by which you

abide. In this act, I am conscious of having occupied, on behalf of my successors, a stronghold from which they can never be dislodged; although, from gathering symptoms, I am forewarned of the approach of that combined assault upon our Episcopal position, in which it is believed that you, Right Reverend Sir, unless diverted by higher objects, may be appointed to take the lead. But I may well ask, what is there in the law of Christ, or in the rules which it lays down for the guidance of its followers in their intercourse with the powers of the world, which can be pleaded in defeasance of this authority of a Christian Sovereign within his own dominions? He is understood, I say, to be acting as the organ and representative of the Church of the nation, as defender of the faith. He is acting in compliance with the desire of that part of the nation which is principally interested in this matter. And he is the minister of God to it for good so long as the Church can be, through the guardianship of the Civil power, secured in the enjoyment of its just rights, and in possession of spiritual benefits. I trust that through the Divine blessing upon the endeavour which is now to be made by the Bishops of this Province, for the conversion of the natives of the Islands of the South Sea, we may, at no distant period, be witnesses of this theory carried into practical operation. They, I am persuaded, will not so far forget the rule of Christian equity, as to attempt to assume permanently, into their own hands, or into the hands of any *foreign* prelate, state, or potentate, the prerogative of erecting Bishopricks, and naming Bishops, within those territories; upon the plea of having first Christianized the inhabitants. Temporarily they may and must do so, on account of the incompetency of an uncivilized and illiterate people to fulfil their proper duty. But the working of the system established by Anglican Bishops will be, I am sure, in the direction of conferring upon those Churches the power of internal self-government, free from foreign interference and jurisdiction, under a settled form of apostolical belief, and with a lawful succession of the ministry from the very outset. And if circumstances shall so tend as

to invest the heads of the civil government there, as the exponents of the determinations of the Church, with control over all causes ecclesiastical, excepting those concerning doctrine, we shall rejoice in such carrying out of the right system. This case, if it should occur, will present a parallel to what ought to have been the sequel of St. Augustine's mission for the conversion of the Saxons. The enactments which, at the time of the Reformation, confirmed the supremacy in the Crown, did but re-establish, so far as the principle was concerned, the order which would have sprung into existence, and would always have prevailed in England among the successors of Ethelbert and Augustine, but for the intrusions and usurpations of Popery. Whether they who possessed authority, either by prerogative or by law, to carry into effect that just principle, did in *all* points follow the line of as exact a discretion in deciding what were the things which should be rendered unto Cesar, I am not now calling in question. Neither am I preparing to discuss whether, under the now much altered circumstances, the Crown can *advantageously* continue (and, if not, whether it should *at all* continue) to exercise over the Church of England that power of control which the law recognizes, and we (the Bishops and clergy) by our subscriptions, have for ourselves, I believe, acknowledged it to possess. Briefly, my persuasion is that the two titles of "Defender of the Faith," and "Chief Ruler of the Church upon earth," have so intimate and necessary an alliance, that when the one ceases to be applicable the other can no longer be supported. All which I contend for is, that under what is the natural state of the Church in its relations with the State, there would not be (and in 1836 was not) any proof of Erastianism in admitting that the Crown, acting always in correspondence with the Church, and representatively on behalf of its lay members, should possess and exercise the power of establishing Bishopricks, and naming Bishops. You appear, Right Reverend Sir, to aim invidiously, though latently, at the latter prerogative, as if it involved an intrusion by the

civil power into a province purely spiritual. My suspicion is raised by observing how conveniently for such a purpose you stop short when notice was required of a most important point which was plainly set forth in the Letters Patent then lying before you. There could hardly be any purpose for such omission to finish the sentence, unless it were that of leading your audience to suppose that the Kings of England assumed to *make* men Bishops, as well as to nominate them to particular Sees. Would it not have been worth while, Sir, if only to avoid the risk of misleading your congregation upon a point of so much importance, that you should have let them more fully and fairly into the entire purport of the instrument you were quoting from? Why this reserve? Why this partial exhibition of facts? Why not have stated, as you might, that all this exercise of the authority of the Crown in naming a Bishop, was left dependent, as is categorically stated, upon the attainment first of all, by the individual so named, of the office of a Bishop; to which office it is said, in so many words, he is to be admitted not by any act of the Crown but by consecration of the Church. The extent to which the Crown allows itself to go, is only to require and command the Archbishop, by the faith and love whereby he is bound to the Sovereign, that he will consecrate the Bishop designate in the manner accustomed. Nothing conclusive would follow from my observing (although it be true) that the person who really did nominate the Bishop was the late most reverend and venerated Archbishop of Canterbury; and that the Crown did but confirm the selection of the Primate. This you might set aside, perhaps, by stating that you were not aware of it. But you were informed (for it is an inference to be drawn from the instrument itself) that in case the nomination of an objectionable person had been made by the Crown, it was in the power of the Archbishop, by declining to consecrate that person, to prevent his obtrusion upon the Church. If the intention had been to place before your hearers on so solemn an occasion, a fair and not an unfair representation of the state of the Church of England,

would it not have been more becoming, Right Reverend Sir, not to express yourself as if the Crown claimed, or could exercise, an absolute power to name the bishop, when you knew that in reality it had but a power which another authority might nullify, if it were, or were believed to be, improperly exercised? It is with regret that I impute unfairness of dealing to a person of your station. But there are other instances of it besides that which I have just pointed out. "The power to ordain, which is a purely spiritual power, is granted by the Queen (you ought rather to have said the King) to this bishop;" that is to say, the King confers upon him episcopal power. If the King had assumed, or could have been supposed to have meant to assert, any such claim of conferring episcopal power, to what intent then, it must be asked, and with what consistency, could he have remitted to the Archbishop for consecration the person who was to possess and exercise that power?—more especially, how could the King design to confer power to ordain, that is, episcopal power, when the ritual of the Church of England, which the King had sworn to conform to and maintain, declares "no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop in the United Church of England and Ireland, unless he be admitted thereunto according to the form following, or hath had formerly episcopal consecration?" But, not satisfied with this, you quote the following words, "and we thereby further give and grant to the said William Grant Broughton and his successors, Bishops of Australia, full power and authority to confirm those that are baptized and come to years of discretion." "Surely," you adjoin, "confirmation at least is a purely spiritual act; one which has no bearing whatever" (as you imagine holy orders *may* have) "upon civil law, or civil rights and privileges in any way whatever." Thus you reason, and thus you triumph, as if you had quoted fairly the words of the Letters Patent, and had drawn from them an unimpeachable conclusion, to the great shame and scandal of the recreant Church of England. But I have to object that you

have *not* quoted fairly, but quite the reverse. You stop short in the middle of a sentence, disjoining the words which refer to confirmation from those which immediately follow. Hereby you give to the sentence a meaning which was never meant; as would at once have been seen if you had quoted it complete; or had given in one unbroken series the words in which the King's license is conveyed. This will be clear to any one who reads them. They are these. "And we do hereby further give and grant to the said William Grant Broughton, and his successors, Bishops of Australia, full power and authority to confirm those who are baptized and come to years of discretion, and to perform all other functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of bishop, *within the limits of the said See of Australia, but not elsewhere*; such bishop and his successors having been first duly ordained or consecrated bishop, according to the form prescribed by the Liturgy of the Church of England." Wherefore, then, did you, Right Reverend Sir, stop short in your quotation in the middle of a sentence? You may assign twenty reasons for this proceeding, but you can assign none which will prove that the effect of it was not to leave your congregation under an entirely false impression as to the power which the King designed to convey to the Bishop of Australia. Will you maintain it to have been, as you say, the spiritual power to ordain and to confirm? Is it not evident that the only authority in contemplation, which it could be intended or pretended to confer upon the bishop, was liberty to exercise, *within a particular district called the Diocese of Australia*, a faculty which, in virtue of his episcopal consecration, he already possessed? The license to confirm stands on the same footing with "all other functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of a bishop," and you can scarcely intend seriously to assert that the Crown assumed a right to confer those functions, when you note what follows, that even the degree of license which the Letters Patent do profess to grant, is made dependent on the express condition that all they who are to act under this license shall *first* have been

duly consecrated bishops according to the form prescribed by the Liturgy of the Church of England. Having these words before you, you could not possibly have thought that the intention of the King was to bestow upon the Bishop power to ordain; but you must have seen the plain force of the sentence to be, that he, *being already a Bishop*, and thereby *qualified* to ordain, might exercise that office within a particular part of the King's dominions, which is a totally different thing. It suited your purpose, however, to mistake the meaning of the words, and you have without scruple done so. You do not hold, of course, that in the Church of Christ there should be Bishops without restraint. You will admit that every Bishop should exercise his mission and jurisdiction within limits appointed to him; or be tied, as Hooker says, to a particular portion of the flock of Christ? Who then is to tie him, who is to fix the limit of his otherwise general and indefinite charge? I protest that after the most careful consideration I can distinguish no arrangement, in regard to this purely temporal consideration of "where" and "how far," which can be more appropriate in itself, or less chargeable with encroachment upon the just rights of the Church, than that the power should be by legislative consent, recognized as belonging to the office of the Sovereign as "the prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes by God himself." What blame do you attach to the Church of England for its acquiescence in that arrangement, so long at least as the Sovereign can without a manifest fiction be represented as personifying by his decision the will of those who ought to possess a voice in all such arrangements? I am quite sensible that a time may arrive when other influences than those of the Church, influences even hostile to the Church, may so operate upon the purposes of the Sovereign, that the Crown can no longer be said fairly to be an embodiment of the lay or secular element of the Church, and therefore can no longer exercise with security to the Church a supremacy which confers a right of interfering in its concerns, and seriously

operating upon its interests. I see most plainly how this may arise, especially in the Colonial portion of the Church, where the Crown, even now, does not strive, or even profess, to exercise any influence in support of the Church, or to retain any peculiar concern for its well-being. But what of this? If it should so happen that the Crown were to be by any concurrent causes rendered incapable of its proper prerogative, or of acting on behalf of that lay element which I have now spoken of, that element must then find means of exerting itself through some other channel, or under some other conventional form. I look back, I must acknowledge, with much regret, upon those changes in our English constitution which, I foresaw from the first, must have the effect of loosening the old hereditary attachment and alliance between the Church and King. Nothing has ever shaken my reliance on the truth of the maxim,

Nusquam libertas gratior extat,
Quam sub rege pio.

If by our fondness for schisms we render inevitable the abolition of that long-subsisting compact, we must pay the penalty of our sin;—which, moreover, a little experience of suffering may have some effect in checking. But there is yet no ground for despondency. Receive my assurance, Right Reverend Sir, we shall yet find a resource. At any rate, believe me, we shall not be driven to that point to which it is so clear you are striving to compel us, that is to say, we shall not, if the supremacy of the Crown should fail us, be induced to take up with the supremacy of the Pope, in default or despair of a better substitute. Be persuaded that there is still too much substance of good sense and serious belief remaining in the Church of England to suffer this.

Yet I have one word to add on the subject of your incorrect representation of facts. In the progress of your sermon you observe “in this compilation which I hold in my hand” (*Parliamentary Papers*, 174,) “there comes another

singular document dated a few years later, by which the Queen *makes that Bishop resign*, in other words *deposes him*, then divides his diocese into several." Really I hardly know what to say to this. We have before us the spectacle of a Bishop making from the pulpit, in the face of the congregation, a declaration professedly derived from papers which he then holds in his hand, a declaration which he believes to be, and intends should be, to the disparagement of another communion of Christians. And yet, will it be believed, these very papers present the most direct contradiction of the assertion which you profess to ground upon their authority "The Queen," you say "*makes that Bishop resign*, in other words *deposes him*; then divides his Diocese into several." After this, I beg to call your attention to the following paragraph contained in the paper which you held in your hand, in the very same page, and in the sentence next following that which you professed to be reading from, at the time of making the above assertion; "And whereas by virtue of the powers of revocation mentioned in the said Letters Patent, We did, with *the concurrence of the said Bishop of Australia*, wholly separate, divide, and exempt the city of Hobart Town and all our island of Van Diemen's Land, and did declare that the said city and colony should thenceforth be wholly separated and exempted from the jurisdiction, authority, and diocese of the said Bishop of Australia, and his successors; And whereas it has been represented to us by the Most Reverend William Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan, that considering the present great extent of the said Diocese of Australia, (notwithstanding the severance therefrom of the said Diocese of Tasmania), and also the inconvenience and detriment arising therefrom, as well to the Bishop of the said See as to the members of the united Church of England and Ireland resident within the same, he is desirous, *with the concurrence of the said Bishop of Australia*, that the extent of the said Diocese should be still further reduced, We having taken the premises into our Royal consideration, and

having been certified of the concurrence therein of the said Bishop of Australia, and being persuaded that by complying with such the request of the said Archbishop we shall under the blessing of Almighty God, greatly advance the well-being of the said united Church within the said colonies, have resolved to grant the same accordingly, &c., &c.” If there can be any question raised as to the import of these paragraphs, if there be in the language of them any such ambiguity as could lead you to think that the reduction of the See of Australia was effected by the mere will of the Crown, the Bishop not being a consenting party, then, I will admit, Right Reverend Sir, that it was fair, honest, and justifiable in you to say “the Queen makes the Bishop resign, deposes him, divides his diocese.” But as the contrary declaration is *totidem verbis* contained in the paper which you had then before your eyes, you have laid yourself open to the charge of affirming from the pulpit that which you must have been aware was not true. It is a very painful accusation for me to bring, but a sense of duty will not suffer me to withhold it. All which I desire to add is this:—that the extracts which I have given, although they make it abundantly clear that the concurrence of the Bishop of Australia had been obtained, yet even they do not declare the truth to the full extent, inasmuch as they omit to state that the arrangement was *from its very origin*, entirely of his devising. It was his own proposal; his own suggestion; the fruit of his own unbiassed reflection upon the state and prospects of his Church; the decision of his own judgment as to what measures would most probably tend to strengthen and support it. You have assumed a right publicly to traduce this portion of the Church of England, as having submitted to an exertion of lay control in the direction of its affairs which would prove it to be in a state of servile dependence on the mere will of the secular authority; such as would render questionable its claim to any true spiritual character. For its sake, therefore, and in its defence rather than in my own, I am compelled to offer these statements. The first movement proceeded from

myself. It was in the year 1845. My proposals were addressed at the same time to the late Archbishop Howley, with a humble and earnest request for his sanction and co-operation; and to the then Governor of this colony, the late Sir George Gipps, through whom was conveyed my petition to Her Majesty that the powers of revocation conveyed by the Letters Patent of 1836 might be taken advantage of for the accomplishment of the design which I traced out. Not only was the proposal mine; but so also were all the attendant details, the limits of the several Dioceses (as projected), the arrangement of income, and in truth the minutest particulars of the scheme, as it was afterwards carried out, were carefully traced by the Bishop of the existing diocese which was to be affected by them. Although therefore the Letters Patent, establishing and conferring the See of Sydney, are correct enough in expressing that Her Majesty had been certified of the concurrence of the Bishop of Australia, before the proposed alterations were introduced, they would still more accurately have represented the course of proceeding had their language been, that Her Majesty had concurred in a suggestion of the Bishop, submitted to her by his desire through the Primate of all England.*

* The following extract from a long letter addressed by the late Archbishop to the Bishop of Australia, (Lambeth, March 30, 1847) while it explains the Venerable writer's sense of the origin of the measure, affords a most pleasing view of the deep interest which, to the very close of his honoured life, His Grace continued to take in every proposal which he thought likely to strengthen the Church and to promote the growth of true religion in the colonies. "Beginning as I do to feel the infirmities of age, I am the more sensible of the benefit which I derive from Archdeacon Harrison's ability and judgment in the transaction of business relating to the ecclesiastical affairs of Australia, which are daily increasing in importance. The Archdeacon has communicated with Your Lordship on most, if not all, of the points which require attention. What is left to me is to inform you of the arrangement which has been made for the appointment of Bishops to the several new Sees. I begin with the two for the erection of which the colony is indebted to Your Lordship's zealous and judicious exertions.....I cannot conclude without expressing my deep sense of the benefits which have been secured to your Diocese by your disinterested zeal..... I trust that through the blessing of Almighty God, the fruits of your pious

You perceive therefore that you have fallen into a series of mistakes. There is all the difference in the world, as I have pointed out to you, between the assumption of power to make a man a Bishop by the fiat of the Crown, and of power to determine the place where, and the limit within which, the functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of a Bishop shall be exercised by a man, who must first have been duly consecrated to the office according to the form prescribed by the Liturgy of the Church of England. The first is a power to which the Crown never laid claim; but of which it is expressly divested by a just interpretation of the terms (*Art 37*,) in which the chief power, or Supremacy, in this realm is acknowledged to belong to the Civil Magistrate. The second, which is the power really claimed and exercised, is one which could not, I believe, be more safely or suitably lodged than in the Crown; so long at least as the political position of the Sovereign shall be such as to ensure to the Church that its earthly head can and will so act on its behalf as to represent fairly the sentiments of the body; especially of that which I have termed *the lay element*. I think, also, there was enough within your notice to enable you to understand (if you had been willing and desirous) the intent and effect of the provision made, that if the Crown shall think fit to revoke the Commission by the issue of other Letters Patent, then every such bishop shall to all intents and purposes cease to be bishop of *Australia*. This you invidiously represent as the reservation of a power to the Crown "to remove him when it pleases." Now, I must repeat, there was enough before you to show that this was not, and could not be, the intended effect of the words. In another place you say, "the Queen makes

labours will appear in due season; that you may have the satisfaction of witnessing the progressive religious and moral improvement of the Church over which you have long presided with such happy effect; and that you may enjoy in their fulness all the comforts, as a Ruler of the Church and as an individual, which consciousness of the fulfilment of duty, and confidence in the protection of the Great Ruler of the Church, can bestow upon you."

the Bishop to resign." You will permit me to point out to you that the Bishop never did *resign*; and therefore it involves an impossibility that he should have been *made* to do so. And if you examine, with the accuracy which a regard for your own reputation for candour and fairness would prescribe, the terms of the instrument you were commenting upon, you will not fail to perceive that the true and only design of introducing this clause of revocation, is to avoid the inconvenience which must have attended the necessity of an absolute resignation (which some civilians at that time thought must occur) as often as the good of the Church should require the erection of new Sees within the original limits of the *Diocese of Australia*. No person endowed with the least foresight could entertain an expectation that the first arrangement would continue in perpetuity, or that one bishoprick should for ever include a territory not much inferior in extent to the continent of Europe. The true intent of the words which you so much object to, is apparent from an instance which actually did occur, in the erection of the See of Tasmania, in 1842. "Whereas our late royal uncle did declare that if he, his heirs, or successors, should think fit to recall or revoke the appointment of the said Bishop of Australia, and should declare such his pleasure by letters patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom, then every such bishop should, from and after the notification thereof to him, to all intents and purposes cease to be Bishop of Australia: and whereas by virtue of the powers of revocation mentioned in the said Letters Patent, We did, *with concurrence of the said Bishop of Australia*, wholly separate, divide and exempt the city of Hobart Town, &c., and did declare that the said city and colony should be wholly separated and exempted from the jurisdiction, authority, and diocese of the said Bishop of Australia, and his successors, &c., &c." You must be sensible now what was the real meaning of that which you have so seriously misrepresented. The power of revocation reserved in the Letters Patent of 1836, is shown, by this application of it, to consist in removing

and separating from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Australia, with his consent, any portion of his diocese which it might be deemed expedient to erect into a distinct diocese ; and without imposing upon the Bishop of Australia the necessity of an absolute resignation of his See before the new arrangement could be carried into effect. It may be said that the revocation might be entire, or might remove the whole diocese from the jurisdiction of the Bishop ; who would thereupon cease, to all intents and purposes, not indeed to be a Bishop, but to be the Bishop of any Diocese. Such might have been the literal interpretation of the words ; but whether it were (which I very much doubt) their true legal import is a question which I am not prepared to enter upon. I am strongly attached to the maxim that the Queen can do no wrong ; and feel an instinctive assurance that the Queen, intentionally, *will* do no wrong. If however, contrary to this expectation, the Queen had been advised, under colour of this expression, to do any wanton injury to the Bishop of Australia, it would have been time to look for a remedy, and a remedy would unquestionably have been found. This however is manifest that you, Right Reverend Sir, have misrepresented the meaning of the words ; and have put upon them an interpretation in which, experience might have shown you, they were not meant to be understood. But I must hasten to a conclusion ; noticing first of all your allusion to what you term “ a singular creation in the Church—a bishop metropolitan, with jurisdiction over other Bishops, and yet he himself subject to the Archbishop of Canterbury. In other words the Bishop of Sydney is a Bishop metropolitan, having Bishops under him, from whom there is right of appeal to him. And yet he is only himself a suffragan of Canterbury, to the Archbishop of which an appeal lies against his judgment.” In assuming this to be “ a singular creation,” I must take the liberty of saying that you are mistaken. The three great divisions of the Church (Antioch, Rome, and Alexandria) as they were gradually broken up into Provinces, each subject to its own proper metropolitan, continued nevertheless under the general

superintendence of the Bishops of the prime Sees ; who, until the time of the Council of Nice, (and probably much later) had, themselves, no higher title than that of metropolitan. Afterwards indeed they began to be called Archbishops, Primate, and Patriarchs ; that the offices might be distinct in name which had long been distinct in reality. I do not speak of those mere honorary metropolitans who had the title without jurisdiction : but of metropolitans having suffragans under them, and yet (as in the corresponding case of Sydney in the present day) "subject," as you say, to their Archbishops. The ground of this is very well ascertained ; because their provinces were taken out of, or separted from, the greater Dioceses as originally founded ; just as the Province of Australasia is assumed to have been taken from that of Canterbury. Whether this assumption be so correctly established as to create a perfect parallel between the cases, and to justify the continued ascription of a superiority to the See of Canterbury, is not the question. If there be a mistake in this, it may be corrected. But in the bare circumstance of one metropolitan being made subject, or if you will suffragan, to one who is himself no more than a metropolitan, there is nothing which need excite alarm. It is no "singular creation ;" but the old and primitive order of the Church. The metropolitan of Alexandria, and the metropolitan of Carthage also, while known only under that title (before the one was called Archbishop and the other Primate) both exercised a power which was essentially patriarchal, without being patriarchs. This may put an end to the fond apprehension which you express that "the See of Canterbury has been made metropolitan over a metropolitan ; in other words a patriarchate in the ancient sense." With submission, it cannot be in the ancient sense, relatively speaking ; inasmuch as the very title of patriarch is of comparatively recent introduction into the Church. The first example that I find recorded of its use is A.D. 451, in the second Session of the Council of Chalcedon. And there is a circumstance attending this primary adoption of the term which I cannot

help pointing out to you: namely, that it was not of ecclesiastical origin, but the offspring of decidedly *lay* parentage. The sitting of that Council was attended by the emperor and empress, Marcian and Pulcheria, in person; and by some sixteen or eighteen high officers of state, Ex-consuls, Prefects, Lords of the Bedchamber, and the like, evidently in their official capacities; representing, I presume, the *imperial* Supremacy of those days. They did not summon the Bishops to sit with them, as assessors, in a judgment to be pronounced by them as to whether the theological opinions of Eutyches did or did not disqualify him from continuing to officiate in the ministry of the Church. The lay authority was in attendance at the solicitation of the Prelates, to discharge its proper office of protecting the deliberations of the Council from interruption, and to provide that the judgment of the Church, upon an Article of the Creed, should not be overborne by tumultuous proceeding, or artful management, transferring the office of pronouncing sentence to any other than the rightful judges upon such a question. The lay Supremacy was here in its proper position; and it is in *its* address, in the address of pure laymen, that the title of patriarch is for the first time in history (so far as I know and believe) attributed to Christian bishops. This might alleviate your apprehension, Right Reverend Sir, were it even true (which it is not) that the Queen had conferred the same title on the Archbishop of Canterbury. It might, I say, have this effect, even if what you urge, as to "this being the first instance of the creation of a patriarch(ate) by the Crown," were not contradicted by the erection of Constantinople to that rank and title, which, although it passed under the name and sanction of a Council, is well known to have been really effected through the influence, if not the coercion, exercised by the Emperor.

We may be (and it appears to me probable that we are) entering into the furnace and into the crucible, in the burning heat of which it is possible the Royal Supremacy (which I mention again is but the supremacy of the lay portion of the

Church) may melt away. But it must re-appear—not, perhaps under the same form, but the same essentially—the same in substance. You, Right Reverend Sir, apparently, possess a marvellous faculty of persuading yourself that what you set your heart upon will certainly come to pass. It would be a faculty no less enviable than marvellous, this, if the effect of it were not also to blind your judgment, and to expose you to the danger of sadly miscalculating consequences. You look before you, and you feast in anticipation upon the approaching overthrow of the supremacy of the Crown over the Church of England: and you indulge the pleasing delusion that, when this shall come to pass, there will be no alternative but for this Church to fall back upon a rule which you (most inaccurately) term “catholic and divine,”—that is to say the supremacy of the See of Rome. But let me undeceive you. Our freedom of election is by no means confined within these narrow limits. The Church Catholic, to which we belong, has its own inherent Supremacy, and this it will not fail to exercise; neither admitting the secular element to assume to itself an influence, by the weight of which it is enabled to paralyze the spiritual, and to appropriate to itself the sole direction of the movements of the Church, (as is the case in England at this time), nor yet, (as has been the case in Rome during many centuries) suffering the ecclesiastical authority to extrude the secular from all right of interference in the regulation of Church affairs; the due ordering of which affects the laity as deeply as the clergy. We must, by the help of God, surmount that which is our prevailing disease, the halting between two opinions. One is true, the other false. Therefore, making always due allowance for the infirmity of human perception which now sees through a glass darkly, we must have resolution to embrace and ever to hold fast that which the Church, as the witness of holy writ, has commended to us from the beginning. Rely on it, Right Reverend Sir, the Church of England has in it that which you are not yet aware of; and when, in the spirit of true godliness, overcoming the spirit of self-will, her clergy

and laity are brought to act together in carrying out the true Supremacy of the Church, which I fear the Crown is ready to abandon, you will find that she will take from you many of those who now form your hope and crown of rejoicing. How we are to trace and identify this Supremacy, except by the testimony of Holy Writ first, and secondly, of the Church (which St. Augustine appeals to,) I cannot tell, nor can you, Right Reverend Sir, instruct us. I humbly hope, that the recent conference of the Bishops of this Province may lead us, and may even lead the world, to a right apprehension of how the Word of Christ is to be made to dwell in us; of how "unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places may be made known, by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God." In our deliberations, we have been fully, even painfully, conscious of the restraints imposed upon our free declaration of the true doctrine of the Church, by the Supremacy of the Crown. Had the Crown continued to represent the faith and religious will of the nation, or had the nation continued to be the Church, we should have felt no such difficulty. Nevertheless, we have laid down, (though for the present, only in an opinionative form), the true principle—that the supremacy is in the Church itself, — that it is in the Sovereign only as the Church is the Nation, and the Sovereign is the representative of both. I am, as *you* may not believe, but as others, who know me better, will believe—a true, earnest, and deliberate adherent to the principle of the Supremacy of the Crown, in matters ecclesiastical. I wish with all my heart that the Crown were as well instructed in its duty towards the Church, as it seems to be tenacious of its privileges in it; or that it had advisers who would venture to tell it, as I would firmly and respectfully, that its true interests are inseparably bound up with those of the Church of England. But if it cannot be so, if the Crown be professedly, in the colonies at least, indifferent to differences of belief, and therefore no longer animated by "its own religious zeal to conserve and maintain the Church, *committed to its charge*, in unity of

true Religion and in the bond of peace," it is scarcely to be conceived that the Crown itself can think it equitable to retain over the Colonial Church a Supremacy which seems invidiously restrictive ; as it confers upon us no benefit, while it prohibits our assuming that character in which, as Churchmen, we might really be doing the work which is proper unto us. The privilege which we require (and you may with some reason exult over us while it is withheld) is only this : that the Bishops and Clergy should be allowed freely to meet in Provincial and Diocesan Synods, for the discussion and decision of all questions pertaining to the doctrinal and spiritual condition of the Church ; and that the laity, being communicants, duly elected, and empowered by their respective congregations, should simultaneously sit in Conventions of their own, for the settlement of all the temporalities ; and to express their assent to, or dissent from, any change of constitution affecting the whole body of the Church, which might be from time to time proposed by their spiritual fathers, the members of the ecclesiastical Synod. I tell you this, Right Reverend Sir, that you may be aware we are not devoted to an Erastian policy. We have proposed to ourselves a form of Church judicature which is not the creature of the State ; but is rational, practicable, scriptural, and Catholic. It may be true that this would leave to the Crown but the shadow of a Supremacy over the Church in the colonies. It would however secure, that which the Crown is no longer able to sustain, the true Supremacy of the Church over itself ; vested in fit proportions in the clergy and people. And I am firm in the conviction that finally it would, though it may be through much suffering, acquire a victory over the false Supremacy of the Papal See ; which, by absorbing within itself the just and natural privileges of clergy and people, enslaves both. I have now concluded what I had to say ; excepting upon one point, which is a very painful one ; for indeed it is always painful to express dissatisfaction and reproof to those who ought, from their station, to be superior to either. But in fulfilment of my duty to the Church which you have

wrongfully assailed, I must not omit observing that you have overstept the line of fair and honourable controversy. Your position with regard to the Church of England was one of a very peculiar character, considering what you must, in your moments of sober reflection, acknowledge the Church of England to be. If upon no higher principle than that of the delicacy which an honourable mind would always maintain, in dealing with an antagonist entitled to its respect, you ought to have been most scrupulously observant of accuracy in all the assertions which you felt it necessary to make in maintenance of your own side of the controversy. This you have not been. You have not scrupled to descend to seek an advantage, by statements which you had at the same time means of knowing were not correct. Not, indeed, that I would be understood as attributing what you have done to personal obliquity of disposition. It is but an effect of the system under which you have been trained. It is but a manifestation of that overweening, intolerant, unforgiving spirit, which is inherent in the Church of Rome itself. It is the spirit which in centuries past broke out and exhibited itself in Brooks and Bonner, your predecessors, when they began to think that there was some chance of their having their adversaries within their power. It is a spirit which persuades the members of your communion, that you may lawfully and commendably dispense with the rules of humanity and fairness towards those whom you term heretics, whensoever any gleam or hopeful prospect arises of your acquiring ability to "go up to Judah, and rouse it up, and draw it away to you, and make the son of Tabeel king in the midst thereof." By some such imagined prospect, it is plain, you are now elated; and hence it has arisen that you, having no object in view but to gather more blind and inveterate partizans to help you in "making the son of Tabeel king," have been led to admit a convenient relaxation of the rule which would lead all honest controversialists, Bishops in particular, and in the pulpit especially, to abstain from uttering anything which was not scrupulously conformed

to truth. This however the genius of your religion would not suffer you to do when an opportunity seemed to be afforded you of gaining an advantage over the Church of England. And yet, pardon my saying, there were grounds and motives, if you could have allowed yourself to attend to them, which might have satisfied you that she had properties entitling her to more generous more Christian usage at your hands. Unless you had established another test of orthodoxy and Church-membership than that which was from the beginning, you could not, even to your own satisfaction, justify your determination to affix upon her the brand of heresy. She holds the Catholic faith; and has been, and is, one of its most determined and able vindicators among all the Churches. She worships One God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity; and also believes rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. You could say nothing in derogation of her claim to be, at least equally with yourselves, a member of the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, had you not established another test or rule of faith than that which prevailed from the beginning. You have a law according to which the acknowledgment of the Bishop of Rome's supremacy over the Church is as indispensable to make a Catholic Christian and to admit him to a state of salvation, as belief in the God who is worshipped by the Church, and in the Saviour who redeemed it with his blood. If I impute to you a want of the true Catholic spirit in this respect, I must no less charge you with ingratitude in another. You are not duly sensible of the services rendered even to your own communion by the influence of the Church of England. It is that influence which saves you from yourselves, wheresoever it can be exerted through the juxtaposition of the two Churches; and where it cannot be so exerted, it is you who suffer from the want of such a corrective. Will you, Right Reverend Sir, compare the state of religion, and of the public mind upon the subject of religion, in Italy, in Spain, in the remote parts of Belgium, in South America, and in other places where the Roman Catholic system has undisputed sway, with the working of the same

system in countries where, by the immediate contiguity of the English Church, it is shamed into the observance of something like moderation in its demands upon the mental submission of its followers. Trace the contrast between the state of your Church in the countries I have named, and in England, or in these Colonies, or even in Ireland, and in other places where our Church is in a position to exercise, by preponderance of example and, I must say, by the power of truth, a restraining influence upon your proceedings. Let it be made known, then, whence arises the marked difference which is invariably found to exist, unless it be from the cause which I have stated?—the vicinity of the Church of England. To the indisputably Catholic, and at the same time more scriptural, character of that Church, your people cannot be blinded : and, seeing, cannot fail to be improved by it. To this cause, it can hardly be questioned, you are indebted for the comparatively improved aspect of your system in certain parts of the world. You are indebted to *us* ; whose name, at the very same moment, you endeavour to cast out as evil. Revolving very attentively, the course of events now passing in the world, I am well nigh ready to believe that this restraining operation on the part of the Church of England, is that which really “withholdeth,” and that if, through your exertions, it could be “taken out of the way,” there might be, forthwith, a revelation of that spirit of unmitigated evil, for the coming of which, in the latter days of the Church, the Scripture has prepared us. Receive my admonition in that temper which will enable you to profit by it. Look attentively, look impartially, into the state of your own Church as it is, and as you would have it. Look also with equal attention and impartiality upon the condition of ours. This is asking much of you ; it is asking you, I fear, to do what you cannot. Otherwise I should follow up this by another request, that when you again address your congregation you would come with your Bible in hand instead of Parliamentary Papers ; and would fairly bring the question to an issue, whether there may not be on the part of the Church a

wider deviation from the faith delivered to the Saints, than in yielding (if it really have yielded) to the Crown, too large a Supremacy in matters ecclesiastical ; whether more monstrous errors in doctrine, and delusions more dangerous to salvation, may not be upheld and enforced under a Supremacy of a different character, than even that of thinking that a Metropolitan Bishop may have a Metropolitan for his Suffragan.

I am, Right Reverend Sir,

Your obedient humble Servant,

W. G. SYDNEY.

POSTSCRIPT.

WHILE a polemical spirit might be gratified, other and better feelings must be pained, by observing that the foregoing is neither the first nor the worst instance in which Dr. Wiseman has attempted to convey a false impression by means of unfaithful quotations from the pulpit. In the 13th of his Lectures (*On the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, delivered in 1836*, vol. 2, p. 107) he introduces the following passage as the testimony of Origen in the second century in support of "Invocation of Saints."—"He (Origen) thus writes on the Lamentations, 'I will fall down on my knees, and, not presuming, on account of my crimes, to present my prayer to God, I will invoke all the saints to my assistance. O ye saints of heaven, I beseech you, with a sorrow full of sighs and tears, fall at the feet of the Lord of mercies for me a miserable sinner.'" He refers also in the margin to "lib. II. de Job" as to another of the writings of Origen in support of the same doctrine. Giving Dr. Wiseman credit for the most ordinary measure of scholarship and research, we cannot form any conclusion but that, when he quoted the above as the words of Origen, he must have been well aware that they are none of his; neither indeed is any portion of the treatise in which they occur. The Commentaries on Job, attributed to him, are also spurious. If Dr. Wiseman questioned this, he was bound, in quoting these

passages, to state his reasons for so differing from the judgment of all scholars and critics, especially those of his own communion, by which they have long and unanimously been pronounced forgeries. It is impossible to explain why Dr. Wiseman should speak of the former of the treatises here mentioned as "written on the Lamentations;" as if it were a Commentary on Jeremiah: whereas the learned Benedictine Ceillier speaks of it as "un escrit, ou plutot un libelle diffamatoire, composé par quelque ennemi d'Origene, et intitulé, *Les lamentations d'Origene*. C'est une piece fort meprisable. Le pape Gelase l'a mise au rang des apocryphes." (*Hist. Gen. des Auteurs Sac.* Tom. II., p. 653). Thus Huet speaks of the same work, "Ad finem librorum περὶ ἀρχῶν attexi solet libellus qui *Lamentum Origenis* inscribitur.—Erasmus, *Lamentum hoc*, inquit, *nec ab Origene scriptum est nec ab Hieronymo versum, sed figmentum est alicujus indocti qui studuerit hujusmodi colore Origenem infamare*—*Mirum itaque sine falsitatis nota a Theologis quibusdam librum hunc nonnunquam in testimonium citari*". (*Origenian*, lib. III. App. § viii.)

Next, as to the Second Book of the Commentaries on Job, the following, I presume, must be the passage intended: for, after the most careful research, it is not in my power to discover any other so applicable. "O beate Job, vivens in perpetuum apud Deum, et victor permanens in conspectu Regis Domini, ora pro nobis miseris, ut etiam nos terribilis Dei misericordia protegat in omnibus tribulationibus," &c. (*Origen. Opp.*, tom. II. p. 894. A. *Bened. Ed.*) It is impossible but that, when Dr. Wiseman referred to this passage as conveying the testimony of Origen in support of the "Invocation of Saints," he must have known perfectly that Origen had no more been the writer of it than I am. If Dr. Wiseman had never inspected the work itself, his inattention was very inexcusable: if he had, he must have found internal evidence to satisfy him that it was not the work of Origen, nor a work of his age. Gottfrid Lumper

(another Benedictine) says of it, “Certum est, *primo*, non esse Origenis: nam et stilus Origeni plane dissimilis est—dein discrepat etiam in sententiis:—constat, *secundo*, auctoris esse Origenis temporibus multo recentioris, et post Arianae hæreseos ortum, ab homine item Ariano scriptum:—mentio occurrit Manichæorum, quorum secta Origenis ætate incognita fuit.” *Histor. Theolog. Crit. de Vita, Scriptis, &c., SS. Patr.* Pars. ix. p. 255). Ceillier and Huet entirely concur in this judgment; of which facts it is perfectly incredible that Dr. Wiseman could be ignorant. Yet he resorts to such confessedly spurious writings as these, and is not ashamed to refer to them from the pulpit, for the purpose of creating an impression that the Invocation of Saints departed had the sanction of Origen in the second century. If any circumstance could add to the flagrancy of the deception, it would be this:—that the writer of this Commentary on Job is not only a false pretender to the name he assumes, but is a profane heretical person who jests (as Lumper remarks) upon the holy names Trinity and Consubstantial, and speaks of the Catholic Church as that trionymous sect represented by the three horns of Satan, with other blasphemies of the like kind, which I forbear to extract, referring only to p. 870, vol. II. *Ed. Bened.*

Even this, however, is not all. In the same lecture (p. 108), we have a passage quoted by Dr. Wiseman as from St. Athanasius, who is described as “enthusiastically” addressing the ever-blessed Mother of our Lord, thus: “Hear now, O daughter of David, incline thine ear to our prayers. We raise our cry to thee. Remember us, O most holy Virgin, and for the feeble eulogiums we give thee, grant us great gifts from the treasures of thy graces; thou who art full of grace. Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Queen and Mother of God, intercede for us.” The reference given to the works of St. Athanasius is “*Serm. in Annun.* T. II. p. 401.” Athanasius, I venture to say, neither thought nor spoke in the sense thus forced upon him by Dr. Wiseman.

In examining the Discourse on the Annunciation, I cannot discover, in their exact form and order, the words above quoted, although there may be words to the same effect. But the Discourse itself from which they are taken is a gross forgery; and the testimony confirming this shall be brought from Roman Catholic authorities. Ceillier, in the 5th vol. of the work already quoted, (p. 285-6,) observes "On a supposé à St. Athanase plusieurs homelies—La seconde est sur l'Annonciation de la Vierge—on ne peut douter que l'Orateur n'ait vecu apres les Conciles d'Ephese et de Calcedoine, dont quelquefois il emprunte les termes." But to omit all other authorities, is it supposable that Dr. Wiseman, when he placed before his congregation this apparently decisive passage conveying the testimony of St. Athanasius in support of the Adoration of the Virgin Mary, can have been ignorant that Cardinal Baronius, in 1592, had addressed a long epistle to Stapleton (the author of *Propugnaculum Primitivæ Anglorum Fidei*), conveying an unanswerable confutation of the vulgar belief that the Discourse on the Annunciation was the genuine production of St. Athanasius? a judgment in which the Benedictine Editors of his works unhesitatingly concur. To pass to one only who was not a Roman Catholic, Cave, I may add, includes the Sermon on the Annunciation among the *spurious* works of Athanasius; and pronounces it to have been written subsequently to the rise of the Monothelite heresy, nearly 300 years after the death of Athanasius. (*Scriptor. Ecclesiast. Histor.* p. 123).

It need therefore be no cause of surprise that Dr. Wiseman should deal hypocritically with an instrument bearing the stamp only of secular authority, or that he should so deal with it from the pulpit. In the exercise of his most solemn offices, he is capable of tampering with the obligation of faithfulness owing by him to that evidence of tradition which, in the view of those whom he was addressing, and, according to the rule of faith established by the Church of Rome, is entitled to a degree of veneration scarcely, if at all, inferior to

that which may be claimed by the Holy Scripture itself. It could not therefore be reasonably expected that he would testify more unimpeached fidelity in reading from the pulpit, and commenting upon, a document propounded by an authority to which he may be satisfied he owes no more than a divided allegiance.

Mr Rev^d C. F. D. Piddell
from the Author.

