

3^a)

April 1837

(intended answer
to Gladstone's letter
of April 2, 1837)

My dear Gladstone,

Your last letter has hardly been out of my thoughts since I received it. And it would be hard for me to tell you how much pleasure, & pain I have felt in thinking upon it - of pleasure, at the open, & confiding expressions respecting yourself - and of pain at the entanglement of good, & evil in our social state - of which I may at once say, that although I know God could unravel all at a breath, and that, I believe it is still in our hands, if we knew where to find the clue, & seeking for it, were willing boldly to follow it out, yet that I am without hope ever to see Truth, & Right, that is the Church, & the Crown of England brought again to the state which God foreshadowed, & adamed for Christian

mercifully - But of this I will say more
at another time. I would first speak of
that, which gives me pleasure, and has in it
the personal intant of private friendship - I
mean from self.

I cannot say how I rejoice to see the im-
plicit loyalty from heart to the majesty
of faith, and heaven amidst the threats, & so-
licitations of earthly expediency, and the
lures of our high ambition to serve God
in the mingled, & bewildering enterprises of
Government. And having within this fortnight,
I fear, it might seem, my dear Gladstone, as
if I had a moment's misgiving the high prin-
ciple of faith, I know too in you - which
seeming would altogether mislead you ^{& belie me} - for
I have ever confided with the most implicit
trust in the humble but stern purpose I
knew you to have of clearing to the sole
highest, & holiest way. My pleasure then

is not to see your steadfastness but to observe how
single your views are made, and how strengthened
refreshed your mind returns from secret con-
murrings with the Prince of the Kings of the Earth
to mix in the sleepless strife which gathers round
the centre of earthly Government. "Think!"
could read in what you wrote of freedom to
well health in a narrow circle, somewhat of
an old yearning for a blessed lot not unlike
my own, as compared with the jilted pri-
vileges of your wide liberty. I think God
has most perceptibly fixed our callings respect-
ively. I see in you a confluence of
moral, and external gifts as visibly
marking you out for what you are, as the
want of them with a certain mixture of other
things shews me my place, & calling. But
of myself no more. This will be so long
as you have time, & will to do so the
very greatest happiness to me to share so
much in the fellowship of your anxieties
as you may think it right, and feel it

pleasing to your own mind to communicate -
and I feel most deeply your Request ^{to me} as "a
friend & minister of God": so that I would
not attempt to detain you by idle expec-
tions of ill-considered thoughts, but would endeavor
to use the privilege you give me as a mat-
ter of conscience, & a means of my own im-
provement - for believe me while I respect greatly
the humility in which you write the word "teach-
ing" in your last letter but one, I feel that
your 'Minerva' is of manifold greater worth
than my 'minerva'. I can hardly dare to
think that I shall be able in any way to
'lend you aid'. In matters of faith, &
conscience indeed I feel that, we have
a pledged strength, & wisdom not our own,
so that while I could not hope out of
any personal resources to contribute any-
thing likely to relieve or confirm your
mind; I believe there comes from the
Priesthood of Christ if it be faithfully
administered, a freshness, & calm, which

May see the a mind harassed, & wearied
 by the intense action of a high tempered con-
 science in its conflict with the subtle, &
 stubborn powers of the World. This so far as
 I may be able I shall delight to do. But in
 truth, I often ~~feel~~ ^{am} depressed under a feeling
 how far short do I come of the standard
 by which they must be measured, who are called
 to minister before Christ in the Holy Place.
 One Separation leads to narrowness, one
 discharge from secular things, to sloth, and
 faith grows sickly, and languid, & indolent.
 I often envy the rigors, & healthy pulse
 of their faith, who have to meet, & master
 the World. I say I envy their faith, for
 as to their lot, I feel I ought to rise
 higher, & to walk more closely with God,
 than all. for so much greater are my blessings.
 You must therefore take all I write with the
 alloy of the writer.

You have asked me to consider "what may
 be compromised without sullying the purity
 of principle."? And I will give this question my
 much more examination. But that I have

been better to forgiveful of it, as I have already
told you, I have seldom thought of it without
you coming to my mind, because I am myself
removed from the perplexity. My way is plain.
And you are the ^{nearest} point of contact, I have
with political questions - let me say by the
way, I see no need for you to excuse yourself
in the matter of speaking about the Respon-
sibilities of Gov^t. God has already brought you
under the obligations, and if you have health
& life, soon or late you cannot fail to be
more deeply involved. But I look forward to
this with hope, & confidence.

That the next accession of the present oppo-
sition to office will be a uniting trial
for principle everyone must see. I have
so little knowledge - having no acquaintance
with I may say any of Sir R P's & Lord
Stanley's friends that I ~~am~~ not able to give
any detailed opinion - but upon the name
Casuarine are united so many varieties of
principle, & no-principle, whose only combining
a generic likeness is a desire to prevalence, that
I can hardly expect much unity of design in
conceiving measures for the carrying on of

Government without extensive compromise on all sides. And it is not possible to leave the great points you refer to as open questions, for they will necessarily be brought on by their opposition, if not met by any succeeding Government.

But on these details, I venture no more. The most definite point in your letter, on which I feel myself able to hazard an opinion is this: "I do not stand upon the basis of the Apostolical ~~Government~~ ^{Successⁿ} for the adminⁿ of Government, as I would for my own individual conduct." In this ^{as far as I now can see.} I wholly agree, and I believe upon raising the question we shall agree also on the principle leading to such a conclusion. It is a sad one, full of melancholy results for the Empire. In this letter I cannot explain more than today that ~~by the~~ the face of Political Changes the Church & State have ceased to be identical, & have become united - so that, every member of the legislature ^{being a member of Christ's Church} seems to have imposed upon him a twofold office, one to the Church of Christ, and another to the secular government of the Kingdom. The question therefore seems to me to be this - not can a Churchman

Continue with a good conscience a member of the
Legislature? "Altho' on this I would hereafter
add something - but, "Have not political
changes made the Governing Powers of the
Kingdom unfit for the administration of the
Church of Christ?" I can say no more now
than that, I think they have become di-
qualified by the admission of Schismatics.
For I can find no precedent for any secular
power individual, or collective exercising
any functions of deliberation, or decision
in the affairs of Christ's Church, save and
by virtue of such power being in commun-
ion with the Church. This is the point on
which I should like to send you my thoughts,
such as they are, in the course of which
I think the other points will be either expli-
cited, or implicitly canvassed. This one
false principle is the fruitful mother of
the evil brood contained in the beginning
of your letter. And now, for the present
I will detain you no longer than only to
add my most heartfelt desire which is also
my prayer, that, the Holy Spirit of God in
the fullness of His sevenfold anointing may
meet abundantly, & abidingly rest upon you,
blessing all that you design, & do, to the good

(155)

38

(answer to
Gladstone's letter of
April 2, 1837)

April 1837

My dear Gladstone,

Two letters have I written to you, & neither can I send - The first because so many questions of a historical nature arose in the course of it, and required much fuller examination - The last because I found, as I wrote, objections I could not answer. I will try once more, and that without loss of time, as Every day convinces me that your trial is very near. I almost shrink from the duty you have put on me of saying what to my mind seems right.

You ask what may be compromised? & what must be held fast?

This a relief to my mind greater than I can say to know that I ~~am~~ writing to you who hold as dear, & precious as myself the deposit of Catholic doctrine, and discipline. Of this nothing can be compromised. In dealing with the Church of Christ in England conscience, & faith forbid a hair's breadth departure from the ascertained lines of apostolical Scripture and Tradition. What these are, none to be found, how proved. What measures do, & do not make against them are all questions ^{written} in great part already agreed between us;

or to be decided by consideration of each emergent case. So far your duty, as a member of Christ's Church is clear.

But as a member of the Legislature, itself a mixed body, representing a mixed state of society, you are called on to take part in questions of a religious but of a schismatical kind. I use the word schismatical in its pure Etymological meaning, without a tinge or colour of harshness. The question recurs - Can you partake of such acts? The picture drawn in your last letter is frightful. I take as example Magnooth, & the Establishment of the ^{Colonial} ~~foreign~~ Presbyterian leaders. Was after very long, and earnest inquiry with myself, with great shrinking from the impracticable dicta of pure theory, I am driven to this conclusion. If Parliament claim to itself the authority to legislate in Ecclesiastical matters and if grants of money be made as for Ecclesiastical purposes to bodies domestic, & Colonial being in Schism from the Church of Christ, I think the faith, & Conscience of a member of Christ's Church forbids at once either to counsel, or assent to such legislation.

But if Parliament renounce the claim to legislate in Ecclesiastical matters, as the very nature, and being of the Church of Christ has long, and day by day still more unambiguously,

and rightfully demands: and if such grants of money be made with a pure secular intent, by a purely secular authority, how much soever the receivers of such grants may use them for religious purposes, I think members of Christ Church may sit in council, or absent.

But, my dear Gladstone, ponder & pray again, & again see what I venture to write lest I should in me or to little mislead.

The principle, from which I draw these conclusions is this that "Parliament cannot rightfully entertain Ecclesiastical questions." God has been pleased to permit the Empire to be torn with Schisms: and the people, from whom Parliament legislates, ^{both} ~~whether~~ at home & abroad are hardly more motley in their Political, than in their Religious opinions, and adhesions. Parliament ought duly to represent, we will say, these Political variations, because there exists no type, or exemplar of Civil Government bound by the laws of God upon mankind. Not so in Spiritual matters. Christ has ordained the type and exemplar of Government: and he will not hold either man, or people guiltless, who overthrow, or make a breach in it. Whether a no Protestant sectarian maintain, as in consistency they ought, that Parliament ought to represent the religious differences - and abide by all the Hobbit consequences of such a doctrine I know not. But of this we are sure that the Church of Christ protests against any man, not in her communion, having voice, or vote in her administration. It is

no argument today - but modern Schismatics are
Heathens. of old they were Heathens. The Church does
not inquire into shades of excommunication. Tho it
be but a film of difference yet if it break com-
munion it is all one.

Therefore as the Empire is of a mixed population,
so must the Parliament be, according to the mo-
dern ^{principles of} legislation, which is to unbind what 1688
bound up - of which I give no judgment now -

And if the Parliament be of a mixed kind, so must
be its acts by reason both of the body that makes,
& the people from whom the laws are made.

But against this mixed legislation the Church of
Christ protests, so far at least as applied to herself.
But alas in England - she alone ^{protests} without avail.
The R C defies parliament.

The Independents see - tremor & resist.

What do the Scotch Presbyterians do?

Let Parliament unmake a R C Bishop, a Diocesan.
Let Parliament suspend the Seal of Bishops in Scotland.
Let Parliament declare that Mr T. Binney shall be the last
preacher at the New Kings Weir House -

All sects, & heretics protest, & success fully, and all
see - but only the Church of Christ in England.
So long as this continues, Parliament sports as Parlia-
ment, an authority to administer the Eccl: affairs of
the Church: and just so long I cannot see how
a member of the Church *salva conscientia atque fide* can

Council, a spent to any mixed legislation for schismatical bodies. While Church, & State were identical every act of the one was an act of the other countitly. Not so now that they are only united, which involves departure from identity, and if not previous, at least possible separation. There are three kinds of matter for legislation in a the Commonwealth - Spiritual, Ecclesiastical, & Secular. The two former can only be administered by the Church of Christ, and are only binding upon her members: the last is absolutely in the hands of the Secular Powers (be they even Mahometan), and all citizens whether in or out of the Communion of the Church are subject to them.

I cannot resolve the question of conscience otherwise than thus. Let Parliament renounce the power to administer Ecclesiastical affairs, once rightfully held, & exercised, but now by the admission of schismatics detained and exercised contrary to right: Let Parliament declare itself to be what in deed it is, the mixed Governing body for purposes purely secular.

I can then see, I think, that every citizen may take a part in purely secular legislation. The unhappy breaches, & wounds of his Country demand remedial treatment. His country-

men upon the highest lawn, & judge themselves unworthy of the Catholic Church. He must deal with them according to their waywardness: Control but not curtail their prejudices: legislate consistently with their broken state but ever seek to reduce them to a healthier condition. Approximation to truth, & right must be his guiding conception; and the unity of Christ's Church, which embraces the members of the Commonwealth his aim.

And yet the question returns, with an almost overwhelming force. Can I vote £10 or 20,000 to Maynooth? As an ecclesiastical act - impossible - as a purely secular question? Can it become so? May not the administration of finance be so considered? Why should I vote for the grant? Is it wiser to educate the Priests at home? Does it detach them from foreign alliances? May I purchase this at the cost of a new stimulus to Romanism in detail? Is it not crookedness, & indirection, & a circumventing of my end i.e. the detachment of Ireland from Rome, & its blending with the British Church & Empire? Have our R.C. Countrymen a claim upon the National Revenue, to which they contribute? If so, how can they be spoiled with greater hope of good? If we cannot convert them, may we not educate? My objection to the Irish Education System is

not the Excerpta, a notes, & Comments, but the
union of the Church with Schismatics, Romanist, &
Protestant. If the Schismatics wd unite, & conflict
with each other, I am willing to vote them or
grant to carry on their clashing of the potter vessels,
while upon God, I should trust to see the Church
of Christ by the concentrated, even force of unity ex-
panding in peace over the wastes their strife
had desolated. But God forbid she should mix-
gle in the fray, or above all buy peace by com-
promise of truth, or fellowship with schism.

And now as this letter can hold but little
more, let me add in one word. The only hope I
can desire in the coming hereafter is that, the
Church of Christ in Great Britain maybe de-
livered by the King, Lords, ^{still in her communion} & Commons, from the
deadly nightshade of Schismatical, & secular
Power. Under them she is drooping, and except
a deliverer be raised up, she must die. Already
I feel with astonishment, & I trust with thankfulness,
"Except the Lord of Sabbath had left us a seed, we
had been as Sodom, & been made like unto Go-
Morrha". When I have looked over ~~the~~ past
history with shame, & sorrow, at God's signal
deliverances, & our greater sins; when I have thought
with grief, and indignation on our present state,
which your last letter gave some short samples: and
looked forward without hope, $\pi\alpha\sigma\epsilon\alpha\varrho\epsilon\omicron\rho\omega\varsigma$ $\delta\alpha\delta\omega$, I come

at last to this the Church, & Commonwealth, are one
no longer. They are indeed united. & hence all our
woes, and dangers - There remains but one thing
that all her administration sh^d be in fact, where
~~they~~ it must ever be in right in the hand
of her Hierarchy, under Christ - of her Bishops
and Clergy, with her King, and Laity, at this
day beyond all precedent numerous, affectionate
& faithful - and when I have come to this point -
I have asked myself, where is the man to wrest
from strong hand power without right: and to
restore it to those, who minister for Christ on
earth? Where is the man that, will hazard
for a time, upon a long venture, political place, &
power, and name, and the reward of a noble
ambition to win the inestimable dignity of
delivering the Church of Christ from the
wolds bondage - a dignity, which some
man shall ever wear on earth;
and all who pledge themselves to Christ
for this service, though they here come
short shall wear, as God is true, in Heaven.

But I must release you from this
long letter. I know how inadequately I have
^{with} met your questions, & sustained some of my