

**THE CONTROVERSIAL
METHODS
OF ROMANISM**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649184569

The controversial methods of Romanism by Arthur Brinckman

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

ARTHUR BRINCKMAN

**THE CONTROVERSIAL
METHODS
OF ROMANISM**

THE
CONTROVERSIAL METHODS
OF ROMANISM.

BY
ARTHUR BRINCKMAN,
LATE OF ALL SAINTS', MARGARET STREET.

"Would to Heaven it were granted us, even at the expense of our own blood, to hasten the return of our brethren, for whom we feel all possible tenderness! Woe to those who would retain the least possible animosity against them! Charity ought to be the characteristic of the Catholics, because it is inseparable from unity, and he is destitute of that virtue who loveth not all mankind with sincerity, or who suffers the natural aversion he ought to have for errors, to inspire him with hatred against the persons of their maintainers." ("Discourses of Ganganelli, Pope Clement XIV.," vol. iii., pp. 286-289.) *Quoted from Union Review.*



LONDON:
SWAN SONNENSCHN, LOWREY & CO.,
PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

1888.

79039

BX
1766
37

P R E F A C E.

It is not very easy to write anything new upon the Roman Controversy, and I should not have written and published this little book if the writers in the *Tablet* had only confined their abusive remarks to myself. Extracts (written and printed) from the *Tablet* were sent to some members of the congregation of All Saints', Margaret Street; and I then resolved that all interested should see the whole of the correspondence, and learn my reasons for giving a warning from the pulpit not to trust any statements made by Roman controversialists.

When Mr. Upton Richards died, there was an interval of several months before his successor, Mr. Berdmore Compton, was appointed. The congregation was very anxious during that trying time of suspense, hoping, of course, that the new Vicar would prove a worthy successor to his lamented predecessor. As one of the staff of curates, I know I was frequently called upon to counteract the efforts of the Roman clergy, who tried hard in that time of anxiety and suspense to win over what members of the congregation they could. "All Saints' is now quite done for." "Like all things that are rotten, it must soon have its end." "We are receiving members daily into the Catholic Church; they, like others who are coming, were only waiting for Mr. Richards' death; they are coming so fast that we are seriously considering if we had not better fix one particular day to receive the congregation *en masse*." This was the sort of thing I was constantly hearing, and so on the Sunday after Mr. Compton' farewell sermon, I thought I was simply doing my duty in warning the congregation not to put implicit credence in any statements emanating from a Roman

controversial source. Thirteen years before, after Mr. Upton Richards' death, the Romans were very energetic trying to proselytise. As far as I can remember, at the outside perhaps, they won over six persons during the interval; in the longer one, before Mr. Whitworth was appointed, I heard of no case of secession, and no special Roman proselytising efforts among the congregation. In fact, it looked as if the poachers were tired of their game; for knowing the keepers were on the alert, they seemed to make no sign, whereas in the former interval their energy was really amusing!

One well-known controversial Jesuit would come occasionally to evensong, just to see if our members were thinning to any appreciable extent, I suppose. So much then for the reason why I warned my hearers against any Roman statements they might hear while awaiting the appointment of the new vicar.

In using the word Roman or Romanism I disclaim any intention of giving needless offence. I have simply entitled my book in the way that best answers to the title of the attack in the *Tablet*.

If I have used any expression harsher beyond what the truth demands, and the person who feels himself aggrieved tells me so, and gives me any reasonable reason for feeling hurt, I will do my best to alter, soften, or retract it. I have no personal feeling of animosity against any one of those who are fighting, and, as I think, not in the fairest, most honourable way, against the Church of England. So far from anger with them it is rather sorrow I feel to see men carrying on a work they profess to be for God and souls in such a manner. My conviction of Roman controversial untrustworthiness is not formed from second-hand, but from what has been directly experienced by myself; and the anecdote which has exasperated the *Tablet* gives point and proof to the assertions I now deliberately make. That the controversial methods of Romanism are most unfair, that if I heard of any trick, deceit, or untruth in the efforts of clergymen of the Church of England to win converts I should be surprised, but if I heard of the same thing said or done by Roman ecclesiastics of the greatest eminence (let alone the generality of their controversialists) it would not astonish me in the least. I am sorry, of course, to confess

this, for I have no wish to call names or say hard things of any one. I certainly have no wish to swell the chorus of fanatics, such as the *Rock* or *English Churchman* newspaper type; I can, as I say, only speak from my own experience, and I must say that, knowing what I do, I am not surprised at so many people believing almost anything bad of Romanists in general.

If in the following pages I seem to give the reader to infer that I believe all Roman opponents are intentionally unfair, I must disclaim any such wish,—not every one who utters an untruth means to be untrue, or should be called untruthful. For instance, if a statement occurs in a book which teaches plainly that St. Mary is more inclined to mercy than Jesus, one may rightly say the assertion is a lie; and not only that, but a blasphemy and an impossibility, and therefore an absurdity as well. God is Love—Infinite Love; and all love is from Him, and no love can equal, much less in any sense of the words even seem to surpass His, or really do so.

Those who make these statements must bear the responsibility; they must answer to a Higher Power than any on earth how they came to pen them or approve them in others. So, too, in misquotations very often they are utterly false or misleading; but they may have been got into the head from text-books which were untrustworthy, and may yet have been used in good faith.

It is rather in the things said in private to persons whom it is sought to pervert that the dishonesty seems to be inexcusable, and these are the things most difficult to prove.

It is generally a case of one man's affirmation and another's denial. Years ago I began to advise every one I could, who was at all likely to be attacked by Roman controversialists, to ask them just to put down their assertions in writing. The effect was excellent.

I believe that there are in the Roman Communion now numbers and numbers whose principles are far superior to the practical system that surrounds them, and who would always try to be open and honest in the solemn work of trying to influence the faith of another soul; but, alas! in the work of proselytising the insolent and aggressive faction (not the Jesuits only) is ever to the fore.

I will, for peace' sake, repeat I do not impute wilful dishonesty and untruth to Roman priests in general ; but I do say, and herein many an English clergyman deservedly far better known than myself agrees, that it is impossible for us to trust any statements made by Roman controversialists in their efforts to draw away to their Communion the members of the Church of England.

INTRODUCTION.

The following appeared in the *Tablet*, August 21st, 1886:—

THE CONTROVERSIAL METHODS OF RITUALISM.

We have been asked to publish the following correspondence between one of the clergy of All Saints', Margaret Street, and the Rev. Dr. Lee:—

I.

"ALL SAINTS' VICARAGE, LAMBETH, August 7th, 1886.

"REV. SIR,—Having been for thirty years and more interested in bringing about visible reunion between the Church of England and the Catholic Church, I regret to read polemical misrepresentations from any quarter. My attention has been called to a paragraph in your sermon upon Mr. Compton, of All Saints', Margaret Street, which, on the face of it, is somewhat uncharitable, and I may add, I trust without offence, a little uncalled for. Here it is as reported in print: 'It is owing to such characters as his (Mr. Berdmore Compton's), that one well known and respected in the Roman Communion said: "Whenever any of my priests tell me anything, I always first ask myself, Are you really telling me the truth; and, if so, what motive is hidden behind it? But with the English clergy I always believe them straight off at once."' Now, Rev. Sir, with regard to this—which does not belong to the substance of your discourse, but is airily introduced to illustrate by comparison somebody else's acknowledged virtues—I note (1) that you imply that the words quoted were uttered by some Catholic bishop; (2) you make him insinuate that he is unable to believe not one or two, but 'any' of his priests; (3) that, moreover, whenever they have occasion to officially consult him, he maintains and asserts that they invariably have a motive