

INTRODUCTION.

“Lasciate ogni speranza, voi, che'ntrate,” sang the Italian poet, and the majority of Englishmen echo it back to every Catholic “Pervert.” Some observe—“That man must be a great fool, and wanting in common sense, who would for a moment dream of preferring the Catholic to the Reformed Faith.” This is severe, and would be hard to bear, did they not also observe almost in the same breath—“That every one should be cautious of mixing with Romanists, in consequence of the great danger there is of being perverted by such intercourse.” These sayings, if they mean anything, come to this: “Catholics are not such fools after all:” or, “Most Protestants have a tendency to become fools!!”

Not many months ago, one of two gentlemen who were discoursing about Popery remarked: “If people would only go and see the mummery of the thing in foreign countries, they would think no more of it.” Now the writer remembers when a boy being once taken to hear the Even Song in an English Cathedral by a Dissenting minister, who called out to him, “what mummery,” and so it was to us, for we neither joined in the ceremonial, nor understood the chaunted service: not so, however,

with the Dean and Chapter, to whom everything seemed well suited for the occasion. In both instances the mummery of the thing rested with those stranger worshippers who spoke of what they had never attended to, and did not comprehend.

Again, is it not strange to suppose that He who gave the Jews a splendid ceremonial for their religion, and who did not think it beneath him to portray in gorgeous terms the glories of his heavenly kingdom in the Revelation of St. John, can object to be honoured by his servants in the magnificent ceremonial of the Catholic Church? Who is there, having been present at a Levee or a Drawing Room, but would smile at the proposal to abolish the pomp and ceremony used on such occasions, because of the superior greatness of Her Majesty, and that the lower classes might reverence her person more? and who does not see that if the same forms are done away with in America, it is because the people are more nearly equal to their chief, and not because the chief is too great to have such empty honours paid to him? Certainly on this question, the authority of the many should have some weight; nearly the whole of the Christian world are in its favour, and never dream of its affecting their spirituality. Catholic and Greek Christians give their Creator the most glorious worship they are able to offer, and yet deeply feel their nothingness in the sight of the Most High. It is true the Jewish was a typical religion, but did that prevent it having a spiritual

worship? In Deuteronomy, ch. 10, v. 12, we find these words: "And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, to keep the commandments of the Lord and his statutes, which I command thee this day for thy good."

But, alas! the most holy and important services of the Catholic Church are in the Latin tongue, and that is worse than choir singing in an English Cathedral to those who do n't understand it! Most true; nevertheless one finds by little and little, that the Catholic poor do understand what they are about, as well, if not better, than their Protestant brethren. The words of the Bible and Prayer-book do not fall upon the ear of our village poor much other than the Latin does on the Irish Catholic. In both cases they comprehend what is being done, not so much because they know the language, as because they use the sacred words so often. Besides this, Catholics have translations of their services as well as prayers for their private use, and, therefore, although one might prefer the idea of service in the national language, the universal use of the Latin in the Holy Communion and some other services, does not form an objection worthy of resistance to Catholic unity.

I may here give some examples of the unfair and absurd way in which Protestants judge of their neighbours. Some few years ago, being in one of

the churches at Havre during a marriage, a relative, who would not go near enough to hear what was being said, contented himself with beholding the ceremonial part only, and then exclaimed as we left the place: "What a shrivelled up religion." The late Bishop of Llandaff thus wrote in August 25th, 1816: "In Flanders everything wears the appearance of strict attachment to the Roman Catholic worship. The churches are open in summer from five in the morning until noon, during which time a succession of priests are officiating, the people coming and going, seldom less than thirty in the church at any one time, with great appearance of devotion. . . . This proceeding took me by surprise. I was not aware that the people took *so warm* a part in the performance of religious offices, it being one of the commonest objections to Popery that it leaves all to the priests, while the people are merely passive." The bishop, however, went on abusing Popery to the last, not caring to see what it did actually teach, or whether he had any more false notions on the subject of its creed or practices.

An immense error is committed by Protestants, when they give extracts from the lives and conversations of wicked men in order to prove that the ancient faith must be wrong. How perpetually do we find extracts respecting the commission of sins of the gravest nature put forth triumphantly to prove the wickedness of a system which *condemns* all such doings. The rulers of the Church, for instance, are

teachers of the faith. They make rules to guide and govern the whole body of Christians. But these rulers are mere men: their power from God to teach the faith does not imply that they are infallible in the rules they may lay down for the daily conduct of their flocks; some may be bad men, as in the days of the Jewish Church, some weak, some narrow-minded; so that they must and do differ from each other, as do the bishops of our Establishment. Yet such a jumble Protestant writers make of Catholic teaching that they suppose every decree of a Church ruler is esteemed infallible.

In the Memoir of Mr. Hewitson, the late minister of the Free Church of Scotland at Dirleton, I find it stated in the Preface: "It tells once more, in language which no sophism can mystify, that Rome is the uncompromising enemy of an open and understood Bible. It tells that before such a Bible Rome cannot maintain her ground." This view of the case is proved true in page 121, where we find that in consequence of certain conversions made to the Protestant faith in Madeira, the Church rulers there were provoked to issue a Pastoral, in which the Bible distributed was declared to be "a book from hell," but, alas, in page 126 it appears that—"a Lisbon newspaper settled the discussion. It contained a royal mandate (portaria) concerning the very same edition of the Bible which the canons condemned, and stated that Her Majesty the Queen, in harmony with the judgment of the Patriarch Arch-

Bishop Elect, approved of it, and recommended that it should be circulated in Terceira, for the moral and spiritual benefit of her subjects." Is it not strange to the candid reader that this last passage so honestly given, should nevertheless have had no effect in moderating the violence of the preface?

The Westminster Review for January 1851 has this remarkable passage quoted by Dr. Newman in one of his recent lectures: "A true British Protestant, whose notions of Popery are limited to what he hears from an evangelical curate, or has seen at the opening of a Jesuit Church, looks on the whole system as an obsolete mummery, and no more believes that men of sense can seriously adopt it, than that they will be converted to the practice of eating their dinner with a China-man's chopsticks instead of the knife and fork. Few even of educated Englishmen have any suspicion of the depth and solidity of the Catholic dogma."

In connexion with this important remark I may state, that an Evangelical clergyman of great learning and merit desired me, before I professed a system which, although it might do to live by, would not avail in the hour of death, to read carefully the decrees of the Council of Trent, where I should find Saint worship almost dethrone the Almighty, while it debased the mind. This I accordingly agreed to do, and in the Preface of the Catechism for Curates composed by the Decree of the Council of Trent, and published by command of Pope Pius the 5th,

saw the following: "This, therefore, seems to be the chief, to remember, that all Christian knowledge or learning is contained in this point, or rather, as our Saviour says, This is life eternal, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. Wherefore, the labour of a preacher in the Church ought especially to be employed in this— That the faithful may earnestly, and from the very bottom of their souls, desire to know Jesus Christ, and him crucified, and most assuredly persuade themselves, and with the deepest affection and devotion of heart believe, That there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby they must be saved; for he is the propitiation for our sins." If then the greater contains the less, and not the less the greater, it follows that the curates of the Catholic Church are directed to teach, and the laity to believe, that however great and glorious the saints may be, and however powerful their prayers in our aid, their glories and their powers, are but the gifts of God, who made them, and preserves them for his honour. For that He only is the propitiation for sin, and there is no other name under heaven, but that of Jesus, whereby man can be saved.

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.

MANY contend that the Church of Christ means the invisible body of Christians who are or will be actual inheritors of salvation, and from them make up a unity and Church, quite excluding that visible body likened by our Lord to a net, containing all kinds of fish both good and bad, or to a field of wheat and tares. This last body, however, seems to be "The kingdom set up without hands," which shall in due time fill the earth: and spoken of by our Lord as the "many who have been called," and adopted by Baptism to be the children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven. Few of them, it is also said, will eventually be chosen; that is, be actual inheritors and members of that mystical body destined to enjoy eternal happiness. All, however, in the Church are called by God his children, and consequently incur responsibilities unknown to the heathen, for whom the day of Doom will be far more tolerable.

There can be but one truth, and therefore but one Catholic teaching; so that whosoever is quite sure he has got the true faith, calls it Catholic. The question is, which is the Catholic or Christ's universal faith? and seeing that question is so often asked,

shews at any rate that it is not so very *easy* to prove our faith from the Bible as we fancy.

I believe the Bible, because it was handed down to me by the Church, or society of men to whom Christ taught the way of salvation. If I take it merely as a book, claiming its own authority, I must examine how it is written, and *whether* it *claims* direct inspiration.

It is composed of fragments of history ; the observations and reflections of different writers, who speak as from themselves ; the life of our Divine Lord, with some of his own most gracious words recorded for our instruction ; letters to Christian congregations, private individuals, and bishops of the early Church ; books containing in certain places the *Direct Word* of God to the whole earth, or to his Jewish people ; and concluding with a Revelation from the Almighty to St. John : of which book it is said, none should add to, or take away, from its sayings. This book, however, I find from history was not received as inspired for many years after it was written. The Church of England says councils have erred from the earliest periods, although as to dates no two persons are agreed ; some saying the seeds of Popery were sown in the days of the Apostles, others that two, four, or six centuries had elapsed before they became untrustworthy. Mr. Simpson, in page 43 of his *Epitome of the History of the Church for the use of Candidates for the B.A. degree in Cambridge*, observes, " Many suppose St. John's gospel to have

been the last of the holy scriptures. The three other Evangelists had shown the humanity of Jesus Christ, St. John manifested his divinity. Two reasons are assigned by the Ancients for the writing of the gospel. First, to refute the Gnostic heresy, which denied our Saviour's divinity and his existence before his incarnation ; " secondly, to confirm the history of the other three Evangelists and supply their omissions." *Three* inspired gospels required one more to *confirm* their history and supply omissions !

Mr. Simpson in the next page observes, " The canon of scripture, that is the authorized and received catalogue of the sacred books, is sometimes said to have been settled by St. John. We are not, however, to understand by this that he collected all the books of the New Testament, and formally sanctioned them by his authority : it is enough that the fact that John acknowledged the genuineness and authenticity of the books of the New Testament cannot be doubted. As to the *time when*, and the *persons by whom* they were collected into one body or volume, the learned are not agreed. It was *necessary* at an early period that some authorized catalogue should be prepared, in consequence of the spurious writings which were circulated ; and we know that before the middle of the second century most of the books composing the New Testament were regarded as the Divine rule in every Christian Church throughout the world."— " The genuineness of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of James and Jude, the last Epistles of

Peter and John, and the Revelations have been questioned; but these were at *length* received in every Church."

If then there be no infallible Church, can we possess infallible scriptures? for they have taught, and do certainly teach Christian sects various doctrines contradictory to each other. Each sect have been actuated by the best motives (to all appearance), and used prayer and faith in extracting their various truths or errors from the sacred page. When, however, we are told that the Church never was infallible, unless in the days of the Apostles, and that sundry errors soon sprung up in her, calling for new scriptures;—that many books of the New Testament were not considered as inspired until long after the deaths of all the Apostles;—when we know that St. John's Gospel is a great handle to the doctrine of transubstantiation, and St. James is always quoted by the Roman Catholic Church in proof of the necessity of good works;—when we are told also that Councils have erred from very early times,—it must be confessed that the complete inspiration of the Bible is unproved and the assertion questionable.

The Catholic Church, meantime, professing to have received the great message of salvation from her Divine founder, who promised He would be with her all days, even unto the consummation of ages; having written down, as she asserts, when occasion required and under Divine inspiration the books which make up the New Testament, having pre-

viously omitted sundry histories of our Lord's life written by her sons, rejecting also an Epistle by him whose name was in the Book of Life; completed the canon of Scripture, and is admitted by the Protestant world to have handed it down intact to our glorious Reformers, who immediately discovered that it militated against herself. This unexpected event, if proved, would of course tell against her. Who, however, is to decide upon the exact meaning of Scripture? both parties allowing it to be true with greater or less reason on their side: what are we to do in difficulties? Protestants as well as Catholics appear to disprove the right of private judgment, which, alas! was the means by which the Anglican and other churches were formed, and enabled to separate themselves from the Catholic. For when the Holy Scriptures are quoted against Protestants by their adversaries, notwithstanding the axioms "That we must believe whatever is contained in the Bible," and "That all persons have a right to the use of their private judgment therein," they call those damnable idolaters and that creed damnable idolatry which on their own premises is proved divine! No wonder there are difficulties in the creed of the Bible, when we read in 1 Cor. ii. 6, "Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect, yet not the wisdom of this world nor of the princes of this world that come to nought, but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery." 2 Peter iii. 15, 16, "And account the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation,

even as our beloved brother Paul, also according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you, as also in all his epistles speaking in them of these things, in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable *wrest*, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." 2 Thess. ii: After talking of the signs and lying wonders, such as Protestants think Popery to be, St. Paul adds, in verse 15, "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle."

If then all things needful to salvation could be easily gathered from the Scriptures by the unlearned, I don't see why some that are unlearned should be told to hold the traditions? or why some might be led to wrest the Scriptures unto their own destruction? Unnecessary things, whether believed in or wrested, could not endanger a man's salvation. If Christ taught a religion, could it have been intended to differ in any way from itself, as taught by various parties in the Christian world? If all were to admit one rule of faith, and one rule of conduct was needed and intended to be carried out, what rule must that be? Must it not be one which binds the teacher to teach only what he has been taught, not what may appear best to himself? otherwise, how can you prevent the diversity of sects and parties, now overwhelming the world, to the no small injury of missions and Christian charity. On what Protestant

principle could one uniform faith be transmitted to mankind?

All Protestants with whom I have ever conversed, or whose books I have read, pay an unwilling testimony to the necessity of one interpretation of the Bible. They tell you one and all that the Catholic Church is wrong, that you must use your Bible with prayer to God to understand it properly, and that you will then be sure to be led into a right understanding of the sacred page. When, however, the means used produce in the mind of the reader an impression contrary to their own, they never for a moment think themselves wrong, but are quite sure you have not had the blessing of God in your labors. You are bid to try again, and until you agree with them, you must make up your mind that you are in darkness. What is this but acknowledging that the sense of the Bible, as *interpreted by themselves*, is the "Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," of which they pretend to be so fond.

The *right interpretation* of the Bible then, is the true Word of God. Do we obtain it by the inward spirit of God, or by the teaching of that, alleged to be, living Church, planted by our Saviour to teach the nations unto the end of time? * All acknowledge that Christ gave this power of teaching and preaching

* Is the intellectual process by which we are to find out the true interpretation of the Bible, the first process in the work of conversion?

His word, before the books of the New Testament were written and the Canon of Scripture settled; this latter having taken place after the time when many of the errors of Popery were believed in, I see not how good Protestants can be obliged to accept the inspiration of those books I have before mentioned, especially as the works called apocryphal were at the same period first included in the sacred Canon. If, therefore, the Bible is to be considered as inspired, the apocryphal books should be included in it, and the Church at the period, A. D. 397, considered infallible, for otherwise the same mistake which included Judith and Tobias might have included the Hebrews and the Revelations. The English Reformers knew the mind of the English Church they were about to constitute, and we have a great number of their writings in our careful keeping. Supposing then, that we held ourselves bound to collect the best and most valuable of those writings, and call them the Reformed Scriptures, professing ourselves fallible men; how could we prove that of those which we admitted all were equally worthy of that honour, and that of those which we rejected none were deserving? Such, according to most Protestants, was the position of the Church when the Canon of the New Testament was completed! In short, how do we know that St. James' Epistle was not an epistle of straw, as Luther called it? and how do we know that the Epistle of St. Clement ought not to have been received as inspired?

But again, if, as some assert, the text "Thou from

a child hast known the Holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation," be considered inconsistent with Catholic teaching, it may be replied that, in such case, the whole of the New Testament, which Timothy never read when he was a child, should be excluded as unnecessary, and our enquiry reduced to the true interpretation of the books of the Old Testament. If, however, God, when he came in the flesh, intended to add a new law and testament, this proves we are not to wrest the words, as some Protestants do; for that even though the Old Testament, by God's blessing, was able to make Timothy wise, we may be assured that neither the added Testament or the oral teaching of Christ's ministers militate against the words of St. Paul.

The Catholic Handbook, by Macguire, is in error when it supposes that the general council of Ephesus, held in A. D. 431, is overthrown by the later decrees of Trent or Pius IV. The Faith has never been altered, but only as in the case of the Bible, additions have been from time to time made to the written teaching of the Church, not to overthrow it but to build up and to fulfil. It is not allowed to make a different creed to supersede that of Ephesus or Nice, or to change the sole foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail.

It may be as well here to give some proofs that Protestants do speak of their interpretation of the Bible as if it were infallible. In page 175 of Mr. Seymour's Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome, I

find he alleges, respecting the English Church, "That which was according to Holy Scripture, was retained, that which was contrary to the same was rejected. The Holy Scriptures were prominently put forward and assumed as the text. For example, Episcopacy was retained because it was consistent with Scripture, while Invocation of Saints was rejected because it was inconsistent with Scripture." Now, at Cromwell's reformation, that which was contrary to Scripture was rejected, therefore Episcopacy was rejected as contrary to Scripture. Surely the other reformed Churches can interpret the Scriptures as well as the Church of England. Again, in page 179, "The Church of England received the Athanasian creed, being ancient and according to Scripture." Many, however, in this country and Germany consider this a mistake. Why should the English Church be correct in retaining it in the teeth of her fellow reformers, and absolutely condemn the Socinians and Arians who from the earliest times have protested against it, who receive the Bible as the word of God and interpret it with clearness and prayer (true Protestant means). They hold the letter of Scripture, believe in the mission of our Lord, have a most consistent faith, are excellent above their brethren in word and deed, and are acute beyond ordinary men. Why, I ask, should they be dismissed so summarily from the faith as it is in Jesus?

Dr. Cumming is infallible as well as the Pope. In his *Sketches Apocalyptic*, page 296, are these words:

“Satan believes so, he made Popery on this principle (pleasing the senses). I am a Christian by grace and by grace I never can become a Roman Catholic; those whose names are written in the Lamb’s book of life never can become Roman Catholics. Popery makes no converts of regenerated hearts, it does not attempt to do so.”

Now what is this good natured argument? The Scriptures are to be our guide. They are dead against Popery, but the Romanists say they are in its favor, or in unison with it. Dr. Cumming says this is false: the Romanists, that Dr. Cumming is wrong, for that they are infallible as to what the Bible means. Dr. Cumming replies, he is not infallible, but he may and will exercise his private interpretation on the subject, and he knows for *certain* they are wrong, because his is the only true interpretation. The poor Papist’s right of judgment is not permitted for a moment, even if asked for. So much for Dr. Cumming. I believe then that God gave the rulers of the Church wisdom to preach and write the Gospel, and afterwards to interpret what we call the Bible. The good news is not a mere book for any one to draw his own ideas from. Three hundred years of discord as to what doctrine it teaches have proved that important fact. Do, however, the Protestants themselves receive the Bible without note or comment? If they did, they could not condemn all as infallibly wrong who did not interpret as they do. This is the gist of the

whole argument. We have no example of the letter of the Bible being considered enough for salvation; everyone has his own tradition respecting its meaning.

What then is nearest to common sense, that the Scriptures should be understood, as explained by that society which we here call the Church; or that it should be understood as explained by internal wisdom, differing according as the reader be brought up in the school of Luther, Calvin, or Socinus?

The Church then I consider to be the kingdom of heaven, set up by our blessed Lord. It was portrayed in the Roman catacombs as a ship, to represent the ark of God, saving souls from destruction, which fact "furnishes a valuable chapter for Ecclesiastical history." To the rulers of this visible Church, until the canon of the Scripture was settled, must have from necessity been confined the teaching of God's mind, they were then at least the Church of God, the pillar and ground of the faith.

"The apostles before they separated to preach the Gospel to different nations agreed upon one symbol or profession of faith, but even this they did not commit to writing, and they made this among other articles of it: I believe in the Holy Church: the title Catholic being afterwards added when heresies increased." Dr. Ridgley, a Puritan divine, who wrote more than one hundred years since, thus speaks of the Jewish Church: "Besides the extraordinary revelation and inspiration with which the

Jewish Church was more or less favoured, truly it is more than probable that, together with the Canon of the Old Testament, they received the spiritual sense and meaning of those things which were contained in them. There was one whole tribe, that of Levi, that was almost wholly employed in studying and explaining the law."

Was it the elders of the Jewish Church who dwelt at Berea, or the newly converted Greeks, who were praised by the writer of the Acts, as being more noble than those of Thessalonica, because they studied the *Hebrew* Scriptures, to see whether those things spoken by Paul were true or false?

The kingdom of heaven being an empire, although not of this world, nor made with hands, must have unity, and if visible a visible head to rule it *under* God, and neither king nor civil power should interfere with her articles of faith, liturgy, or any spiritual matters. Dr. Newman observes: "The work of the Church is priestcraft, in the same sense as goldsmith's work, or legal science, is a craft. It must have its teaching, its moral habits, its long experience, its precedents, its traditions. The more certainly the Church is the kingdom of heaven, the more certain it is she must have a heavenly work which the world cannot do for itself. The Church professes to be built on facts, not opinions; on objective truths, not variable sentiments; on immemorial testimony, not on private judgment; on convictions, or discernments, not on conclusions. She

must have a dogma and sacraments which give meaning to a Church, or sustain her against the State.

It is evident then, that, though National discipline and customs may be respected, creeds and doctrines cannot be otherwise than in unity with each other all over the globe: "being the heir of the apostles, the Church must have something to transmit, not to invent." Hence it is impossible for her to teach otherwise than that her doctrines and her Bible are in harmony with each other, or to withhold the latter from the laity for the miserable reasons usually assigned by her enemies. The testimony of the Church then, I believe to be the testimony of Christ, and the Bible to be the Word of God written by his servants, and acknowledged to be an inspired volume by this same Church, the pillar and ground of the faith. So only can I reconcile the difficulties of the book, its fragmentary nature, and the many, at first sight, improper and unexpected accounts we find in its pages; things startling enough to have made some men infidels, and only to be explained by the consideration that they were written for special purposes, and to different places and peoples, by those who had power to carry out a difficult work in a sinful world, and who afterwards had power and authority to transmit these writings, as professors of other sciences do their law-books and text-books. 1 Thessalonians, ch. 2, verse 13.—"For this cause also, thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the

word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the word of God ; for ye became followers of the churches of God which in Judea are in Christ Jesus.”

I conclude my remarks on the Church and the Bible, by a requotation of my Puritan friend, Dr. Ridgley: “ Besides the extraordinary revelation and inspiration with which the Christian Church was more or less favoured, truly it is more than probable that together with the Canon of the New Testament they received the spiritual sense and meaning of those things which were contained in them.”

ORDERS AND INFALLIBILITY.

Christ's apostles are admitted to have had true orders and powers to preach and teach his word in all the world. They were infallible on all questions of faith. Such infallibility, and no more, do the Catholic clergy claim at the present time. People often allude to decrees of the Church which have been attended to and abrogated, some of which may have been good, some bad, some uncalled for, to prove that these infallible teachers have differed amongst themselves as often as we have; but this is not denied by any Catholic, and only goes to prove that men will always be liable to error save when they are especially preserved by God's Holy Spirit in matters of salvation. When, therefore, the creeds are proved to be changed, or set against each other, and not before, will it be fair to charge the ministers of the Church with fallibility in their divine mission. I admit that dogmatic teaching has developed from time to time, but deny that any new faith has been brought into the Church since our Lord left the Mount of Olives. For it was only on account of differences of opinion on matters of faith that the elders of the visible Church had from time to time to propound a dogma. Thus when the Trinity was

attacked, the dogma respecting it, called after St. Athanasius, was first given. When heresies sprung up and increased, as our Lord foretold, the true Church was called Catholic. When the presence of our Lord in his Sacrament was doubted, the dogma called Transubstantiation was added. And should our belief at any future period be attacked on some new point now uncontroverted, a new dogma will be necessary. These statements will, I trust, show how much time has been wasted by Protestants in fighting an imaginary enemy. But it may be asked, do the Scriptures which the Catholic Church calls her own, and which we admit to be our sure guide, give any warrant for an apostolical commission and power to teach God's message, interpret his will, and administer his Sacraments exclusively? That a body of men must possess this power is to me a necessary consequence of what I have already stated, for if no commission existed after the apostles, there could be no common faith necessary, since those who believed all that was written by them could not be called to account if they did not interpret it in the same manner as their neighbours. Moreover, those parts of Scripture added to the Sacred Canon after the death of the last apostle could not be regarded as binding on Christians. True it is, that our Lord did not allow his apostles to rebuke those who taught in his name, but we never find that they were therefore permitted to act as priests in the Church. In short it does not follow at all, from

Holy Writ or ancient history, that our Lord's directions to his apostles were intended for the guidance of all mankind. If there was but one faith, one rule of salvation, one baptism, as well as one Saviour, one set of apostles to teach in unity one set of ideas, there cannot in the Christian any more than in the Jewish Church, be more than one set of authorized ministers to train up the world in that faith or creed. You must continue in the same path or you cannot state that you are following the same divine rule; hence the necessity in my eyes of accepting only one Church and one creed, or making the subject of religion a mere matter of a private nature between each man and his God, through the medium of his conscience, and the history of past ages, including of course those books which the best human testimony proves to have been written more or less under a divine influence.

But to return to the authority of Scripture for the Sacrament of Orders and Infallibility. We find therein the following expressions: "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father has appointed unto me" (Did the Father give the Son any power?) "that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

"All power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth, go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to

observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Are the Apostles now alive to teach, and command, and judge? If they are not, by virtue of their successors then is Christ's promise void, unless we refuse to understand the plain meaning of the passage. But if they are, the Saviour is still with them to guide them into all truth, and they will be infallible if the Apostles were; they have a kingdom, if the Apostles had, like Christ's, and it is said to them as well as to the Apostles, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature (not yet done), and these signs shall follow them that believe: in my name shall they cast out 'devils,' they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them, they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." Now most Protestants admit that these wonderful things came to pass in the days of the Apostles, although not in all cases of danger, want, and difficulty, for we hear of their loss of life eventually in many instances, as well as loss of health and worldly goods. If then *all* the wonderful works which are said so constantly to happen in the Catholic Church are untrue, this promise has failed. Again: "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Which of the original

eleven Apostles was in South Africa, America, New Zealand, China or Japan? "Verily I say unto you, he that receiveth *whomsoever* I send receiveth Me, and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me." Here we find that Christ's messengers are in the place of God speaking to man!

We find in the 18th of St. Matthew that our Lord tells his disciples they must confess their faults in the first instance privately, afterwards in the presence of two or three witnesses, but if that will not suffice the Church must hear it, and if either of them refuse to obey the Church they are to be considered as heathens or excommunicate, because "whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Christ being always present to hear and attend to his children even when "two or three gather together in his name," much more will he be in the assemblies of his Church. Lastly, Christ's words are never to fail, yet he says that he will be seen coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory before this generation shall pass away: what can the passage mean, *except* it alludes to the succession of Christian Priests who should take the place of their Jewish predecessors to the end of time? Therefore, how or why the use and the belief in these high powers and gifts can be horrible and antisciptural I am quite at a loss to understand. If they mean nothing and never did, the whole affair is a mummery. If they were formerly in force, but

not now, part of these extracts are untrue. If we must explain the whole conversation, or conversations, to suit our views of the Gospel in this one of its most important parts, to study the Scriptures in a child-like manner is impossible. Let then the furious sects and parties in the religious world at least be good enough to give their Catholic brethren the benefit of private interpretation, let it suffice that Catholics do acknowledge a belief in the Bible and their right to interpret its meaning; and although it may appear strange, and unreasonable, to hear themselves called heretics, allow their adversaries to be *possible inheritors* of a system of salvation, including at least the two necessities of the Protestant theory, a reception of the Bible, and a sincere and heartfelt interpretation of the same. On Protestant principles, although the Catholic may not be nearest to the truth, he cannot be, as Dr. Cumming would infer, condemned to certain damnation.

I cannot make out whether the English Church admits the truth of Chillingworth's Seventh Sermon on the Religion of Protestants; if it does, I quote the following as an illustration of my idea of orders and their sacramental power even now. "Can any man," he says, "be so unreasonable as to imagine, that when our Saviour, in so solemn a manner, having first breathed on his disciples, thereby conveying and insinuating the Holy Ghost into their hearts, renewed unto them or rather confirmed that glorious commission whereby he delegated to them an authority of

binding and loosing sins upon earth, &c. can any one think, I say, so unworthily of our Saviour as to esteem these words of his for no better than a compliment? Therefore, in obedience to his gracious will, and as I am warranted and enjoined by my holy Mother the Church of England, I beseech you that by your practice and use you will not suffer that commission which Christ has given to his ministers to be a vain form of words."

Many Anglicans I am quite sure are convinced of the truth of these remarks. They say that the Church of England is a part of the Catholic Body, and regard with disgust the unworthy language so often applied to those holding the creed of Rome. I would that they could prove the first assertion true; but, alas, our hierarchy is isolated in Christianity, its episcopate being rejected by Catholics, Greeks, and Protestants. It calls itself a branch Church, but does not profess the same creed as any other. It is a go-between—a compound of the ancient faith and the theory of Calvin. It takes its orders from a Church whose sacraments it calls fond, vain, and damnable idolatry. Its articles declare there is no infallibility on earth save in the Holy Bible, whose truths it cannot interpret, except to say that on all difficult points there may be two opposite views held. Thus Chillingworth, Laud, and the present Bishop of Exeter teach the value and grace of her orders, whilst others in high places within her pale contend that they are quite or almost immaterial.

The value and nature of her two sacraments are likewise so uncertain, that what may be taught in her pulpits in the morning may be disputed in the afternoon. In the reign of King Charles I. her pope in council would have favoured the Catholic, as would her present pope in council favor the anti-catholic theory on Baptism. As for the sacramental graces conveyed in the lesser sacraments, it is only among a few of her rulers that they are considered worthy of attention.

Strange successor of the Apostles must be that Church whose general tone is taken from the spirit of the age! but so it has been in the three eventful ages of her existence; knowing the political history of any portion of that period, the reader can with ease pronounce whether her general creed was Catholic or Protestant. Alas! she is compounded of two systems, a Church in print, not living. You cannot ask her her mind; you must consult her acts of parliament and courts of law. She professes to have a message from her God to the English people, but she cannot exactly explain it. She is the State Establishment, not the Catholic Church. I will not deny that a British Church was founded long before the coming of St. Augustine and his Roman monks; it must, however, be remembered that this British Church held the same faith as the Roman. It had its monks and nuns, its seven sacraments, and only disputed about the period of Easter and the supremacy of the Roman See. Therefore, if the Anglican be the

same as the ancient British Church, let her teach the same doctrine and follow the same rules. If we are a true branch cut off at the Reformation, let us hold the creed of the Greek Church, as she separated hundreds of years before on account of the supremacy so intolerable to Englishmen. Those who believe the English and Roman to be branch churches, should remember that branches of the same tree require the same sap. Now the sacraments are the very essence of a Church, and there cannot be opinions, but faith and obedience in regard to them. If we have not fallen from the One Faith, the Greeks and Romans must have done so, and how then can our sacraments, which have been transmitted from a thousand years of error and wrong belief, be apostolic?

The late Bishop of Llandaff, Dr. Coppleston, in 1841, says, "I had intended to introduce my own views as to the man of sin, but reading Todd's Lectures, and Maitland's, have made me pause. There is one point I am inclined to differ from them. They think that an apparent inconsistency is sufficient to refute an interpretation of prophecy. That to suppose the spiritual successors of the ministry transmitted through a medium characterized as antichrist amounts to a contradiction, now it may be a difficulty, an unaccountable mystery, so is the prevalence of evil."

It is indeed a mystery, especially as the spirit of truth was to guide into all truth, even unto the end

of the world. Mr. Drummond views it as a dead or inanimate presence of God. "The sacraments were promised to be true, and God keeps them so still. He does regenerate by Baptism, give us his flesh to eat in his sacrament, and his holy spirit to all who take orders; so that these are real and true sacraments, but nothing more is granted to the apostolic successors in consequence of their loss of faith and sin." Are not these Anglican views novel and singular, not to say inconsistent? Can the apostolic blessing continue on an Establishment which rejects the sacramental system of the Christian Church both East and West, and claims no authority but in union with a royal council, or an inward spiritual enlightenment of a most shadowy nature? The most worthy and decent of the sects she may be; but if our Saviour and his Apostles left us one rule and way of salvation, surely it is not to be found in our Royal Establishment. Discipline may be altered, Faith never.

THE SUPREMACY, MISSIONS AND DISCIPLINE.

A kingdom must have unity, and an executive; and a religious kingdom, like the one established by our Saviour for the whole world, cannot have in its creed, or spiritual government, *any national or territorial limits*. If then, we find both the Bible and the Church give encouragement to the idea, I cannot help acting on the supposition that our duty is to acknowledge one Metropolitan Bishop.

Although the Apostles were to be all equal, and behave towards each other with humility, not considering who should be the greatest, yet we are told that Simon the son of Jonas, was named by his master Peter, which means a rock, and that after Simon had on one occasion exclaimed "Thou art the Christ the son of the living God," "Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven, and I say *also* unto thee, that thou art Peter (not Simon) and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and

whatsoever thou shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Here, we see, that Peter was to be the instrument in the hands of God, to hold power and rule for his Maker in his visible kingdom, and we have before seen that the Spiritual power and dominion in the kingdom was given until the end of all things, Christ being ever with his Church to keep it from error.

The Church (to my mind) proved to be under God's infallible guidance, her executive or chief ruler must partake of the like blessing. As a bishop in his own diocese he is no greater than any other, his acts and deeds in it being derived from that same order of his God. "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, that ye may eat and drink at my table (the altar), and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Protestants fancy that the Metropolitan, or Pope, is considered absolutely infallible; this is not the case. As a man he is exposed to all the dangers and temptations to which flesh is heir; nevertheless, as the scribes and pharisees who sat in Moses' seat were to be obeyed concerning the law of Moses, so are the rulers of the Church concerning the law of Christ. To St. Peter alone was it said "Feed my sheep." "Feed my lambs." Seeing then that the idea of a visible head of the Church is no unreasonable thing, and that it appears to be confirmed by what we read of in the Bible, I proceed to consider how far history is in its favor. That St. Peter was crucified at Rome appears to be an historical fact, likewise that on his

death Linus, bishop of Rome, was considered the supreme ruler of the Christian body, from whom the dignity has been transmitted in unbroken succession to the present Pontiff.

St. Irenæus who had conversed with the disciples of the Apostles, appealed to the Chair of St. Peter as to his "rule of Faith established at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, that tradition which it has from the Apostles and the faith announced to men, coming down to us through the succession of bishops, for in truth with his Church, on account of its greater eminence it is necessary that every Church should agree, that is, those on every side who are faithful." *Contra Hæres, lib. iii. Ed. Ben. Venet. Pars i, p. 175.*

Tertullian, end of the second century, writes: "Behold an edict and even a peremptory one, emanated from the Sovereign Pontiff the Bishop of Bishops." *De Pudicitia, cap. i. "Audio Edictum et," &c.*


St. Polycarp calls Rome, "the greatest, most ancient, and most universally known Church, having been founded by St. Peter and St. Paul, to which every Church is bound to conform."

St. Cyprian in the third century, *Ep. 55, ad Cornelium*, writes: "after this a false Bishop having been appointed over them by heretics, they further presume to sail hither, and to bring letters from schismatics and profane persons to the Chair of Peter, and to the principal Church whence Episcopal Unity arose."le

Gregory of Nyssa, says: "Jesus Christ has given through Peter to the Bishops, the keys of the kingdom of heaven."

St. Chrysostom, in one of his Homilia, 88, in the fourth century, writes: "as (St. Peter) was distinguished among the Apostles, the mouth of the Apostles and head of the Choir, for this reason Paul went up to visit him before the others."

Gregory the Great, though he disclaimed the title of Universal Bishop, did exercise the power of Supreme Pastor throughout the Church. He says: "the care of the whole Church was committed to St. Peter, yet he is not called Universal Apostle; again, when Bishops commit a fault, I know not what Bishop is not subject to the See of Rome." To Augustine he wrote: "we commit all the Bishops of Britain to your care," &c.* Popery being generally considered as "full blown" after this period, we need not consult the works of later writers. Lest any one should imagine that later ages are considered to have developed Popery, I will quote Dr. Conyers Middleton's "*Free Inquiry*." In the preface he says: "It was in those primitive ages, particularly in the third, fourth and fifth centuries, those flourishing times of miracles, in which the chief corruptions of monkery, relics, invocations, prayers for the dead, the superstitious use of images and sacraments were introduced."

* It must be observed that these authors were never censured by the Church for this writing of the Roman See. 

I do not think it necessary to discuss the question whether the Pope, Mahomet, or Infidelity be anti-christ, or whether the Scarlet Lady of the Seven Hills be Christian or Pagan Rome. A fair knowledge of the drift and spirit of the system, followed by an examination of Scripture *without prejudice*, would prove to the educated and thoughtful mind the best defender of the Pontiff and Christian Rome. Some, however, may wish to know how one can get over the evils of Roman misgovernment? In answer, it may be as well to observe, that the States of the Church were given up to the Roman Bishops by the Gothic Kings, after the fall of the western empire, at a time, when amidst a chaos of confusion, the Bishops were the only persons to whom the inhabitants of the land could apply for help, and who consequently gave their votes in favor of Papal sway, which was for many years the most beneficial they could have enjoyed. At the present period, when civilization has advanced and laymen are become the most capable rulers and law makers, clerical dominion would be far better if confined to spiritual matters, and I suppose Protestant England has mainly to thank itself for the existence of the decrepid government of the Ecclesiastical States. The assumption of power by the Church, and especially by her chief Bishop during the middle ages, was far too great, and justified in a great measure the haughty bearing of the Venetian government towards her. The Venetians, unlike the English nation, could however,

distinguish between the things of Cæsar and of God. As a band of yellow drawn by the side of a band of blue, on damp paper, would produce a line of green which both colors might claim, because it contained portions of their own natures, so where the Spiritual rule meets the purely Earthly, there is a blending of interests claimed by Church and State. Hence the origin of montane and ultra-montane theories. Well would it have been had the Church not chosen to claim possession of this green border, influencing it more by means of the consciences of her sons, than by the thunders of her discipline. That the Pope may be fallible in conduct (even in the eyes of a Catholic Archbishop of the middle ages) I admit by the following quotation which appeared in *The Times* for September, 1851, and was signed Fidus :

“ Sacriligious men, murderers, plunderers, are absolved, impenitent men, whom I boldly pronounce on Christ’s word though the world be against me ; not even St. Peter, were he in the Roman See, could absolve in God’s sight. I will trouble the Court of Rome no longer, let those apply to her who are strong in their iniquities, and after triumphing over justice, and leading innocence captive, return in glory for the confusion of the Church.”

MISSIONS.

That Christ’s universal truth should be spread by means of gigantic missions is self-evident. A glimpse of what the Church is doing I will give from English

authors. In the *Illustrated London News* for Feb. 1st, 1851, I find: "The Propaganda is the grand missionary head quarters of the Roman Catholic Church, and its system of education is one of the most comprehensive that was ever devised in any age or country, for any purpose whatever. It was aptly compared by a witty Frenchman to a sword, the handle of which remained at Rome while the point reached everywhere. Its object is to educate students for the service of the Altar in their own countries respectively, and for the propagation of the faith amongst men of every complexion and language on the habitable globe. In its classes may be found accordingly Chinese, Hindoos, Negroes, Natives of Pegu, Siam, or other remote parts of Asia and Africa; inhabitants of the different countries of South America, of the United States, and of Europe. Their education comprises theology and the scriptures, moral science, history, logic, and the learned languages." Surely this is to carry out the order of our Saviour, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel, not send it merely to explain itself, or be explained by half educated foreigners. Great gifts from heaven were required by the Apostles before they left their homes to preach the truth, and shall we not as far as may be follow their examples? Mr. Kip, in his *Christmas Holidays in Rome*, says of this institution: "It has been justly regarded by the Church of Rome as her right arm of strength, the school in which are trained her missionaries for every

foreign land. The building is large, supplied with a magnificent library, and with a press, by which books are printed in almost every known language." "In Naples there is a branch of it devoted entirely to the instruction of young Chinese." "The Catholic character of the institution is shown by the fact that the composition of essays, poems, and colloquies of the students were in fifty-nine different languages and dialects; when shall our own Church be thus prepared to go forth with the pure Gospel to all nations and kindreds, and people and tongues?" The hated Jesuits are the greatest missionaries the Catholic Church possesses. Mr. Seymour in his *Mornings among the Jesuits*, thus writes: "While these interesting revelations came from my friend, he seemed not aware that he was giving to the order the very character that made it disliked by me, as showing that all the members made themselves the mere tools or instruments to give effect to the designs of the General and his Council."

Who among the soldiers of the Bible deserve to be called the mere tools of that inspired Book? Does not the loss of faith in the Church shake our faith in the words of Scripture whenever they seem to differ from our own opinions? Do we sell all that we have and give to the poor, forsake houses and land for the Gospel's sake? Have we the minds of little children in the belief of things difficult or impossible to our humanity, simply because we find that written in the Bible?

Mr. Seymour next observes: "It was a practical confutation of those, and I confess I was myself once among the number who suppose that the Romish priests are all infidels, that the simple and superstitious and ignorant may perhaps believe what they are taught, but that the talented and educated are infidel as to some of the doctrines which they inculcate. I am fully persuaded, while this may be true of some, it is not true of many whose acquaintance I was enabled to make during my residence at Rome. They were educated, learned, astute and talented men, and yet believed things contrary to all experience, reason, and revelation. I regard them as melancholy evidences of the fall of human nature, and sad monuments of the shipwreck of the human judgment, evidencing to the world that no reach of human intellect, and no grasp of mental genius, and no range of this world's learning, can bring the true and saving knowledge of God to the mind and heart of man. The record may be a saddening one, but it is true. 'The world by wisdom knew not God.' This is a pretty business: the poor and ignorant are blamed for their folly and superstition; the jesuits for believing contrary to all worldly experience and reason (as little children), because their Church tells them it is not contrary but rather agreeable to revelation; then they are blamed for having so much worldly wisdom without saving knowledge, and told that by wisdom they cannot find out God, for his wisdom is foolishness to the world, and contrary to human

reason. In fact they are blamed because their Church does not teach them in things contrary to human wisdom, exactly like Mr. Seymour's Church teaches him. Mr. Seymour says we must judge for ourselves what the Bible declares ; the Jesuits what the Church says the Bible declares. Suppose then the English Church to be Mr. Seymour, and the Roman Church his Jesuit friend, why should not the private judgment of the latter be as worthy of attention, on Mr. Seymour's own principle, as the private judgment of the former ? Surely this good Protestant must see the weakness and injustice of his argument, although I am aware that he has no wish to be counted " a fool for Christ's sake."

Can we believe with Exeter Hall that a system like the Jesuits', being a perpetual self-mortification, comes from the devil ? One which aims and wishes to substitute heaven for worldly pursuits to be anti-christian ? Obedience and humility, even if mistaken, works of the devil ? Faults and sins there always must be among men, but does that prove the intention to be evil ? To give up every thing earthly for the love of God, and having him only for one's portion, may be foolish and unnecessary, but it cannot be wicked. True the devil may take advantage of a system which attempted too much " for sinful man below the sky," and be permitted now and then to gain an advantage over it, but is that any proof that the institution is from hell ? Protestantism is a far easier plan, which, however, is most like St.

Paul's. The Jesuits are all missionaries, as was St. Paul, conspirators to bring every one into subjection to Christ and his Church, as did St. Paul. To be all things to all men that they may gain some, as was St. Paul!

Granting then as I do, that some Jesuits have acted harshly and cruelly, some to have been immoral, some without due regard to truth, I cannot for a moment allow that their system does, or ever did, approve of those evils so often laid to its charge; nor will I allow that the Church of England is more anxious for the interests of morals, or more zealous in the cure of souls, than is the Jesuit order.* Our cold-heartedness creeps out in the public papers to a most curious extent. What would be said of a Dublin Roman Catholic paper publishing the following? "*Ecclesiastical Gazette*," August 12th, 1851. "A clergyman of the old Church of England principles desirous of meeting with a commodious house of residence, ten bedrooms, in a pleasant marine situation, mild air, good neighbourhood, with light parochial duty, with or without land, may apply, prepaid, to the Incumbent of ———, near Falmouth." "Church Preferment.—For sale, with prospect of immediate possession, a valuable living, situated in one of the most agreeable and healthy of Her Majesty's colonies, offering to a gentleman of

* The reader should study the lives of these Jesuits, who are revered by the Church, before he abuses the Order for the craft and crimes of its wicked, or worldly-minded members.

unexceptionable character an unusually comfortable and influential position." Or, the "*Times*," November, 1851.—"Eligible Church preferment.—Somersetshire.—For sale, the advowson and next presentation to a desirable living, well situated in a pleasant neighbourhood near an excellent town in Somersetshire. There is a capital *parsonage-house*, grounds, &c., and the income amounts to nearly £600 per annum. *Population* small."

DISCIPLINE.

If our Lord did leave a rule of conduct and faith to be preached to all the world, and if he desired all his followers to be of one mind, it would appear that those who attempt to carry out their Master's wishes must have dogmas, and be more strict than theorists in carrying them out. They must act as if they were certain, which is another word for infallible. They must treat the books of their law with all reverence, but they must take care that the people do not differ as to the interpretation of books, which being written in two languages, neither of which are now spoken, and often obscure in their meaning, are liable to be misconstrued. It therefore follows that the translations of the sacred volume should be jealously watched.

We must remember how other creeds dislike Catholic Bibles; and again, that the teaching of the Bible being considered more useful to the poor than its mere perusal, the same stress need not be laid on its being

constantly read as with us. I *cannot find* that it is less understood, or that Catholics consider it as any other than the text-book of their religion, the written part of the Divine word from God to man. In a report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1850 I found the following passage, intended to show the wickedness of the Papists in prohibiting the Bible. I trust, however, that the candid reader will draw from the passage a different conclusion. Address of the Bishops of Lombardy at Milan in the same year :
“ The Church, by the mouth of the Roman Pontiff, has forbidden her children to read the Bible in any vulgar tongue whatsoever, and has not even sanctioned the various Catholic authors, though free from all suspicion, *unless* they have received the approbation of the Apostolic See, and were furnished with annotations taken from the works of the Fathers or of learned and Catholic writers. Be careful then that prohibited Bibles and bad books leading astray from the Faith, do not find their way into Christian families. Let the faithful read the Holy Scriptures, but let them be such as are furnished by the Church, which is the sole depository and interpreter of the sacred volume.” If this had been spoken by English Bishops and Dissenting Ministers, against Popish and Unitarian translations of the Latin and Greek Scriptures, would it not have been well received ? Let us then judge as we should wish be to judged. The Catholic wishes to teach God’s truth, so does the Protestant. The Catholic holds God’s word to be

contained in the Bible, so does the Protestant. The Catholic knows it is often wrested, and wrong interpretations are put on its meaning, so does the Protestant. But the Catholic holds the traditions or oral teaching of the Church, as the only true interpretation; and the Protestant, that every man has a right to judge for himself. Nevertheless most of them so strongly object to others differing from themselves in this interpretation, that they do not hesitate to say that their unfortunate brethren have not been renewed in the heart, and are in the bondage of Satan!!!

What is this but saying with the Lombard Bishops "Let the faithful read the Holy Scriptures, but let them be such as are furnished by our Church, which is the sole depository and interpreter of the Sacred Volume." I admit and lament that Catholic Bibles have not been sufficiently spread through foreign lands, but maintain that it never was occasioned by a want of love or reverence towards the Inspired book. At the same time I would suggest as a matter of thought, that for 1500 years after our Lord founded his Church, the poor *could only* have the Gospel preached unto them; they could never have obtained a copy of it, even had it been translated into their own languages. This to my mind is no slight argument against the idea of those who consider that the circulation of the Bible amidst the poor, is the main thing needed for carrying out God's work. England is not any better than other European nations for all the Bibles sown among her people; the general amount of crime, ignorance, and vice, is pretty much

the same all over Europe ; we might back Glasgow and Stockholm, any day against Vienna or Paris, for debauchery ; or Belgium against Exeter Hall, for sincere religion. Whenever then Protestants are inclined to get very angry at the notion of there being any prohibited books in the nineteenth century, they should remember that the object for which they are excluded, is the same for which some of their own Clergy refrain from reading Popish books, however full of devotion they may be ; and *oblige* those of their own congregations over whom they have any influence to do the same, considering such reading as running into temptation. *Notwithstanding* they say at other times, the reading of the Bible is sufficient to drive away all religious error, especially Popery !!! Is it not a similar feeling which induces parents to refuse to see, or aid, their children in any way, because they dare to follow the wicked system of Popery ! which made a clergyman say in public, that Popish priests ought to be killed, or driven out of the land ! In fact the endeavour to keep one's friends in that which we consider the right path, in spite of their better judgment, is simply persecution.* As

* The Catholic Church hates heresy, or soul-murder, as she does a murderer of the body, because both are enemies of her Master, Jesus Christ. But it is not her province to enforce the execution of the sinner, either for the temporal, or the spiritual crime. Whether execution in this world should take place for murder, is a disputed point amongst loyal subjects of Her Majesty ; this is the case respecting the right of punishment for spiritual crimes amongst loyal Catholics. Mr. Pierce Connelly's quotations, from Pascal the Younger, will not prove, to any candid or intelligent mind, that persecution for heresy must be held by all good Catholics, any more

every one knows how persecuting Catholics have been, I think it but fair in this place to quote a few passages from a book of the Laws against Papists and Popish Recusants, Nonconformists, and Nonjurors, published in 1744, by his then Majesty's command. "A person saying Mass (Holy Communion) forfeits two hundred marks, and shall suffer one year's imprisonment, and until the fine be paid. A person hearing Mass, one hundred marks, and one year's imprisonment (page 10). The poor Dissenter or Reformer from the Church of England had to say, "I, A. B., do humbly confess and acknowledge, that I have grievously offended God in contemning her Majesty's godly and lawful government and authority, by absenting myself from Church, and from hearing Divine Service, contrary to the godly laws and statutes of this realm; and in using and frequenting disordered and unlawful conventicles and assemblies, under pretence and color of the exercise of religion; and I am heartily sorry for the same, and do acknowledge and testify in my conscience, that no person hath, or ought to have any power or authority over her Majesty," &c. (page 19). Against Quakers: "If any person who maintains that the taking an oath is unlawful, refuse to take an oath when he is lawfully required, or endeavours to persuade others

than that all good Protestants in Ireland must of necessity be Orangemen. Mr. Connelly having acted very improperly behind the scenes, deems such acting necessary to the Catholic system; he must have known plenty of scandals amongst the Protestant Clergy, and ought in fairness to quote their sins, as proofs of the evils of Protestantism.

to refuse;" "or if five or more people called Quakers, being sixteen years of age, assemble under pretence of religious worship, forfeit a sum not exceeding five pounds for the first offence, not exceeding ten pounds for the second; and where no distress can be had, to be committed three months for the first offence, and kept to hard labor for the second, with six months; and for the third offence, to be transported to the plantations, or abjure the realm" (page 57).

The following inscription was taken from the Covenanters' tombstone in the Grey Friars Churchyard, Edinburgh, and tells a sad story of the persecuting spirit of the English Church.

"Halt, passenger, take heed what you do see,
 This tomb doth show for what some men did die.
 Here lies interred the dust of those who stood
 'Gainst perjury, resisting unto blood;
 Adhering to the covenants, and laws
 Establishing the same, which was the cause
 Their lives were sacrificed unto the lust
 Of Prelatists abjured. Though here their dust
 Lies mixed with murderers, and other crew
 Whom justice justly did to death pursue;
 But as for them no cause was to be found
 Worthy of death, but only they were found
 Constant and stedfast, zealous, witnessing
 For the prerogatives of Christ their king,
 Which truths were sealed by famous Guthrie's head,
 And all along to Mr. Renwick's blood,
 They did endure the wrath of enemies,
 Reproaches, torments, deaths, and injuries,
 But yet they're those who from such troubles came,
 And now triumph in glory with the Lamb.

From May 27th, 1661, that the Most Noble Marquis of Argyle was beheaded, to 17th Feb. 1668, that Mr. James Renwick suffered, were, one way or

another, murdered and destroyed for the same cause about eighteen thousand, of whom were executed at Edinburgh about one hundred noblemen, gentlemen, ministers, and others, noble martyrs for Jesus Christ. The most of them lie here." "For a particular account of the cause and manner of their sufferings see the Cloud of Witnesses, Crookshank's, and other histories."

I am sure all right minded Protestants, as well as Catholics, would condemn such acts of barbarity; however, when the gunpowder plot, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and other odious doings are charged to the Catholic system, one cannot help reminding them equally of the righteous deeds of their ancestors.

The celibacy of the clergy in the Catholic Church is one of the errors which is said to prove her anti-christ. Now although I should prefer a modified system, at least for England, where the people appear so especially fond of *lawful comforts*, that to give up any of them is peculiarly distressing, I cannot get myself to condemn the idea which accepts no one for a clergyman who is not willing to devote himself entirely to his work. St. Paul said he thinks he has the spirit of God in saying that those who devote themselves to their parishes are better without wives. Have we any right to assert that the Church teaches a doctrine of Devils in accepting only of such persons? They are not compelled to become Churchmen. They are educated more strictly than with us, and certainly our easy married clergy are not equal to them in looking after their people; and for mis-

sionaries the comparison is ludicrous. The scandals of wicked priests are for ever brought up to prove that they ought to marry; as well might the same scandals amongst us prove that we require two or more wives, because St. Paul told Timothy that a *Bishop* should only possess one wife!

That our Saviour contemplated the possibility of such a state I cannot but believe, if what Matthew says in his eighteenth chapter be true, "All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given: for there are some eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb, and there are some which were made eunuchs of men, and there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of Heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it let him receive it." Again: "Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit (not hell) everlasting life."

The same observation of our Lord is quoted by St. Mark, and also by St. Luke. St. Paul said to Timothy "Thou therefore endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ, no man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life, that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier." Are these directions inferior to those of King Henry VIII. and Cranmer? That our good clergy are for the most part pretty well entangled, none can deny; nor can those who think little of the Sacred office be expected to comply with such rules. They must "be

able to receive it." Perhaps the day is not far distant when people will begin to think whether so great a sacrifice, a voluntary sacrifice, for Christ's service, be so very bad after all, and will try to find out whether among every thousand Catholic clergy there be more profligates than among a thousand Anglicans. Certainly to enter the Church for the sake of a profession is most objectionable. What do Anglicans give up for Christ's service which the Laity do not? Lastly, Protestants blame imprudent marriages, and multitudes of them are obliged on that account to lead single lives. Many fall into sin. Do Protestants sanction the unhappy consequence, or condemn it? Consider then that no one need be a clergyman, that in his case prudence means a sacrifice of himself to God's service, and that if he falls into sin, he is blamed just as much, and more, than men are blamed for not doing their duty in the world. The world is not wrong in recommending prudence, and scolding when men fall into temptation. Why then should not the Church recommend celibacy, by accepting the service of those only who are willing, and by God's blessing believe themselves capable of performing their duty in that state? With respect to those who live in convents I would simply observe, that they have as much right to live in perpetual prayer as in perpetual gaiety. If those scandalous scenes described by Mr. Hogan do occur, they only prove that in common with the Evangelical Protestant clergy, sin is ever ready if unwatched, to take advantage of humanity.

THE SACRAMENTS.

What is called the Sacramental system is based on the belief that the Almighty has been pleased to make use of earthly elements for the purpose of conveying religious benefit to man. Hence, although the Catholic Church believes with the Protestant that God alone is able to save the soul from eternal condemnation, she teaches us that material means have been devised to convey the grace, and prove the faith, without which it is impossible to please God. I understand then, that as the voluntary sacrifice of the Son of God in a human body on the cross was equally the means, with the sufferings of his Divine Soul, of man's redemption, so the water used in his name is equally with faith the means of a spiritual benefit. Also that the instrumentality of those holding a divine commission is with faith and repentance a means of the taking away of sin, or a confirmation of religious blessings. Lastly, it appears to me to follow as a necessary consequence to the foregoing, backed up as it is by the words of Scripture, and interpretation thereof by the Church: That as our Saviour veiled his Godhead in a babe's humanity for the sins of the world, so he has veiled himself again and again in the Holy Sacrament for

the individual benefit of the members of his mystical body. How in any of these cases good is effected we know not; it should suffice us to know God's will, and accept his means of pardon and peace. If anything requires the mind of a little child in God's revelation to man, it is the Sacramental system, without which, however humbled we might be for our sins and follies, nothing in the Bible that I can see demands a surrender of the intellect to the obedient thoughts and actions of a little child. Break one of the links in this mysterious chain, and to me Socinianism must follow.*

The utter uncertainty of the Protestant world, respecting the nature of these divine ordinances, is surely sufficient to make one doubt whether the Almighty did not leave a living expounder of his will, such as the Church pretends to be, in addition to the written words on those subjects scattered over the Bible. Most sects, if not most men, have different notions of the creed they ought to believe. The Church of Canterbury appears to hold two creeds, the Catholic and the Calvinist. Dr. Watson, bishop of Llandaff in 1795, told his clergy "not to esteem any particular opinion concerning the Trinity, satisfaction, and original sin as necessary to salvation;" he also says: "I think it safer to tell you where the

* I had here prepared some Scripture proofs, of the impossibility of holding the doctrine of the Incarnation; without, at the same time, allowing the interpretation of the Church to be infallible; but on second thoughts forbear to publish them, lest, instead of convincing my reader of the truth of the Catholic Faith, I should lead him to adhere to the doctrine of Socinus.

doctrines of Christianity are contained than what they are. They are contained in the Bible; and if in reading that book, your sentiments should differ from those of your neighbour, or from those of the Church, be persuaded that infallibility appertains as little to you as it does to the Church." Dr. Sykes contends: "That the articles were either purposely or negligently made equivocal;" so that he upsets Dr. Wordsworth's idea of the articles being made to agree with the liturgy, because they were made by the same parties, who could not contradict each other. Dr. Clayton, once the Bishop of Clogher, said: "No two thinking men ever agreed exactly in their own opinion, even with regard to one article of the Church of England." Certainly the present Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Exeter are not quite agreed as to what the Church teaches of baptism. Can it therefore be absurd in one left to choose for himself, if he follows the guidance of those men who, as already shewn, claim to have the true mind of Christ on these subjects, especially since in the event of being wrong he can but quote the English bishop, that "Infallibility appertains as little to the English as it does to the Catholic Church!!!"

BAPTISM.

Our Lord, when he taught his apostles the New Testament faith, bid them go and teach it to all nations, even to the end of time. Those who were taught were accountable for believing or not believing that faith. If they believed, and acted on their

belief by being baptized with water, they were elected into the society of the sons of God, and made heirs of God's kingdom, and those who had sinned were pardoned, while those who as infants had not committed actual sin, nevertheless by virtue of the water of Baptism had their original sin blotted out, and with their parents became elect Christians and heirs of heaven; so that many were called, and the visible Church increased greatly. The Bible tells us, however, that but few are chosen, and we know that the seeds of sin remain in all men through life, so that neglect of the rules laid down by Christ for his people will be followed by fresh sin, and sin unrepented of, will lead to eternal death. As there be many heirs who never obtain their inheritance, so many baptized persons will lose their souls, and be more awfully punished than the heathens. This knowledge and teaching prevents any of those errors respecting the certainty or otherwise of baptized persons, said to be so hurtful to members of the English Establishment. We also lose the benefit of the Sacrament of Confirmation by the laying on of the hands of a bishop, if, as I before hinted, our bishops have by their departure from the faith lost their divine commission and its attendant blessings; yet this even is not so serious as our deprivation of the Sacrament of

PENANCE, OR REPENTANCE,

for as we are constantly falling into sin and lost for ever, unless we repent, surely repentance is most

needful ; and if, as the Church of England allows, Christ's ministers have power to pardon them that truly repent, we require his ministers for that purpose, and they cannot know whether we repent or not unless we explain matters to them ; also we must remember, that we may think we have repented of our sins, when we have not done so truly, and the matter is too serious a one to allow of a chance to be thrown away, because if God's grace has given us a way of Salvation, it is not too much to expect that we should walk in that way. If we confess our sins, it at least proves that we wish to repent, and wish to follow Christ's rule to the letter, as of course no one ever confessed to his minister without confessing to Almighty God, and as no one confessed what he never did, nor can the minister originate any question, it is evident to those who will honestly examine, that the objections and filthy ideas so frequently brought against this Sacrament, are beside the mark. I firmly believe that no pure minded person ever was injured by this ordinance. Some amongst the impure, may have again fallen into sin, even in this means of grace, but that should not prevent the majority from obtaining great blessings any more than the misconduct of some medical man should deprive all persons of medical aid. The Rev. Mr. Ryle says in one of his little tracts, "And here I will not shrink from warning all young men to remember the seventh commandment, to beware of impurity of every kind. I fear there is often a want of plain speaking on that point of God's law ; but

when I see how Prophets and Apostles have dealt with this subject, when I observe the open way in which the Reformers of our own Church denounce it, when I see the number of young men who walk in the footsteps of Reuben, and Hophni, and Phineas, and Ammon, I, for one, cannot with a good conscience, hold my peace. I doubt whether the world is any better for the excessive silence which prevails about this commandment." Penance then, or Repentance with Confession, is well termed in the *Dublin Review* the great balance to Baptism, keeping it secure from those dangers to which High Church views are said to lead, within our own communion: for what Catholic ever thought himself safe because his sins were taken away in Baptism? How could high views of that Sacrament ever be to him a soul-destroying system? Some argue against the remission of original sin by Baptism; that in the case of infants, the benefit of regeneration depends on the will of the parents; which argues God to be unjust. To this we may reply, that the heathens are dependant on missionary aid, so that the voluntary offerings of Christians, more or less, may, or may not, be the means of their being brought to a knowledge of the way of Salvation. If then we suppose God to be unkind to infants, would it not imply the same to the Heathen world?

EXTREME UNCTION.

When the fever of life has passed, and the departing Christian following the directions of St. James,

has called for the minister of the Church to pray over him, can it be, that the anointing with oil in the name of the Lord, that body by whose means sin has passed so often to his soul, is objectionable? Can it be, that any one calling himself a Christian, will seriously blame such a service, or refuse to believe, that thereby God will not be well pleased to convey his grace?

HOLY COMMUNION.

Why should we not believe what we cannot understand, when it relates to the properties, and powers, and good pleasure of God? Is it not probable that to try our faith, and above all, our pride, the Saviour did not make his hard sayings more easy to our finite understandings?

“Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the Sadduces,” said our Lord, and his friends reasoning on the exact meaning of the words, were answered by him thus: “O ye of little faith, why don’t ye understand that I bade ye not beware of such leaven,” then they understood that he spake of the doctrine. Why then if Christ explained one mistake, did he not do so on a more important subject, when many left him because they could not understand how he could give them his flesh to eat. Surely had they not understood him in a Catholic sense, instead of a Protestant, they would never have left him, nor would he for so reasonable a mistake, have permitted them to cast him off for ever.

Again, is it so very absurd to believe that the God

who became man, even a babe, born of a woman, uniting human flesh with his divine nature, for ever ; should see fit to unite this same glorified and subtle body with the species of bread and wine ? That as he saved us from eternal pain by the suffering of his body, so we might individually be refreshed and nourished by him in his Holy Sacrament ? Dr. Ridgley, the Puritan Divine before mentioned, whom I must be allowed to consider as of equal authority with the Evangelical part of the Church, says, vol. i, page 73, " Our Saviour took occasion to display his own glory as the Lord and Governor of his Church, even before his incarnation, to whom he often appeared in human form, assumed for that purpose, as a prelibation thereof, so that they had the greatest reason from hence, to expect his coming in our nature." Again in page 120, " We must not suppose that the Holy Ghost uses any figurative ways of speaking, so as to cast a veil on plain truths ;" but alas in page 554 of the same volume he observes : " That which led them (the Papists) into this mistake was their misunderstanding the sense of our Saviour's words, ' Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.' " Is this logical ? If so, let us see how the mistake arose. We find, as Dr. Ridgley observes, that our Lord once appeared to Abraham, and eat and drank with him, before the destruction of Sodom. Again, the Lord appeared unto Joshua, who " fell on his face to the earth, and did worship." We also know that after

Abraham had overcome the kings of the Salt plain, he was met by Melchisedek, the priest of the Most High God, who gave him bread and wine. In the New Testament we are further told who this priest was: "That he was without descent, neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God." Moreover, we are informed that Christ should be a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedek, that is, one offering sacrifice, otherwise he is not a priest; the sacrifice being bread and wine, otherwise it is not after his manner. It is true our Saviour was the type of the Lamb slain once a year by every Jewish family, and also that he was the type of those sacrifices day by day offered in the temple at Jerusalem. It is equally true, that although it was impossible for the blood of Sacrifices to take away sin, yet that by Christ's one bloody Sacrifice on the Cross for all men, he redeemed the whole world. This however, will not explain what is intended by Christ's being a priest for ever, because one offering cannot include all time, save in its results. With regard to the Divine victim it is not perpetual, having been completed for more than eighteen hundred years. Again, as before observed, the priesthood must be after the order of Melchisedek, who sacrificed no blood, but offered bread and wine. I am forced then by the Bible itself to consider that the priesthood of Jesus must continue active to the end of time, and that he must offer to God an unbloody offering like that of Melchisedek. Was not this

foretold by Malachi: "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; (this must be after Christ came;) and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen saith the Lord of Hosts."

When, as time passed on and the Saviour appeared in mortal form, we have four short notices of his life. In them we learn that on two several occasions many thousands of the people were fed by a few loaves and fishes, not sufficient on natural principles for a hundredth part of the multitude, and moreover that there remained of the provisions, fragments sufficient to fill twelve baskets. These miracles were so subtle and secret, that I suspect many in the multitude knew not of them, and most men now-a-days, would have been anxious to consider them sleight of hand; especially if they believed with the Church of England, that it be repugnant to nature, for Christ's glorified body to be in two or more places at the same time. For it is manifestly repugnant to natural food to fill three or four thousand people and yet remain in greater quantity than before it was eaten. If it be replied the latter was a miracle, I answer, none suppose in the Catholic Church, Christ's glorified body, to be subjected to those laws which hold and restrain our natural bodies. St. John informs us in his 6th chapter, that the morning after the five thousand had been fed with five loaves and two small fishes, the

Lord said they cared more for the loaves and fishes, than to see his miracles. That they should labour for what would never perish, but endure to everlasting life, which he would give them. On their asking for a sign from him, and stating that Moses gave them manna, Jesus said he would give them the true manna, and that he was the Bread of life. Of course the Jews murmured at his being the bread of heaven or coming from thence at all, when our Lord replied, "Your fathers who eat manna are dead. I am the living manna. If any man eat of me, he shall live for ever. The bread I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

Now as Christ actually died on the Cross, this cannot be a figure, and if he is a priest for ever, offering himself after the fashion of Melchisedek, the whole mystery of this conversation is cleared up. Then however, as now, the Jews said, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? When our Saviour instead of explaining himself as at other times was his custom, suffered most of his disciples to leave him with the hard saying "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." The expression afterwards used, "The Spirit quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing," shows that the power of God, not natural laws, worketh the virtue to man and the miracle in himself. This introduction by St. John, whose Gospel we must remem-

ber was admitted by the Church into the Canon of Scripture after Popery had begun, prepares us for the account the other three Gospels give of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament, when our Lord took Bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said "Take Eat, this is My Body; and he took the cup and gave thanks, and said Drink Ye all of it, for this is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the Remission of Sins." Once more after his Passion our Lord met two disciples, with whom, having conversed and eaten bread unknown as to his sacred character, he proceeded to communicate to them the adorable mystery, and immediately vanished out of sight. At that period the work of Redemption was finished, and that kingdom had begun of which there shall be no end. If then our Lord's glorified body was so subtle that he could enter into a room the doors being shut; if, contrary to nature, he could suddenly vanish out of sight; if he ascended to Heaven contrary to gravity, and was even before his death transfigured contrary to nature, why should we disbelieve his mystic presence in the Sacrament because we cannot perceive him, and such presence would be contrary to the senses? Dr. Ridgley adds, because man would have the power to make the Body and Blood of Christ. This is as much as saying that Christ had no right to promise to the Apostolic and Priestly office that he would condescend to be present at, and take unto himself the veil of his own Sacrament!

Was there any thing unusual to mortal eyes in the appearance of the little babe born in a stable at Bethlehem? And why not? Because God had become man and veiled himself in that humble form. What is inconsistent with the Infinite nature of God Incarnate? The Divine Body raised as St. Paul expresses it a Spiritual Body.

I suppose that to an angel who was able to comprehend the exceeding might of Him who made the worlds, and fills all space, before whom the inhabitants of earth are but as grasshoppers, or the small dust of the balance, it would appear of little count in amount of dignity, whether that Almighty one, to save a soul from death, took the form of a Human Infant in its mother's womb, or was contented to veil himself, under the guise of Bread and Wine.

We have now to consider the testimony which history affords to the truth of what I have assumed. St. Paul in the 10th of Corinthians speaks thus: "The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ? for we many are one bread, one body, because we are all partakers of that one bread." In the 11th chapter we also read of Christ's institution of the Sacrament, and that St. Paul did not consider it a figure is to me evident, because he adds "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, for he that eateth and

drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body."

How is it conceivable that the eating of common bread and drinking common wine, even by the ungodly, should be any greater sin than doing what God has commanded the ungodly to do before they can expect to receive grace, namely, to pray? But if on the other hand, we do feed on him in his Sacrament, the act in the case of a wicked person, appears at once, awful, and insulting.

An able writer has observed "The same rationalistic process which will dare to pierce the veil of mystery in which the union of men with their Saviour has been shrouded, will also dare to divert the Incarnation of its mystery, and reduce it to some intelligible formula, expressing the mere operation of the Spirit of God on some chosen human spirit." I know not how to disprove the popular idea of the novelty of the preceding views respecting the Holy Sacrament, better than by the following few extracts from ancient history. The Pagan Romans according to Gibbon said of the Christian Sacrifice "There were many who pretended to confess, or relate, the ceremonies of this abhorred society. It was asserted that a new born infant entirely covered over with flour, was presented like some mystic symbol of initiation, to the knife of the proselyte, that as soon as the cruel deed was perpetrated, the sectaries drank up the blood, that afterwards at the appointed moment the lights were suddenly extinguished, &c., &c." St. Irenæus

says : " That Christ had taught a new oblation in the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles, does offer throughout the whole world." Origen says : " Manna was formerly given us as a figure, but now, the flesh and blood of the Son of God is specifically given, and is real food." Ep. 54, ad Cornel. In the fourth century St. Gregory of Nyssa : " The body of Christ was by the inhabitation of the word of God transmuted into a Divine dignity, and so I now believe that the bread sanctified by the word of God, is transmuted into the body of the word of God. The bread, as the Apostle says, is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, not that as food, it passes into the body, but that it is instantly changed into the body of Christ, agreeably to what he said : ' This is my body,' and therefore does the Divine word commix itself with the weak nature of man, that by partaking of the Divinity, our humanity may be exalted." St. Ambrose says : " Was the order of nature followed when Jesus was born of a virgin ? Plainly not. THEN why is that order to be looked for here ?" St. Gregory who sent St. Austin to convert England says : " Since God willing I shall say mass thrice to-day, I cannot be very long in my discourse upon the Gospel." In the year 900 the Greek Church separated from the Roman, it has never changed its faith since that period, it therefore is a standing witness that before and ever since 900 the whole Christian world (except the Reformers of the last three hundred years) have believed in the Ca-

tholic doctrine on this point, as well as to the pretended novelties, of prayers for the dead and addresses to the Saints. At the Reformation Luther could not agree with the other Protestants who denied the real presence, and he pronounced those who denied the doctrine as "heretics and damned souls, for whom it is not lawful to pray." He also wrote in his *Epist. ad Amicos Argent.* tom vii, fol. 502. "If Carolstadius, or any man else, could five years ago have convinced me that in the Sacrament there is nothing but Bread and Wine, he had wonderfully obliged me, for with great anxiety did I examine this point, and labor with all my force to get clear of the difficulty, because by this means I knew very well I should terribly incommode the Papacy. But I find I am caught without hopes of escaping. For the text of the Gospel is so clear and strong, that it will not easily admit of a misconstruction." Dr. Wordsworth objects to the Catholic Faith, that the Councils of Constance, and Trent, were not agreed upon the mystery, but the difference appears a mere quibble, one Council having to contend against heresy, decreeing that we must believe Christ, to be whole, and entire, in the Sacrament; does not call in question the truth of that other decree, in which it is said; that the bread of Communion is our Lord's body, and in the cup, is contained his blood; as the Church equally teaches, that our Lord, is in the one, present under the veil of Bread, and in the other, present under the veil of Wine. What the Church of England teaches is

vague and uncertain. Mr. Bartlett, a learned Dissenter at Bideford, in the year 1714 thus speaks of the Holy Communion: "You are to believe that Christ is as certainly present at the table as if you could see him with the eye of the body. If he is present with two or three gathered together in his name, doubtless he is so at his table; you are called to contemplate the Lamb slain, and to admire and adore him. This is a part of worship much like the heavenly. The inhabitants of heaven are in the Revelations represented as assembled together around the Lamb that was slain, falling down before him, praising and adoring him. Thus it is in the blessed Sacrament, to draw so near the great God, as you do at this ordinance, to sit at the table of the king of Saints, a table which the Lord calls his; to be taken into such familiarity with the eternal God, to see Christ's body broken, and his blood shed, and to partake of that bread which is the Communion of the body of Christ, and of that cup which is the Communion of the blood of Christ, is awful, very awful." Now I do not contend that this good man was a believer in the Catholic doctrine on the point in question, but merely wish to show how a pious mind felt a hundred and forty years ago, just midway from the period when England left the fire of love which must ever accompany a reality in religion, for the cold and sober system of a figurative theory. For our belief then of the true presence of Christ in his Sacrament we have two foundations. First, the

authority of our Lord as represented by the Catholic Church; Secondly, the difficulty of coming to any other conclusion from Protestant premises, namely, the Bible being the Inspired word of God, which we are to receive in a child-like manner, and the majority of credible testimony having been in all ages in favor of the Catholic view. I cannot express this belief better than in the words of Moehler's Symbolism, translated by Robertson: "Catholics firmly hold that in the Sacrament of the Altar Christ is truly present, and indeed in such a way that Almighty God who was pleased at Cana of Galilee to convert water into wine, changes the inward substance of the consecrated bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. They therefore adore the Saviour mysteriously present in the Sacrament. The will of Christ to manifest his gracious condescension to us in the Eucharist forms no less an integral part of his great work than all besides, and in a way so necessary that whilst we here find the whole scheme of Redemption reflected, without it the other part would not have sufficed for our complete atonement. It must in no ways be separated from the other things which Christ has done for us. In this last portion of his great sacrifice, all the other parts are to be applied to us. Christ on the Cross is the universal victim. Here he is the victim for us in particular. The community continually needing forgiveness, strives ever more and more to appropriate to itself the merits of Christ. The present Saviour incessantly addresses

his father above; 'Behold in me the believing and repentant people,' and crieth to his brethren below: 'Come to me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you.' Each one who returneth to me with all his heart shall find mercy, forgiveness of sins, and every grace. Without this presence the Lord's Supper is a mere reminiscence of the sacrifice of Christ, exactly in the same way as the anniversary of some esteemed individual whose image it recalls to mind. The Mass is offered up for the living and the dead, that is to say, God is implored for the sake of Christ's oblation to grant to all those who are dear to us whatever may conduce to their Salvation, accordingly the faithful join in prayer, that the merits of Christ which are considered concentrated in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, should be applied to all needing and susceptible of them. The Congregation declares that in itself without Christ it discovers nothing agreeable to God, nothing but what is sinful. It gives itself up to Christ, hoping for his sake forgiveness of sins and eternal life. In this act the believer throws himself off in order to live only by Christ and in Him, hence he is in a state to enter into, to commune with him." Is this the spirit of antichrist? Moehler thus speaks of Communion in only one kind: "This custom was not first established by any ecclesiastical law, but was the consequence of the general prevalence of the usage. The rite had its origin in the monasteries, in consequence of a pious dread of desecrating by spilling and the like. However we should

rejoice if it were left free to each one to drink of the consecrated chalice, and this permission would be granted if with the same love and concord a universal desire were expressed for the use of the cup, as from the twelfth century the contrary wish has been expressed."

Those who have attentively read the preceding remarks must be aware that the Catholic holds the belief that our Lord is present whole and entire in both veils, so that all the faithful in taking the consecrated Host do "eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood." In this instance singularly enough, the Catholic Church is blamed for not holding with respect to the laity, the literal meaning of Christ's words, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," while at the same time she is blamed, for believing the literal truth of Christ's words, "This is my body."

GOOD WORKS.

Much has been written against the Catholic idea of Good Works. Let us see what it is. The Council of Trent says, "As a constant power flows from Christ the head on the justified who are his members, as from a vine to its branches; a power which precedes their good works, accompanies the same and follows them: a power without which they can be in no wise agreeable to God and meritorious; so are we bound to believe, that the justified are enabled, through works performed in God, to satisfy the divine law

according to the condition of this present life, and to merit eternal life when they depart in a state of grace.”

“ So great is the goodness of God towards all men, that he considers his own gifts as their merits. This doctrine can give no occasion to self dependence or self glory, but he who glorieth must glory only in the Lord.”

St. Philip Neri used “ every day to make a protest to God, saying, Lord beware of me to day, lest I should betray you and do you all the mischief in the world. The wound in Christ’s side is large, but if God did not guard me, I should make it larger. Lord, I protest before thee that I am good for nothing but to do evil. When ill he used to say that God had sent him that sickness to convert him.” “ A person considering the great gifts which God had granted to Philip, said to him one day, ‘ The Saints do great things, Father.’ He answered, ‘ Nay, not so, but rather God does great things in his Saints.’ ”

This man it should be remembered, believed in the regeneration of baptism and the merit of good works !

Bardo, a Catholic Archbishop of Mentz, born in the very midst of the dark ages, about the year 981, preached thus before the Emperor of Germany respecting the Saints, whom he was by Protestants presumed to worship. Most of the sermon has been translated by Dr. Maitland, and may be found in his history of the Dark Ages. “ And of the clouds Isaiah says, who are these that fly as clouds ? The

assemblies of the Saints, says he, shine as clouds, yea more than clouds, as it is written, they shall shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. They shine, one in chastity, another in simplicity, another in poverty of spirit, another as a peacemaker, so as to deserve to be called a son of God, another is crowned in blood, another meek so that he will hurt no one, another wise so as to teach the ignorant, and to conclude generally, each one specially shines with some particular virtue. But whatsoever the measure of this may be, at the same time, the whole is in God ! Great clouds and magnificently radiant there have been from the beginning of the world, but how great soever, they have passed away before the divine brightness."

"There is also another way of explaining this saying. You know the sun, you know its rays, you know the clouds. The clouds which are at a distance, opposite to the sun's rays, shine as long as they are thus before the sun, and as they approach nearer, so much more brightly do they shine ; but if the sun and the clouds come to be in the very same place, so that where the sun is above, there the clouds are below, they are neither called clouds, nor are they so in fact, but all the brightness is ascribed to the sun. What shall we call this, my brethren, but in some sort a type of the kingdom of heaven ? What do the clouds represent but the human race, beclouded with the night of sin ? What does the splendour of the sun represent but the light of the divine brightness ? What the rays

but the illuminating works of Christ? The clouds then in their own nature obscure, shine when breathed on by the rays of the sun, because human littleness shines when illuminated by the works of Christ. The nearer it approaches to the true sun so much the brighter it will be: and powers which by its own nature it had not, it receives by the illuminating Christ, the true sun: but if it shall attain to that same point of divine operation which is perfectly to give up the world, and with sedulous contemplation to look only to the divine will, and with the Apostle to say, 'But our conversation is in heaven,' then it partakes of the Deity, so that it ought to be called, not man but even God. Whence our Lord, in the Gospel, when he had prayed for his disciples, said, 'Not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me: that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us.' Not only that they may be called one in us which is great, but that they may be one in us which is greatest. 'That they may be,' he says, 'one in us,' that is, that these clouds following me, the sun, may, in my brightness, lose the nature of clouds, and be sun." I cannot omit to mention in this place, a singular proof that the Immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, (or her preservation from sin in order to render her more worthy to become the mother of our Lord) was held far and wide in the Eastern world, long before Protestant writers consider the error to have sprung up

in the Latin Church. In page 36 of *Sale's Koran* we find these words: "and called her Mary, and I commend her to thy protection, and also her issue, against Satan, driven away with stones." Note.— "According to a tradition of Mahomet every person that comes into the world is touched at his birth by the Devil, and therefore cries out; Mary and her Son only excepted, between whom and the Evil Spirit God placed a veil, so that his touch did not reach them."

INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

An Independent Minister named Lavington, who lived at Bideford some seventy years ago, thus expressed himself: "The King of kings sent death, the most gloomy of all his messengers, to arrest the friends we doated on, and to inform us that the Lord had set them apart for himself. We shuddered at the summons, and said, I pray thee have them excused, or called in foreign help, or sought to the physicians, and we sought also to God; we prayed most importunately ourselves, and desired the prayers of all that we thought had any interest at the throne of grace, and strove hard to keep them out of heaven," &c.

Again: "Think what joy it must have carried to heaven to see you on your knees; how angels and glorified spirits paused in the midst of their allelujahs to look at you, and cried out one to another, behold, he prayeth."

In the Bible we read that "There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." From these passages I gather that the Ancient Church is correct in teaching that we should pray for each other, and ask each others prayers for ourselves; also, that those in the invisible world are intimately connected with those here, although we see them not. Granted the Bible does not command us to ask the prayers of our departed friends, as Job's friends were commanded to ask his prayers, have we any right to say it forbids us to commune with the dead in Christ? Does the Bible command us to keep Sunday holy instead of the seventh day? Has the Church no voice in this matter, equal at least on Protestant principles to that of any other sect?

In Revelations, 8th chapter, 3rd and 4th verses, we read: "And another angel came and stood at the altar having a golden censer, and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints (saints above and saints on earth) upon the golden altar which was before the throne, and the smoke of the incense with the prayers of the saints ascended up before God out of the angel's hand." Now if the saints are with Christ, if they are one with him in his mystic body, if guardian angels are ever around us, can it be absurd that those in the world of spirits and with God should know what we are about, and what we request them to pray for us? and this being the case, surely the Mother of our Lord cannot be less willing or less able to ask for us

those things which are according to the will of God, than she was to obtain wine for her friends at the marriage-feast in Cana of Galilee.

Surely this cannot be idolatry, nor can it in any way prevent our adding with Mr. Ryle of Helmingham, "Without Christ we can do nothing: wisdom without Christ is folly, righteousness out of Christ is guilt and condemnation, sanctification out of Christ is filth and sin, redemption out of Christ is bondage and slavery."*

PURGATORY.

That some who desire to lead a religious life do not appear in a fit state to meet their judge at death is generally admitted. In this country, however, we suppose that by a miracle of divine favour they are made quite fit to enter heaven and obtain their eternal reward. Other people it is also admitted do lead more exemplary lives, do repent continually of the sins they commit, even the smallest and most venial, and are on their death-bed so angelic that none can

* Mr. George Finch has justly observed, in one of his tracts, that as the love of gold, which nobody worships as God, is called Idolatry, when it interferes with a due attention to God's service, so, although the Virgin be not worshipped as a goddess, nevertheless she may be so loved as to obstruct the due performance of man's duties to his Maker and Saviour. Such love and worship, if it ever took, or takes place, is contrary to the Catholic Faith. The truth is, that those who have loved the Virgin best, have ever been the most mindful of her Son, and ardent in his worship.

doubt but their joy has begun even on earth. Such latter persons the Catholic Church calls saints, and the former holy souls, who, while sorrowing for those sins which they never, or only partially sorrowed for on earth, are in a state of unrest or purgatory. This belief, founded on the justice of God, several passages of scripture, and the constant testimony of the Church, appears based on too solid a foundation to be successfully resisted. It is of this state St. Peter remarks in his 1st Epistle, ch. 3, v. 19, "By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient," &c. It is also of this prison, according to many learned men, that our Lord speaks in Luke, 12th chap., verse 59, "I tell thee thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the very last mite." 1 Corinthians, 3rd chap., verses 13, &c. and Matthew, 12th chap., 32nd verse, imply that some sins are forgiven in the separate state. St. Chrysostom is too much regarded, even by Protestants, not to have some authority in this case. He said, about three hundred years after Christ, "It was not without reason ordained by the Apostles that mention should be made of the dead in the tremendous mysteries, because they knew well that these would receive great benefit from it."—See *Milner's End*. Mr. Simson we have seen admits that the custom began as early as the second century, that is before the dark ages. The Apocrypha has that "It is a good and salutary thing to pray for the dead:" and we know that St. Austin prayed for

his mother Monica. These are respectable authorities on a subject not contradicted by any direct passage of scripture, and should weigh against Cranmer and Ridley, unless we are to believe nothing true but what we find clearly mentioned in the Bible, which of itself would involve the change of Sunday into the Saturday, Baptism by immersion, abstaining from the use of blood, and many other things in which we follow the Catholic Church.

The puritan Dr. Ridgley says: "The account the Papists give of this middle state is, they are exposed to torments little short of hell, and if they are not helped by the prayers of the Church they are in danger of being sent from thence directly to hell, from whence there is no release." Now as Catholics teach that no wicked person can enter purgatory, this remark of the Doctor was a gratuitous untruth.

A great deal of ridicule attaches to Catholics, for their constant habit of adding names to the list of persons who they consider beyond doubt present with Christ and members of his mystic body. This habit it should be remembered is a consequence of the doctrine of the invocation of saints, for unless one has good grounds to believe in the saintly state of those whom we invoke, the invocation must be vain. The Church is therefore most particular in her examination of the characters and lives of her children, and only after an investigation, which would satisfy a Protestant himself, will she admit the departed soul to be regarded as "absent from

the body and present with the Lord." She pretends not to say, who are not with her Lord, but only from time to time expresses her certainty of the bliss of those more eminent members, who while on earth, gave full proof of being sincere and humble followers, of her Lord and Master.

When David sinned in the matter of Uriah, God pardoned him, and yet punished him by the death of his child. And when King Hezekiah sinned by showing the glories of his kingdom to the ministers of the king of Babylon, he was pardoned, and received a remission of the punishment due for his sin. This last, is what the Church calls an indulgence, or remission of the temporal punishment due for sin, even after the sin itself is pardoned. The idea of the Church giving any pardon for sin by an indulgence is entirely false.

What she teaches respecting the use of images, and pictures, may best be explained, by a consideration of what Protestants believe and teach on the Fifth of November, when they think it their duty to burn images, and pictures, in dishonour of Catholic Bishops, Priests, Guy Fawkes, Foreign Generals, Emperors,

and other detested individuals. If one party may show dishonour to fancied enemies, by burning their images and pictures, surely another party may honour their friends by honouring representations of them. How in common sense, can the commandment given to the Jews when in the midst of Pagans, not to make an image of the true God, apply to representations of the human form, afterwards taken for our salvation, by the Second person of the Blessed Trinity, on whose *two commandments* were made to hang all the law and the prophets.

When a Royal Lady, and Cathòlic Queen, was being led to execution, by command of one whose superior power had the control of her earthly destiny, she was seen to bear in her hands the image of the crucified, upon which the Earl of Kent, who attended, desired her to put away such superstition and cleave to Christ in her heart. What then did the Lady answer? "I cannot hold in my hand the representation of his sufferings, but I must at the same time bear him in my heart."

SALVATION OUT OF THE CHURCH.

This is best illustrated by the following extract from Archbishop Bramhall's works, vol. i, page 198, Oxford edition. "Take two testimonies of the Bishop of Chalcedon. 'If they (the Protestants)

grant not salvation unto such Papists as they count vincibly ignorant of Roman errors, but only to such as are invincibly ignorant of them, they have no more charity than we, for we grant Church saving faith and salvation to such Protestants as are invincibly ignorant of their errors.' And in his book of the Distinction of Fundamentals, the same Bishop says: ' If Protestants allow not saving faith, Church and salvation to such as sinfully err in fundamentals sufficiently proposed, they show no more charity to erring Christians than Catholics do. For we allow all to have saving faith, to be in the Church, in way of salvation (for so much as belongeth to faith), who hold the fundamental points of the faith.' "

CONCLUSION.

I have now given some reasons for believing that our Lord's Message of Salvation is taught by the Ancient Church in the exact purity and fulness of the primitive Christians; of those who amidst the Roman catacombs have left us traces of their early worship. That it is only on the subject of the One Faith that I believe the Church to be infallible, I again repeat; also, that as a visible Church implies a kingdom with rulers and a chief, it is natural to consider that disputes should from time to time take place, as was the case with our Catholic ancestors and their Spiritual rulers.

What, however, has that to do with belief in the Faith, once for all ages delivered to those sent forth by our Saviour?

The Apostles are allowed on all hands to have been the ambassadors of God, charged to shew unto mankind the way of life and rules of faith. We are agreed moreover, that those Gospels, Epistles, and Divine Revelations which they wrote, should be considered part of the Word of God. Such being the case, unless it follows that their successors be infallible by virtue of the Divine promise, and remembering

as we must, that some portion of the Bible was not written by the Apostles, nor the Books of Scripture collected by them into one volume, and pronounced the Word of God : what is our position as Protestants in regard to the Bible ? We believe, as I have before stated, that in the second century prayers to Saints, and for the dead were known : that Purgatory was taught as an article of belief : nay, one has said, who had read a little more of history than the Saints of Exeter Hall, that the seeds of Popery were sown in the times of the Apostles ! And yet, when we come to examine into the formation of the Canon of Scripture, we find that after these practices were taught, even when the Jewish books called Apocrypha were added, the Canon of Scripture was first completed by the admission of the Revelations of St. John, &c., as before shown !

Mr. Burgess, of Chelsea, observes in page 57 of his *Sermons for the Times* : “ It is perfectly true that the Romanists admit the Scriptures to be the Word of God as we do : when they ask us how we learn that Scripture is Divine without the authority of the Church, they ask us a superfluous question, because we admit with them that the Scripture is the genuine and true Word of God, and that which they call Scripture, we call Scripture (the Apocryphal books excepted), therefore there is an end of the controversy in this matter.”

To myself I confess this account is most unsatisfactory, and being left free to think, am compelled to

consider it necessary either to accept the Church and the Bible, or to reject both. Not that I could suppose there never has been a Divine Revelation. The united testimony of all ages, conjoined to its harmony with our own wants and aspirations, sufficiently demonstrate that fact. The difficulty is to believe the *whole* Bible the Inspired Word of God, and that it contains no legends and opinions which we may accept or not, as we please, also historical fancies in the place of facts; for the intelligence which the Church possessed in and before the fifth century, if not heaven directed, was quite as liable to err, in deciding the Inspiration of the Epistles of St. Peter and Revelations of St. John, &c., as in deciding the Inspiration of the books of the Apocrypha, and admitting those practices which Protestants condemn as unscriptural and Popish. And this idea recurs to my mind whenever I advert to the subject of miracles. I admit that very many false miracles have been found out, and that pretended miracles are from time to time palmed off upon the credulous. But are all miracles to be accounted false because they are absurd; or unnecessary, as we think; or because the days of miracles are passed? How do we know that miracles were to cease as soon as the Apostles were no more? How can we call any thing absurd, when we believe (no matter on what authority) that a false prophet, as the matter turned out, was swallowed up by a fish, and lived three days and three nights riding about in his stomach!! That two thousand pigs, were ordered

to run down in one vast army into a deep lake, because a mad man had been cured ! That Elijah, the prophet, rode up to heaven in a chariot of fire, driven by horses of the same nature ! That an axe-head was made to swim, by a stick being thrown in after it ! That a relic of Elisha could raise a dead man to life ! That handkerchiefs were taken and touched by an Apostle, upon which they received curative powers ! That the shadow even of an Apostle was set value on ! That the God manifest in the flesh, who could cure by a word, or a will, should, on one occasion, have been observed to spit on the dust and make clay, with which he covered the eyes of a blind man, to make him see, which he is said to have done as soon as ever he had washed it away !

These, and many of the relations which, if not written in the Bible, would be called puerilities, are all, we must remember, unsupported by any testimony that we know of, except the men who recorded, and the Churches who received their record, as Inspired truth.

It is true that I have already admitted, Christ's Apostles to be worthy of all credence, as were their writings ; but St. Paul was not one of them, he speaks of his passions, and failings, and *thinks* he has the spirit of God ; he evidently, as far as we can gather from his own words, wrote now with, and now without, a sense of inspiration ; so also with regard to the writer St. Luke ; his Gospel, and Acts of the Apostles, with all their piety and zeal, are works

bearing on Protestant principles, clear marks of religious enthusiasm.

With respect also to the Apostles themselves, although they tell us the will of God, they nowhere inform us, that the three histories of our Saviour's life, which they published to the world, were written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. They write as other good men have done, that which they believe, and their slight differences so satisfactory to the minds of those who wish to feel sure that their story was true, are yet sufficient to prove on human grounds that they wrote subject to the mistakes of fallible men. How ought we then to accept all the Bible marvels just quoted as Gospel truth, and yet pronounce it untrue that any miracles since the days of the Apostles ever took place, or being absurd, could take place, even though the authorities of the same Church announced that they had, who, we believe, truly and correctly admitted the Gospel of St. John, and sundry other books into the Canon of Scriptures.

Again, miracles are but facts, not matters of Faith; prove a miracle untrue and it is set aside, but until the deception is found out, how can a person be called upon to believe it false, because it may appear absurd or incredible? The only difference between the two religions on this subject which I can find is this: the one believes God's power occasionally discovers itself to his people, and the other does not; the one points to facts, the other points to those facts which have been proved false; the one admits them to be false,

but declares others to be true, while the Protestant ends the matter by saying, they would all be proved false if we could only find them out! But this argument would suit an Infidel equally well in disputing with a Protestant Minister. When, therefore, prayers to God and his Saints, are now and then attended by what the world calls natural cures suddenly made when hope is gone, in fact as some Protestants would say, by special interpositions of Providence, why, I ask, may I not, if I must believe the Scriptures on human testimony, not call on the same testimony, such interpositions miracles? I do not ask others to say so, but only require permission for English Catholics to believe thus, without being supposed more ignorant or misled than Protestants.

Is it fair, then, or noble-minded, to misrepresent those who cling to the belief of God's indwelling with his mystical body, and their intimate connection, by his good pleasure, with this lower world, and constant interest in it, and that God's power is exerted at their request as it was, or more so, than when they were on earth? To say of such, that "they deprive God of his power, place the Virgin on the throne of Christ, lean on arms of flesh, or on people whom they deify." Can it be worth while for the noble author of the "Progress of the Reformation in Ireland" to boast of the following answers of his converts?

Q. Can the Virgin save us?

Ans. It kept her busy enough to save herself: we

see here a misapprehension of the subject, as well as an acknowledgment of the merits of good works.

Q. Can you give any proof from Scripture that there is no such place as purgatory?

Ans. St. Stephen said when he was stoned, "I see heaven opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God;" and he added, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Here we have a proof of there being no place of sorrow for sin, because there is such a place as heaven for a departing saint!!!

Q. What is the great error of Transubstantiation?

Ans. Idolatry.

Who, having heard the foregoing pages, will believe that the Catholic Church worships anything but the true God supposed to be present?—even granting transubstantiation to be a mistake; is our Lord not as much present at the mass, as he is, when other bodies of Christians meet to worship him; and kneel before their chairs or forms in token of reverence? Do they worship the house in which they suppose he is? Surely not. Why, then, suppose that which Catholics tell you is untrue? They do not worship bread and wine, they worship Christ, in the form of bread and wine.

Q. How do Papists try to prove the doctrine of Purgatory?

Ans. From Matt. v. 26.—"Thou shalt not come out from hence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing."

Q. Prove that this doctrine is false.

Ans. Christ said, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise; and blessed are the dead who die in the Lord."

Here we find, that because after the noble conversion of the thief, in the midst of his purgatory on the cross, his forgiving Lord, took all his sins away, and promised after the long death agony he should be blessed; and because those who die in Christ are blessed (as are all those in purgatory), that therefore there is no purgatory.

Q. Can you mention any other errors?

Ans. The worship of the Virgin Mary.

Q. Why is she not to be worshipped?

Ans. God alone is to be worshipped; she is dead, and cannot hear us.

The author of this question should have explained to his pupil, how it was that when the family at Cana worshipped the Virgin, exactly as the Catholics do, they got the water turned into wine. Also, how he knew, that the saints and angels, do know nothing, or hear nothing of what is going on here; even although there is joy in heaven amongst the angels of God over one sinner who repents. It appears that, as far as unquestioning dogmatic teaching goes, the poor Irish in Achill, have only got out of the "frying pan, into the fire."

How comes it again, that an English Protestant could write, in October 11th, 1851, "The Vicar of Christ is necessarily Anti-Christ, the word denoting that he who sets up himself in the room of or instead

of Christ, is against Christ." Now, the follower of Mahomet or of Reason, does hold that Mahomet took the place of Christ, or that his reason is superior to Christ. What Catholic, however, says, or imagines such a thing of the Bishop who takes the place, not of Christ, but of St. Peter! The same letter, published in the "*Bristol Mirror*," after some observations on withholding the Bible, goes on to state—"The Church of Rome substitutes penances for repentance, the self-tormenting of the body for a change of heart; faith in the priest for faith in the Lord; obedience to the Church for obedience to the will of God revealed in his Holy Word." Do sane people, did the writer believe all this nonsense? Does he not see how convicted untruth, must tell against the system which adopts such weapons? Let me quote against it the following verses and observations to be found in Mr. Kip's "Holydays in Rome," edited by Mr. Sewell. In page 271, we find it remarked, that "No one can read the writers of the ages which we call dark, without feeling that beneath the surface was a depth of devotion and a degree of intellectual light for which they have never received due credit; an isolated passage, or a brief allusion discover, perhaps, a thorough acquaintance with the truth which we have been accustomed to consider utterly forgotten, until rediscovered at the time of the Reformation. Look at one single example of this in the poems of a Spanish cavalier, Don George Manrique, who was killed in the year 1479. Where in the

present day, can we find a clearer statement, of one of the great doctrines of our faith, than is given in the following :—

‘ Oh thou that for our sins didst take
 A human form, and humbly make thy home on earth ;
 Thou that to thy Divinity
 A human nature didst ally by mortal birth,
 And in that form didst suffer here
 Torment and agony and fear so patiently ;
 By thy redeeming grace alone,
 And not for merits of my own, Oh pardon me !’

And yet this was written years before Luther was born ; and it was a popular ballad in Spain, sung in the castles of her nobles, and in her peasant homes, through many a retired valley, nearly half a century before the Reformation began.”

Would it not be well, for those good intentioned people, who meet in Exeter Hall, instead of getting up a crusade against a faith which they consider founded on truth, first, to spend their energies and money, in converting to some religion, those who have none, although born and bred in their own protestant land? Sad and singular does the neglected state of these poor creatures appear, while immense sums are raised, and numbers of people employed, to change the faith of those Irish, who do believe in the Incarnation of Christ, and his death upon the cross, being the sole cause of man’s redemption ; which redemption each mortal must lay hold of by faith, with good works, which are its visible proof, but which works are useless unless joined to the merits of the Saviour.

It being the faith of these unfortunate people, with all their errors, to suppose that the Bible is the word of God, and that the faith it teaches, must not be contradicted. That the merits of saints, however great they be, are only the effect of Divine grace in their souls, and that their prayers to God for temporal or spiritual aid, are only given, if in accordance with the will of God; and lastly, that the sacramental system is to be accepted and believed in, merely because it appears, clearly revealed, that God, not man, has invented it.

Surely the outcasts of our great towns, are in more danger of damnation than the most ignorant Catholic:—surely Protestants know not the spirit and drift of the religion they denounce. It will not suffice for them at the last to say, that they did not suppose Catholics knew the truth, of what they pretended to believe; else they would not have reviled them as idolatrous heathens, or worse than heathens. It will not do to say, that in ignorance they were for ever breaking the ninth commandment, while inculcating the duty of attending to the second. Mr. Carlyle, the pleasant author of Cromwell's life, gives us, in his memoirs of Stirling, a singular picture of what the rational, anti-superstitious Church of England appears to him, the man of learning and liberal religion: of course he applies his sweeping censure to the ancient, as to the established faith; nevertheless, from an apparent belief in the Jewish worship and revelation, one would suppose that, had he

studied Catholic theology, as he has done German literature, he would have found the Catholic, not only harmonize with the Jewish, but to be its only possible development, each explaining the other, and at the very least proving their possible truth; the same objections and proofs applying to each, and the engrafted Christian, naturally winding up a mysterious but definite intervention of God, in behalf of a debased world, undergoing for unknown, but undoubtedly wise reasons, a series of experiments, on the impossibility of happiness with sin, and ignorance of the true God: or the possibility of fallen men, being able to retain from age to age, one definite, and practical faith, without having a living and infallible appeal, in all cases of doubt and difficulty. Let us hear, then, what Carlyle, and with him a great number of philosophic but religiously disposed minds, say, of not only the Catholic, but also of the discreet and sensible Protestant faith: page 126—

“ So dark and abstruse, without lamp or authentic finger-post, is the course of pious genius towards the eternal kingdoms grown—no fixed highway more, the old spiritual highways and recognized paths to the Eternal, now all torn up and flung in heaps, submerged in unutterable boiling mud-oceans of hypocrisy and unbelievability, of brutal living atheism, and damnable dead putrescent cant. Surely a tragic pilgrimage for all mortals, darkness and the mere shadow of death enveloping all things from pole to pole; and in the raging gulf-currents, offer-

ing us will-o'-wisp for loadstars, intimating that there are no stars, nor ever were, except certain old Jew ones which have now gone out." . . . "Alas! if we did remember the divine and awful nature of God's truth, and had not so forgotten it as poor doomed creatures never did before, should we, durst we in our most audacious moments think of wedding it to the world's untruth, which is also like all untruths of the Devil's. It is not now known, what never needed proof or statement before, that religion is not a doubt—that it is a certainty, or else a mockery and horror;—that none, or all the many things we are in doubt about and need to have demonstrated and rendered probable, can, by any alchemy, be made a religion for us, but are and must continue a baleful, quiet or unquiet hypocrisy for us, and bring—salvation, do we fancy? I think it another thing they will bring, and are on all hands visibly bringing this good while!"

I quote these passages, and could also quote passages in a work published by a celebrated Professor, and formerly Fellow of Balliol Coll., Oxford, entitled "Phases of Faith," did I think it necessary, to show that the supposed absurdity of Catholic Christianity is not wiped out by the Reformation, in the eyes of learned men, possessing religious feelings and dispositions. Of course Exeter Hall saints will say, that none of them have received any gospel light; until, however, they admit themselves infallible, and can so demonstrate themselves, how can they, with any

show of fairness, sit in judgment on their brethren? Hard as it may appear I dare say it, that nothing but the Catholic creed, can answer the lucid objections contained in the "Phases of Faith," and that any Protestant who attempts to answer it, must fight with weapons which are not his own.

One other word on persecution. In the second volume of Mackinnon's "History of Civilization and Public Opinion," we find in page 298, "That three thousand witches were executed in the time of the Long Parliament alone, and that in the first eighty years of the 17th century, the number of witches executed annually was five hundred;" but he concludes in page 302—"When we consider the atrocities committed in every part of Europe, not only by the Inquisition, but in those countries where that tribunal never existed, we shall see that all the cruelty arising from the burning of witches for heresy, and for other supposed crimes or offences, arose from fanaticism and want of civilization of the nations of Europe, not from any particular creed or party." Surely the way in which too many "perverts" are treated by their Protestant friends, should be seriously considered, for, if it be right to thwart, injure their trade, or force out of society, those who return to the creed of their forefathers, the same conduct in a ruder age was justifiable, on the ground of departure from that faith. And when we remember that many a priest, has, for observing the most sacred duties of his religion, been hanged and

had his bowels torn out ere life was extinct, one may well believe that it is not to the superior charity of Englishmen as Protestants, that exemption from religious persecution unto death, is a part of the privileges of every British subject. Lastly, are not those persons both absurd, and unreasonable, who at one time tell us, that the Bible alone freely circulated, is sufficient to chase away the mists of Romish superstition, and at another time, warn those brought up in the very heart of protestantism, against holding any converse with a Catholic, lest immediate perversion ensue; and Bible, Gospel education, Anglican fathers, and all, be blown to atoms, by the mere momentary contact of Popery!!!

We are told, that the strongest minds, are apt to be led away by error and superstition. But what is superstition? Faith in falsehood some would say; who, however, can decide when faith becomes false? In dealing with an infinite subject, such as religion is, our finite minds, must of necessity be led by faith in many instances, and the more so, if we accept revelation in the place of rational religion. Most true it is, that some people have more faith than others, are more superstitious, but are they in consequence to be considered less enlightened? If a man must be content to take some religious doctrines on faith, by reason of the infinite nature of the subject, how can he call his neighbour weak and ignorant, because he believes a few more doctrines and supposed effects, connected with the same superhuman subject? The

atheist may contemn all belief, in that which we cannot comprehend, but not so, the man who believes in the truth of the Bible, for therein he reads of great events taking place by apparently ridiculous causes, and doctrines broached far beyond his faculties to understand. How may he, then, deem anything impossible, or laugh at those who consider the Almighty has revealed still more wonders to his people? I am not here arguing that these wonders are true, only that a belief in their truth, is not absurd, or any proof of weakness or ignorance. Is it wiser to believe too little or too much? In all ages, I take it, the wisest have ever been the most believing: in the world of science this has been emphatically the case. The persecution of Galileo by the rulers of the Church, in an imaginary defence of the Bible, is an instance in point. The first projector of the steam engine was by the French king, to whom he endeavoured to explain himself, deemed mad; and we know how homœopathy is still by some called humbug, and the magnetic influences between man and man, fancy! Surely in the eyes of a Christian philosopher, superstitious, should be no term of scorn. Of course nothing should be taken on mere hearsay evidence, nor is it, in the Catholic Church. Did Protestants but condescend to examine into the reasons given for Catholic belief, not individual belief, the charges against her on this subject, would be triumphantly rebutted. Granting, then, that belief on slight foundations, is a proof of folly and

weakness, what shall we say of those Protestants who write tracts full of errors, and deductions from false premises, and of those good Protestants who read them, and believe them true, never taking the trouble to investigate both sides of the story? What shall we say of those, who tell us that indulgences for sin, can be bought, or that any grace may be obtained on the mere payment of a certain sum of money?—that the Virgin Mary must have been from eternity if she is the Mother of God; that all the crimes and errors of Catholics are part and parcel of the Catholic system; and that persecution, and the real presence, are equally portions of the same creed; that the Pope, because he is the successor of St. Peter, is the successor of Christ; that, because a priest is the channel of grace, he is considered the author of the grace;—in fact, that because a pipe conveys water from a fountain, whether it be made of gold or of lead, that therefore it must be the water itself!! Happily the number of these silly ones is diminishing; may they soon entirely cease from our land.

Far be it from me to deny, that gross corruptions of manners, and morals, existed before, and at the period of the Reformation; or that in temporal things, the rulers of the Church have committed huge faults, or that a loss of temporal wealth, and power, would be of service to the chief Bishop of the world. In a clever book called “The Spiritual Quixotte,” I remember seeing a remark to this

effect :—That the spiritual don, Mr. Wildgoose, who wanted to revive the religion of England, would have done better by teaching the people to act up to the creed they professed, instead of injuring that creed, in order to establish one of his own, thus producing, not only a revival, but a schism in the land. Had the same just sentiments been adopted in the days of Cranmer, we might have held the faith of St. Paul, St. Irenæus, St. Gregory, St. Austin, St. Ambrose, the Venerable Bede, Archbishop Fenelon and Pascal, and at the same time have maintained our right to a national discipline. We might have possessed an English Liturgy, not given our churchlands to greedy nobles, allowed some of our clergy, or the whole of them, to marry, and not permitted our king to put away his lawful wife, for one who suited his fancy better ; we might all have partaken of Christ's sacrament in the cup, without explaining away unsupported by any pretended infallibility, and in defiance of all historical testimony, the literal meaning of those solemn words, which not even unbelieving Jews, could persuade the Saviour to retract. When we add to this, the loss of unity of communion, and our multiplicity of creeds, each based on the same first principles of which our branch Church took advantage, most of them differing in articles of faith, as well as discipline, and the importance of the one faith, now so little thought of, that we cannot distinguish the unity of the Catholics, because we see their multifarious differences, on matters unconnected with

their faith!—Seeing also that nothing is universally agreed upon by the Protestants, but what might be granted almost equally by a deist, or a Socrates, and yet all pretend that the Bible is the sole ground of their religion: It is impressed upon my mind, too deeply to resist, that if faith in Christ's gospel, be carried out literally, we must believe in the doctrines of the Catholic Church. As long, then, as our establishment denies, the reality of that invisible, but most august presence, which, as the Shekinah of old, God is pleased to grant us all days, even to the end of the world: I ask for no other reason, for joining those whose faith is humble and deep enough, to believe the faithfulness of God's word when he said "This is my body," as when he said "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." Believing in this last, how can one forget the wondrous means made use of to that end?—the one bloody sacrifice on the cross! Can the remembrance of those three hours' agony, be dimmed by the sight of the emblem of the Passion? Can the cross be the mark of the beast? No, rather though in scorn, would the writer reverence the sacred sign, and wish himself worthy at his death, to have inscribed upon his tomb, the beautiful lines of the author of the "Faerie Queen:"—

" And on his breast a bloudie crosse he bore,
 The deare remembrance of his dying Lord;
 For whose sweete sake that glorious badge he wore,
 And dead, as living ever, him adored."

Collect for the Third Sunday after Easter.

ALMIGHTY God, who shewest to them that be in error the light of thy truth, to the intent that they may return into the way of righteousness; grant unto all them that are admitted into the fellowship of Christ's religion, that they may eschew those things that are contrary to their profession, and follow such things as are agreeable to the same; through our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

FINIS

W. Davy & Son, Printers, 8, Gilbert Street, Oxford Street.