

THE
CLAIMS OF ROME.

BY
SAMUEL SMITH, M.P.

THIRD EDITION.

LONDON:
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
1897.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

The severe criticism to which this pamphlet has been subjected by Roman Catholic writers has led to a searching revision, and some slight corrections have been made. But the writer sees no reason to doubt the substantial truth of his statements. He has had the pleasure of reading the admirable work of Dr. Salmon on *The Infallibility of the Church* since the first edition of this pamphlet was published, and he takes the liberty of quoting freely, in the Appendix, from this unanswerable work.

In this edition the Appendix has been much enlarged, so that ample proof is now given of the truth of the statements made in the body of the pamphlet.

March, 1897.

PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION.

The first chapter of this Pamphlet was delivered as an Address in my constituency, the County of Flint; the remainder has been added by a process of expansion. Hence there is a certain degree of informality in the order of the argument. I have sought only to state what I believe to be undoubted facts, and if these should lead to a fuller study of this great question I will be satisfied. There cannot be a doubt that it is the paramount question of the day for the English people.

INDEX.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE.
Growth of Romish Doctrines	7
The Priest and Christ Jesus the Mediator	8
The "Infallible Pope"	9
The <i>Syllabus</i> of Pio Nono	10
Cruelties of the "Holy Inquisition"—Massacre of St. Bartholomew— Galileo and the Papal Anathema	11
The Popes of the Middle Ages the Shame of Christendom	12
Cruel Persecution of the Waldensian Church—Milton	13
The Bible not for the Laity	13
The Romish System an attempt to degrade the Human Mind—Its operation described by Channing	15
Mary the Intermediary between Man and Jesus Christ	16
Transubstantiation	17
The Study of the Scriptures a Safeguard against the bondage of Popery	19

CHAPTER II.

Claim of the Popes to be Successors of St. Peter	21
Arrogant Pretensions, Temporal and Spiritual, of the Popes	22
A Patriarch of the Greek Church on the Dogma of Infallibility	23
Papal Forgeries—the "Decretals"—the "Clementine Homilies"	25
The Church of Rome Incapable of Reformation	29
The Reformers of the Sixteenth Century	30
The Policy of Rome bound by Unchangeable Decrees	31

CHAPTER III.

Image Worship—Relics—Saints, &c.	32
Cardinal Vaughan on Church of England Practices	35
Priestly Assumption and the Weakness of Human Nature	38
Thomas à Kempis—"Pilgrim's Progress"—The True Saints of God	39

	PAGE.
A Want of Reverence about Protestant Services	40
Earnest Spiritual Preaching of the Gospel needed to Arrest Spread of Ritualism and Romanism	40

APPENDIX.

Roman Deductions as to the Power of the Priesthood	41
Sacerdotalism	43
Mariolatry	45
The Virgin Mary	46
Worship of the Virgin	47
Purgatory	49
Indulgences	52
The Holy House of Loretto	58
The Vatican Decrees	59
The Church War in Quebec	61
Quemadero—the Spanish Smithfield	63
Spanish Inquisition	64
Galileo and the Infallible Tribunal	64
The Roman Church in the Tenth Century	66
Pope Alexander VI. and His Times	67
Immorality of the Clergy before the Reformation	68
Prohibition of the Bible	69
Discouragement of Bible Reading	72
The Bible in Brittany	73
The Pope's recent Decree concerning Bible Reading	74
Cardinal Newman on Infallibility	75
Peter's alleged Roman Episcopate	76
The Forged Decretals	77
Irish Bishops and the Pope's Infallibility	80
The Vatican Council of 1870	81
The Apostolic Succession	82
Excommunication of Queen Elizabeth	84
The Romish Confessional and its Dangers	86
Celibacy and the Confessional	87
Convents	88
Priestly Assumptions	89
Ritualism in the Church of England	90
Novelty of Romish Doctrines	91
The Coronation Oath, &c.	92
Father Chiniquy on Transubstantiation	94

THE CLAIMS OF ROME.

I.

THE public mind has been much exercised of late by the claims of the Roman Church. The Pope's Encyclical has recently been published in most of the newspapers: other circumstances have pressed home on the Protestants of this country the astonishing growth of Romish doctrines in our midst, and I have thought that I might offer some observations on this all-important question. I call it all-important because the very life of a nation depends upon the character of its religion. The gulf that separates England to-day from Spain and Italy, from Mexico and Peru, is chiefly owing to its breach with Rome in the 16th century. Our civil and religious liberty, our strong individuality, our national greatness, have their roots in the Reformation of the 16th century, and if the religion of the priest is to supersede the religion taught by Christ we shall surely witness the decadence of all that makes our country great. The judgment of history is unmistakable on this point, no nation governed or guided by priests has ever prospered and none ever will; yet there is an ominous apathy in our day which fills me with dread. Under the spurious name of Charity many seem to think it matters little what faith a people holds; a generation

has grown up which knows little, and cares less, for the tremendous struggles by which our forefathers purchased their freedom. Money-making and amusement divide the allegiance of most men; and Romish doctrine unperceived is stealing over the nation like an eclipse of the sun. One cannot deny that for many minds Sacerdotal religion has a strange fascination; many of our most earnest men and women have passed into Rome through the door of Anglican Sacerdotalism; if our purer faith is not to be lost we must refurbish the arms by which the Reformation was won. There are no weapons that will avail in this warfare except those by which our forefathers triumphed; they used "the Sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God" and "which is sharper than any two-edged sword," and this weapon has not lost its temper; let Romish and Sacerdotal doctrine be judged by this standard, and what do we find?

The great Charter of the Christian is direct access to God by Christ. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (I. *Tim.* ii. 5). His language is not come to the priest, or come to the Church, but "come unto me." Never in the New Testament is a priest interposed between the sinner and the Saviour; that vast machinery of mediæval superstition which is well described by the word "Sacerdotalism"* is utterly unknown to the New Testament. If the salvation of men depends upon sacraments, and those sacraments owe their validity to a divinely constituted priesthood with apostolical succession, it is marvellous that Christ and his Apostles preserve a total silence on the subject; never once is a minister of religion in the New Testament called a priest; never once is a sacrifice for sin spoken of except that which was offered on Calvary once for all for the sin

* See Appendix, p. 43. Dean Farrar, in *The Bible and the Ministry*.

of the world; the unvarying language of Scripture is, "whosoever believeth in the Son hath everlasting life" (*St. John* iii. 16).* It knows nothing of the adoration of the Virgin,† of the invocation of Saints, of the miraculous properties of relics and images; it knows nothing of purgatory,‡ of prayers for the dead, of penances, of indulgences;§ it knows nothing of Saints' days and fast days, of holy places|| and holy garments; it contains not a hint of "the confessional," or of priestly absolution, or the celibacy of the clergy.¶ With austere simplicity it fixes the sinner's eye on Christ and on him alone, "who is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them" (*Heb.* vii. 25).

In this age of spurious charity it is widely thought that Rome is being liberalised. The Pope's latest utterance should be a rude awakening to any such dreamers; he re-asserts the claims of the Papacy as unbendingly as Hildebrand. He says, "The Fathers of the Church are unanimous in considering as outside the Catholic Communion anyone who in the least degree deviates from even one point of the doctrine proclaimed by the authoritative Magisterium of the Church." By the Magisterium he means the judgment of an infallible Pope. Again he says, "As Christ willed that his kingdom should be visible, Christ was obliged to designate a vicegerent on earth in the person of St. Peter. He also determined that the

* "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

† See Appendix, pp. 45—47. "Mariolatry," Vaughan, Salmon, and Sinclair.

‡ See Appendix, p. 49. Dr. Salmon, on "Purgatory," &c.

§ See Appendix, p. 52. Extract from Wylie's *History of Protestantism*.

|| See Appendix, p. 58. Dr. Salmon, on the "Holy House of Loretto."

¶ The Bible teaches the direct contrary. "A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife. . . . One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity" (*I. Timothy* iii. 2, 4). Peter himself was married, for we read of "his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever" (*Matt.* viii. 14).

authority given to him for the salvation of mankind should be inherited by St. Peter's successors. Thus the power of St. Peter is supreme and absolutely independent."

Those know little of the policy of Rome who think it will ever change. By the dogma of infallibility every Pope is obliged to uphold the decrees of every other Pope. The present Pope is bound by the Syllabus of his predecessor Pío Nono. In this extraordinary document, which contains the inner soul of the Papacy, it is asserted (by way of condemning the opposite opinion) "that the State has not the right to leave every man free to profess and embrace whatever religion he shall deem true."

Syllabus E. (24) "The Church has the power of availing herself of force or any direct or indirect temporal power."

(37) "It has not the right of establishing a National Church separate from the Pope."

(42) "It has not the right of asserting the supremacy of its own laws when they come into conflict with Ecclesiastical Law."

(53) "It has not the right to assist subjects who wish to abandon monasteries or convents."

"It has not the right to abolish monasteries or convents."

(71) "It has not the right to uphold any marriage solemnized otherwise than according to the form prescribed by the Council of Trent, even if solemnized by a form sanctioned by the Civil Law."

But, on the other hand, this document asserts:—

(15) No man is free to embrace and profess that religion which he believes to be true guided by the light of reason.

(23) "They are condemned who hold that any Pope ever exceeded the bounds of his power; also, that any Œcumenical Council ever did so; and further, that either the one or the other ever usurped the rights of Princes."

(See 24, as given before.) "She has the right to employ force."

(77) "She has the right to require that the Catholic religion shall be the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all others."*

* See Appendix, pp. 59—61. Extract from Gladstone's *Vatican Decrees*; also one from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, on the "Church War in Quebec."

All these monstrous claims are reaffirmed by the present Pope, and no future Pope can repudiate them. Had the Papacy the same power as it possessed in the middle ages it would re-enact the persecutions of those times; it would depose heretical Kings, absolve subjects from their allegiance, and excommunicate Kingdoms as in the time of King John.

Has any Roman Pontiff ever condemned the action of his predecessors when they stamped out heresy with fire and sword? Have the cruelties of the "Holy Inquisition" ever been condemned? It is computed that 30,000 martyrs were burnt at the stake in Spain alone;* their ashes and calcined

* Besides those who were burned to death by the Inquisition, a far greater number were consigned to its gloomy dungeons, to be tortured and imprisoned for life. I myself have seen a collection of the instruments of torture used by the "Holy Office;" they were such as to make one's flesh creep. I subjoin an account of the chamber of horrors from the Spanish historian quoted by Limborch, Professor of Divinity amongst the Remonstrants, vol. ii. p. 217, London, 1731:

"The place of torture in the Spanish Inquisition is generally an underground and very dark room, to which one enters through several doors. There is a tribunal erected in it, in which the inquisitor, inspector, and secretary sit. When the candles are lighted, and the person to be tortured brought in, the executioner, who is waiting for him, makes an astonishing and dreadful appearance. He is covered all over with a black linen garment down to his feet, and tied close to his body. His head and face are all concealed with a long black cowl, only two little holes being left in it for him to see through. All this is intended to strike the miserable wretch with greater terror in mind and body, when he sees himself going to be tortured by the hands of one who thus looks like the very devil."

The degrees of torture are described by Julius Clarus and other writers, quoted by Limborch. They were various, and included the following:—

(1) The being threatened to be tortured. (2) Being carried to the place of torture. (3) The stripping and binding. (4) The being hoisted up on the rack. (5) What they called "squassation." This was what they called the torture of the *pulley*. Besides this there was the torture of the *fire*, or chafing dish full of burning charcoal applied to the soles of the feet. Then there was the torture of the *rack*, and of another instrument, called by the Spaniards "*escalero*;" then that of the pouring water into a bag of linen stuffed down the throat; and that of iron *dice* forced into the feet by screws; and of *canes* placed crosswise between the fingers, and so compressed as to produce intolerable pain; then the torture of *cords* drawn tightly round various parts of the body, cutting through the flesh; and of the machine in which the sufferer was fixed head downwards; and lastly, the torture of red-hot irons applied to the breasts and sides till they were burned to the bone.

bones were dug up in Madrid not many years ago.* Some 50,000 Protestants perished in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the Pope of that day sang a Te Deum and struck a medal in honour of it which is still to be seen at Rome. Has any Pope ever repudiated his action? Has any Pope ever condemned the burning of John Huss, or Jerome of Prague, of Savonarola the martyr of Florence, of Tyndale the translator of the Bible into English, of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, and hecatombs of other reformers? Has any Pope ever disowned the excommunication of Galileo for asserting that the earth moved round the sun? I have read the anathema in his observatory at Florence where it is still preserved with the recantation of the astronomer, but posterity has adjudged the astronomer to be right and the infallible Pope to be wrong!†

I sometimes wonder if that stream of pious proselytes who are drifting Romeward know anything of the Popes of the middle ages. Do they know that for centuries they fought and intrigued with other sovereigns for power and territory with as little regard for the souls of men as if they had been Pagan monarchs; do they know that they made use of the most shameless forgeries to build up their power? Do they know that many of these Pontiffs were men of scandalous life?‡ Some, like Pope Alexander Borgia,§ and

* See Appendix, p. 63. "Quemadero, the Spanish Smithfield."

† See Appendix, p. 64. Extracts from Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*.

‡ "For about seventy years (883-955) the Roman Church was enslaved and degraded, while the Apostolic See became the prey and the plaything of rival factions of the nobles, and for a long time of ambitious and profligate women. It was only renovated for a brief interval (997-1003) in the persons of Gregory V. and Silvester II. by the influence of the Saxon Emperor. Then the Papacy sank back into utter confusion and moral impotence; the Tuscan Counts made it hereditary in their family; again and again dissolute boys, like John XII. and Benedict IX. occupied and disgraced the Apostolic throne, which was now bought and sold like a piece of merchandise, and at last three Popes fought for the tiara, until the Emperor Henry III. put an end to the scandal by elevating a German bishop to the See of Rome."—*The Pope and the Council by Janus*. See also, in Appendix, the testimony of the Roman Catholic historian Baronius.

his infamous progeny, were the shame of Christendom;* and yet the unblushing claim is made that these men were the Vicars of Christ on earth, that they held the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and could cast into outer darkness the holiest men who denied their claims.

Milton has enshrined in imperishable verse the cruel persecutions of the Waldensian Church. For centuries Rome tried to stamp out the pure faith of that noble race, and more than once almost extirpated the people.

“Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold ;
Even them who kept thy faith so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones.
Forget not ; in thy book record their groans
Who were thy sheep, and in their ancient fold
Slain by the bloody Piedmontese that rolled
Mother with infant down the rocks. Their moans
The vales redoubled to the hills, and they
To heaven. Their martyred blood and ashes sow
O'er all the Italian fields, where still doth sway
The triple tyrant ; that from these may grow
A hundredfold, who, having learned thy way,
Early may fly the Babylonian woe.”

Let those who wish to know what Rome was in the dark ages read the history of the Waldenses, and he will not be surprised that the Reformers of those days designated the Papacy as Anti-Christ. Wherever Rome has had undisputed sway she has tried to keep the Bible from the laity. I well remember, in my younger days, when the Pope still held the temporal power, how friends of mine had the greatest difficulty to smuggle a Bible into Rome. No Protestant place of worship was then permitted within the city walls. When the Italian army entered Rome, the first wheel carriage contained a consignment of Bibles. The present Pope gave his approval to Lasserre's French

§ This infamous man died of accidentally drinking a cup of poison which he had mixed for another (Froude's *Council of Trent*, Longmans).

* See Appendix, p. 67. Alexander VI. and his times, an extract from Froude.

translation of the Gospels, which had a large sale, but, strange to say, it is now placed on the *Index Expurgatorius*, and its sale prohibited.

The previous Pope, Pio Nono, in his Encyclical of 1850 goes on to say:—

“ Nay, using even the assistance of the Bible Societies, which have been long ago condemned by the Holy See, they do not fear to scatter abroad the Sacred Scriptures, translated contrary to the rules of the Church into the vulgar tongue, and so corrupted, and by a detestable daring distorted to a false sense, and under the pretence of religion to recommend the reading thereof to the people. Hence, according to your wisdom, Venerable Brothers, you may well understand with how great vigilance and solicitude you must labour in order that your faithful flocks may abhor the pestiferous reading of these books; and that particularly in regard to the Sacred Scriptures they may remember that no man may so arrogate to himself, as resting on his own prudence to distort them to his own cause, contrary to the sense in which Holy Mother Church has held and doth hold them; to whom indeed alone has it been commanded by Christ the Lord that she keep the deposit of the Faith and judge concerning the true sense and interpretation of the Divine Oracles.”*

Nothing is more certain than that in every country where Rome is supreme the circulation of the Scriptures in the common tongue is practically forbidden.† In countries like ours, where the claim would be laughed at, a discreet silence is preserved; but it is not many years since it was penal to circulate the Scriptures in Italy, Spain, Austria and other States where the policy of Rome was supreme.

The religion of Rome is a veritable chameleon; it assumes as many hues as there are conditions of mankind; it adapts itself to the devout, earnest ascetic like most of the converts from the Anglican Church, but it equally

* See Appendix, p 72. Note from Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*.

† See Appendix, p 69. “Prohibition of the Bible.”

adapts itself to the ignorant lazzaroni of Naples and the wily diplomats of the Society of Jesus. It has well been described by Channing in the following words:—

“To him who would scourge himself into godliness it offers a whip; for him who would starve himself into spirituality it provides the mendicant convents of St. Francis; for the anchorite it prepares the death-like silence of La Trappe; to the passionate young woman it presents the raptures of St. Theresa, and the marriage of St. Catherine with her Saviour; for the restless pilgrim, whose piety needs greater variety than the cell of the monk, it offers shrines, tombs, relics, and other holy places in Christian lands, and, above all, the holy sepulchre near Calvary.”

I do not doubt the earnest piety which has led so many of our countrymen to Rome during the last 50 years, but it is a piety which inevitably leads to superstition. The most illustrious convert whom Rome has made in this century was John Henry Newman; no one can doubt the sincerity of his convictions, but it is melancholy to see how, little by little, he parted with the right of private judgment. For a while he opposed the dogma of Papal Infallibility* like many of the Catholic Bishops, but at last meekly accepted it; and he brought his fine intellect to believe in such juggles as the winking Madonna, and the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius. He says, *Apologia*, p. 298:—

“I think it impossible to withstand the evidence which is brought for the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius at Naples, and for the motion of the eyes of the pictures of the Madonna in the Roman States. I see no reason to doubt the material of the Lombard crown at Monza; and I do not see why the Holy Coat at Treves may not have been what it professes to be. I firmly believe that portions of the True Cross are at Rome and elsewhere, that the crib of Bethlehem is at Rome, and the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul also.”

The fact is the Romish system is the most successful

* See Appendix, p. 75. Cardinal Newman's Letter to Bishop Ullathorne.

attempt in the world's history to capture all the faculties of the human mind ; in the name of faith it dethrones reason ; in the name of religion it evokes superstition ; all the graces of the Christian life assume a new complexion in Rome ; repentance becomes penance ; faith becomes credulity ; zeal becomes fanaticism ; holiness becomes asceticism ; that sweet wholesome life which Christ intended his Disciples to lead " in the world but not of the world " is transformed into a matter of Church ritual. The New Testament says, " the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost " (*Rom.* xiv. 17). Rome says that the Kingdom of God consists in Saints' days and fast days, in masses and penances, in pilgrimages and priestly absolution. The motive power by which the system is kept alive is fear ; outside the Catholic Church there is no salvation ; all doubt is of the nature of sin. Even the Saviour of the world is too terrible a being to be approached directly ; his mother must be invoked to soften him. The present Pope, in an Encyclical dated 1891, as published in the " *Tablet*," Oct. 10, 1891, states :—

" With equal truth may it be also affirmed that, by the will of God, Mary is the intermediary through whom is distributed unto us this immense treasure of mercies gathered by God, for mercy and truth were created by Jesus Christ. Thus as no man goeth to the Father but by the Son, so no man goeth to Christ but by his mother."

" We adore the beloved Saviour, lavish of His blood and of His life ; we dread the inexorable judge. Thus do those whose actions have disturbed consciences need an intercessor mighty in favour with God, merciful enough to lift up again towards hope in the Divine mercy the afflicted and the broken down. Mary is this glorious intermediary ; she is the mighty mother of the Almighty ; but what is still sweeter, she is gentle, extreme in tenderness, of a limitless loving kindness."*

* See Appendix, pp. 46—48. Salmon and Sinclair on this subject.

It sounds to my ears very like blasphemy to say that
 “no man goeth to Christ but by his mother.”*

I cannot part from this subject of Romish doctrine without quoting the Romish definition of the Mass; it is the central part of Romish worship. I do not think many Protestants really understand how incredible is the demand made upon faith. The Council of Trent thus defines Transubstantiation:—

“If any one shall deny that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist there are contained truly, really and substantially the body and the blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore whole Christ, and shall say that he is in it only by sign, or figure, or influence, let him be accursed.” (Canon I. on the Eucharist).

“If anyone shall say that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine along with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny the wonderful and singular conversion of the whole of the substance of the bread into the body, and the whole of the substance of the wine into the blood, there remaining only the appearance of bread and wine, which conversion the Catholic Church most appropriately calls Transubstantiation, let him be accursed.” (Canon II. on the Eucharist).

Again, the Council of Trent states:—

“It is therefore indubitable that all true Christians, according to the practice of the Catholic Church, are bound to venerate this most holy sacrament, and to render to it the worship of *latria* which is due to the true God. Nor is it the less to be worshipped that it was instituted by Christ the Lord as has been stated: for we believe the same God to be present in it of

* Contrast with this the words of Christ (*St. Mark* iii. 31 to 35):—“There came then his brethren and his mother, and standing without, sent unto him, calling him. And the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren seek for thee. And he answered them, saying, Who is my mother, or my brethren? And he looked round about on them which sat about him, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.”

whom the Eternal Father, when he introduces him into the world, thus speaks: 'And let all the angels of God worship him.'" (Chap. v. on the Eucharist).

Again:—

"The Holy Council teaches that this sacrifice is really propitiatory, and made by Christ himself. . . . Assuredly God is appeased by this oblation, and grants grace and the gift of penitence, and discharges the greatest crimes and iniquities. For it is one and the same sacrifice which is now offered by the priests, and which was offered by Christ upon the cross,* only the mode of offering is different. . . . Wherefore it is rightly offered, according to the tradition of the Apostles, not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions and other necessities of living believers, but also for the dead in Christ who are not yet completely purified." (Chap. ii. on the Sacrifice of the Mass).

I cannot help saying that to my Protestant eyes the worship of a wafer seems very like idolatry.†

It is a mystery which I have never been able to unravel how Romish teaching has been evolved from the simple doctrine of Christ and his Apostles; the two cannot live together on equal terms, and sooner or later where Rome prevails the Bible is supplanted by tradition. As Christ said of the Pharisees of old, "Full well ye reject the Commandments of God that ye may keep your own tradition." (*Mark* vii. 9). The strength of Rome lies in the decay among Protestants of reverence for the word of God. The Protestants to-day do not know the Bible as their forefathers did; the youth of this nation are not grounded in Scripture so as to wield "the Sword of the Spirit which is the word of God."

* Contrast this with the statements of Scripture. "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once, in the end of the world, hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (*Heb.* ix. 25-26). Again: "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (*Heb.* x. 12-14).

† See Appendix, p. 41.

The Reformation was won by appeal to Scripture. Rome builds upon the Fathers and tradition; the Tractarian movement did the same; Christ and St. Paul are to be interpreted by Jerome and Augustine, and Cyprian and Chrysostom. By the fourth century the Church was full of corruptions, and the seeds of Sacerdotalism were sown broadcast. We are doomed to failure if we substitute "the Fathers"* for the Scriptures; our appeal must be to "the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."

I plead for a deeper study of the Holy Scriptures in all our Protestant seminaries. Much of the Protestant teaching has lost its savour from a subtle spirit of Rationalism; therein comes the opportunity for Rome. The soul of man craves for certainty in the matter of religion; it wants bread, not husks. Rome claims the certainty of an infallible Pope; we Protestants possess the Holy Scriptures "which are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (II. *Tim.* iii. 15). Let us teach the word of God as Paul taught it, as Peter taught it, and we need not fear the anathemas of the pretended successors of St. Peter. The battle of the Reformation must be fought anew in this country. Not only the claims of Rome, but the whole priestly system, must be shown to be unscriptural; beware of letting in the thin end of the wedge; wherever the priest enters with his pretended power of absolution, there is the cloven foot of Popery.

Many Roman Catholics are pious and estimable men, reared in their system from their youth up they do not see its errors; we would fain say nothing to offend them yet fidelity to truth is a higher duty. When the boldest

* "The Fathers" are but poor guides, for they constantly disagree among themselves, and the same writer often contradicts himself. There is a wonderful descent from the Scriptures of the New Testament to the patristic writings of the third and fourth century.

attempts are being made for what is called "the conversion of England," we cannot forbear to warn our countrymen. We may truly say of the Papal system what Peter said of the Judaic system, "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear" (*Acts xv. 10*). "Therefore," says Paul, "let us stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (*Epistle to the Galatians v. 1*).

II.

I now wish to deal with the claim which the Popes make to be the successors of Peter. The whole fabric of Roman assumption rests on this slender foundation: disprove it, and the entire fabric topples down. The present Pope, like his predecessors for many centuries, claims that Christ, in those remarkable words* (*Matt.* xvi. 18, 19), constituted Peter the Prince of the Apostles and earthly head of his Church; also that he was the first Bishop of Rome,† and bequeathed those powers to his successors the Popes of Rome. Never was so astounding a claim rested on so precarious a foundation. There is not a word in the New Testament to show that Peter was ever at Rome at all. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans does not allude to Peter's existence. "The Acts of the Apostles" conclude with Paul a prisoner at Rome, but with no notice of Peter. Paul's last Epistle (*II. Timothy*) was probably written from Rome A.D. 66, just before his martyrdom, but there also no allusion is made to Peter. Is this credible if Peter, as the Romanists aver, was Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years?

Further, Peter himself in his two Epistles never alludes either to his primacy over the other Apostles, or to his imaginary Bishopric of Rome. He writes with a sweet

* "Thou art Peter, 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 shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

† See Appendix, p 76. Dr. Salmon on "Peter's Episcopate."

humility, in wonderful contrast to the boastful assumptions of the Popes, "the Elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an Elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." (I. *Peter*, v. 1-3).

Contrast this with the language of the Popes. Pope Gregory VII. (Hildebrand) said, at his Roman Synod of 1080:—

"We desire to show the world that we can give or take away at our will kingdoms, duchies, earldoms, in a word, the possessions of all men; for we can bind and loose." (*Mansi* xx. 536).

Boniface VIII. in his Bull *Unam Sanctam* asserts:—

"That the Pope is judge over all secular matters where sin is involved, and holds the two swords, one to be used by himself, the other by kings and warriors, but at his beck and by his permission; that he judges all, but is judged by none, being responsible to God only; and that whoever denies this subjection of every human being to the Pope cannot be saved."

I give a further quotation from Boniface VIII. if possible still more astonishing:—

"The Pope is of so great dignity and excellence, that he is not merely man, but as if God and the Vicar of God. The Pope alone is called most holy . . . Divine monarch, and supreme emperor, and king of kings. . . . The Pope is of so great dignity and power that he constitutes one and the same tribunal with Christ, so that whatsoever the Pope does seems to proceed from the mouth of God. . . . The Pope is as God on earth."

Pope Innocent III. taught:—

"That the Papal power is to the imperial and royal as the sun to the moon, which last has only a borrowed light, or the soul to the body, which exists not for itself, but only to be the

slave of the soul, and that the two swords are a symbol of the ecclesiastical and secular power, both of which belong to the Pope, but he wields one himself and intrusts the other to princes to use at his behest and for the service of the Church." (Innoc. III. in chap. 6, *De Majorit et Obid D.* 1. 33.)

Gratian, the great Canonist, says:—

"As Christ submitted to the law on earth, though in truth he was its Lord, so the Pope is high above all laws of the Church, and can dispose of them as he will, since they derive all their force from him alone." (Cans. 25. Q. 1. c. 11. 12. 16.)

Can we conceive a greater contrast than between the meekness of Peter and the arrogance of his pretended successors? Further, whatever was the meaning of these remarkable words, "I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," there is not the slightest hint that these powers were transmissible. Very similar words were spoken to all the Apostles (*Matt.* xviii. 18),* but there is nothing to show that Christ intended those powers to be perpetuated. The early Church knew nothing of the transmission of Peter's power to the bishops of Rome. I quote from that remarkable work, *The Pope and the Council*, by Janus, page 91:—

"Of all the Fathers who have exegetically explained these passages in the Gospels (*Matt.* xvi. 18, *John* xxi. 17), not a single one applies them to the Roman bishops as Peter's successors. How many Fathers have busied themselves with these texts, yet not one of them whose commentaries we possess—Origen, Chrysostom, Hilary, Augustine, Cyril, Theodoret, and those whose interpretations are collected in Catenas—has dropped the faintest hint that the primacy of Rome is the consequence of the commission and promise to Peter."

To this I add a quotation from the remarkable letter, issued by the Patriarch of Constantinople, as representing the Greek Church, in reply to the dogma of infallibility

* "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

promulgated by the Vatican Council in 1870. No Protestant could wish a more searching exposure of the monstrous claims of Rome. The Greek, or Eastern, Church contains, I suppose, fully 100 millions of people.

“But having recourse to the Fathers and the Œcumenical Councils of the Church of the first nine centuries, we are fully persuaded the Bishop of Rome was never considered as the supreme authority and infallible head of the Church, and that every bishop is head and president of his own particular Church, subject only to the synodical ordinances and decisions of the Church Universal as being alone infallible, the Bishop of Rome being in no wise excepted from this rule, as Church history shows. Our Lord Jesus Christ alone is the eternal Prince and immortal Head of the Church, for ‘He is the head of the body, the Church’ (*Col. i. 18*); who said also to his divine Disciples and Apostles, at his ascension into heaven, ‘Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world’ (*Matt. xxviii. 20*). In the Holy Scripture, the Apostle Peter, whom the Papists, relying on apocryphal books of the second century, the pseudo-Clementines, imagine with a purpose to be the founder of the Roman Church and their first bishop, discusses matters as an equal among equals in the Apostolic Synod of Jerusalem, and at another time is sharply rebuked by the Apostle Paul, as is evident from the Epistle to the Galatians (*Gal. ii. 11*). Moreover the Papists themselves know well that the very passage of the Gospel to which the Pontiff of Rome refers, ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church’ (*Matt. xvi. 18*), is in the first centuries of the Church interpreted quite differently, in a spirit of orthodoxy both by tradition and by all the divine and sacred Fathers without exception; the fundamental and unshaken rock upon which the Lord has built his own Church, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, being understood metaphorically of Peter’s true confession concerning the Lord, that ‘He is Christ, the Son of the living God’ (*Matt. xvi. 16*). Upon this confession and faith the saving preaching of the Gospel by all the Apostles and their successors rests unshaken.”

I must now allude briefly to one of the principal means whereby the Popes in the middle ages succeeded in imposing their arrogant pretensions on Christendom. I

refer to what are generally called the "forged Decretals." A long succession of forgeries were executed in those uncritical ages whereby the Popes were alleged to be granted enormous powers. One of those forgeries was a pretended letter from the Emperor Constantine to Pope Sylvester making over to him, and his successors, the Kingdom of Italy; this is generally described as the "Donation of Constantine." They are described by Janus as follows:—

"In the middle of that century, about 845, arose the huge fabrication of the Isidorian decretals, which had results far beyond what its author contemplated, and gradually, but surely, changed the whole constitution and government of the Church. It would be difficult to find in all history a second instance of so successful, and yet so clumsy, a forgery. For three centuries past it has been exposed; yet the principles it introduced and brought into practice have taken such deep root on the soil of the Church, and have so grown into her life, that the exposure of the fraud has produced no result in shaking the dominant system. About a hundred pretended decrees of the earliest Popes, together with certain spurious writings of other church dignitaries and Acts of Synods, were then fabricated in the West of Gaul, and eagerly seized upon by Pope Nicholas I. at Rome, to be used as genuine documents in support of the new claims put forward by himself and his successors."*

For several centuries the Popes treated these forgeries as authentic, and grounded upon them their monstrous assumptions; but, when learning revived in Europe, the true character of these spurious decrees was exposed, and at last even Roman Catholic historians gave them up as untenable. The accurate historian Hallam writes:—

"Upon these spurious Decretals was built the great fabric of Papal supremacy over the different National Churches, a fabric which has stood after its foundation crumbled beneath it; for no one has pretended to deny during the last two centuries

See Appendix, p. 77. Dr. Salmon on the forged "Decretals," &c.

that the imposture is too palpable for any but the most ignorant ages to credit."

Bishop Lightfoot says:—

"The letters from subsequent bishops of Rome in this collection abound in anachronisms and blunders of such a kind that a less credulous age would have detected the imposture at once."

What a lurid light this throws on the pretended infallibility of the Popes!

Before passing from this subject of forgeries I must allude to the earliest of all, the false Clementine homilies, which first gave rise to the idea of an ordination of Clement by St. Peter as Bishop of Rome. I quote from the admirable Charge of Archdeacon Sinclair, recently issued, on the "Differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome," one of the most learned, temperate and masterly documents it has been my pleasure to peruse:—

"Bishop Lightfoot thinks that the original forgery or romance was composed not later than the middle of the second century. It was written in Syria or Palestine, and influenced Tertullian. It contains a supposed account of the ordination as Bishop, which, as we have seen, was nearly a quarter of a century too soon. It altogether excludes St. Paul, because the writer was an Ebionite and hated him."

The fact is, that without this forgery it would have been almost impossible for the Popes to claim succession from St. Peter at all, for the earliest Fathers knew nothing of it.

But the claims of the Papacy are vitiated, not only by forgeries, but also by the heresy of several of the earlier Popes. Probably few pious Catholics know that several Popes were excommunicated, and condemned by subsequent Popes. These facts are notorious to all Church historians. I refer first to Pope Liberius (A.D. 366).

Janus says:—

“In the Arian disputes which engaged and disturbed the Church beyond all others for above half a century, and were discussed in more than fifty Synods, the Roman See for a long time remained passive. The long pontificate of Pope Sylvester (A.D. 314-335), has no document or sign of doctrinal activity to show any more than those of all his predecessors from 269 to 314. Julius and Liberius (337-366) were the first to take part in the course of events, but they only increased the uncertainty. Julius pronounced Marcellus of Ancyra, an avowed Sabellian, orthodox at his Roman Synod; and Liberius purchased his return from exile from the Emperor by condemning St. Athanasius, and subscribing an Arian creed. “Anathema to thee, Liberius;” was then the cry of zealous Catholic Bishops like Hilary of Poitiers. This apostasy of Liberius sufficed, through the whole of the middle ages for a proof that Popes could fall into heresy as well as other people.”

Janus further says:—

“Pope Vigilius was less happy in the dispute about the ‘Three Chapters’—the writings of Theodore, Theodoret and Ibas, which were held to be Nestorian—which he first pronounced orthodox in 546, then condemned the next year, and then again reversed this sentence in deference to the Western Bishops, and thus came into conflict with the Fifth General Council which excommunicated him. Finally he submitted to the judgment of the Council, declaring that he had unfortunately been a tool in the hands of Satan, who labours for the destruction of the Church, and had thus been divided from his colleagues, but God had now enlightened him. Thus he thrice contradicted himself: first he anathematized those who condemned the Three Chapters as erroneous; then he anathematized those who held them to be orthodox, as he had just before himself held them to be; soon after he condemned the condemnation of the Three Chapters; and, lastly, the Emperor and Council triumphed again over the fickle Pope.”

A still more startling case is the heresy of Pope Honorius. Janus says:—

“The Monothelite controversy, growing out of the assertion that Christ had not two wills, a human and a Divine, but one

Divine will only, led to the General Synod of Constantinople in 680. At the beginning of the controversy, Pope Honorius I. when questioned by three Patriarchs had spoken entirely in favour of the heretical doctrine in letters addressed to them, and had thereby powerfully aided the new sect. Later on, in 649, Pope Martin, with a Synod of 105 Bishops from Southern and Central Italy, condemned Monothelism. But the sentence of a Pope and a small Synod had no binding authority then, and the Emperor Constantine found it necessary to summon a General Council to settle the question. It was foreseen that Pope Honorius I. who had hitherto been protected by silence must share the fate of the other chief authors of the heresy at this Council. He was, in fact, condemned for heresy in the most solemn manner, and not a single voice, not even of the Papal legates who were present, was raised in his defence. His dogmatic writings were committed to the flames as heretical. The Popes submitted to the inevitable; they subscribed the anathema, and themselves undertook to see that the 'heretic' Honorius was condemned in the West as well as throughout the East and his name struck out of the Liturgy. This one fact—that a Great Council, universally received afterwards without the slightest hesitation throughout the Church, and presided over by Papal legates, pronounced the dogmatic decision of a Pope heretical, and anathematized him by name as a heretic—is a proof, clear as the sun at noonday, that the notion of any peculiar enlightenment or inerrancy of the Popes was then utterly unknown to the whole Church."

I think these references, which might be indefinitely multiplied, are sufficient to show how absurd is the claim that the Popes in all ages have been the unerring interpreters of the mind of Christ. At the time these Popes were excommunicated the doctrine of Papal Infallibility* had not been invented. The bishops of Rome were looked upon as fallible mortals, like other bishops; but now the cloak of infallibility is thrown backwards over the whole list of Popes, real or imaginary, up to the time of Peter;

* Even as late as 1826 the Irish Catholic bishops denied their belief in the Pope's infallibility. I quote from Mr. Gladstone's *Vatican Decrees*, p. 15 (see Appendix, p. 80).

and no stronger advocate of this claim has existed in our times than the late Cardinal Manning. These facts to which I have alluded were well known to many members of the Vatican Council of 1870, and so deep was their feeling of resentment that over a hundred Bishops, largely French and German, retired from the Vatican rather than take part in the promulgation of the dogma; yet, *mirabile dictu*, all acquiesced in it after promulgation rather than face the terrors of expulsion from the Church.* The learned Döllinger, and a few able and pious persons seceded, and formed what they called "The Old Catholic Church," but its career has not been prosperous. The fact is, the Church of Rome is incapable of reformation; her roots lie far back in the past, and draw their nutriment from such a mass of fabrications that were the light of day let in the whole edifice would collapse. Every attempted reformation has been a failure, and her last great move, the definition of Papal Infallibility, put the cope stone to the fabric of imposture. Henceforward, the only language we can address to the adherents of Rome is, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues" (*Rev.* xviii. 4). It is a strange but remarkable fact that not a few Catholics in the Middle Ages applied to Rome the prophecies of *Revelation* regarding Babylon the Great. Dante did so; he lived in a time of fearful corruption; he saw little at Rome but avarice and vice, and he drew the darkest picture of the age. One of her own Cardinals at that time used startling language. Janus says:—

"Even a man like St. Bonaventure, whom the Popes had loaded with honours, and who was bound by the closest ties to Rome as a Cardinal and General of his Order, did not hesitate in his Commentary on the Apocalypse to declare Rome to be

* See Appendix, p. 81.

the harlot who makes kings and nations drunk with the wine of her whoredoms. For in Rome, he said, Church dignities were bought and sold; there did the princes and rulers of the Church assemble, dishonouring God by their incontinence, adherents of Satan, and plunderers of the flock of Christ. He adds that the prelates, corrupted by Rome, infect the clergy with their vices; and the clergy, by their evil example of avarice and profligacy, poison and lead to perdition the whole Christian people."

Need we wonder that in the great uprising against this Anti-Christian power in the sixteenth century one of the chief weapons of the Reformers was the application of prophecy to the Roman system. The whole of Christendom was writhing under the horrors of the Inquisition. The cry of the slaughtered Waldenses and the French Huguenots, the victims of Alva in the Netherlands, of Catherine de Medicis in France, and Philip II. in Spain, had gone up to Heaven: "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (*Rev.* vi. 10). "I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus" (*Rev.* xvii. 6). How irresistible was the inference?

It has been feebly replied to arguments of this kind, why drag up the crimes of the dark ages, "let the dead bury their dead." Have not Protestants also committed great crimes? Did not Calvin acquiesce in the death of Servetus? Did not Luther and Zwingle justify the slaughter of Anabaptists? Did not Elizabeth persecute the Catholics in England after her excommunication by the Pope?* Did not the penal laws in Ireland most cruelly wrong the Irish Catholics? Most certainly it is true. No one has denounced the cruel treatment of the Irish Catholics more than the writer has done; but there is this enormous difference; the Protestants of to-day repudiate

* See Appendix, p. 84.

and condemn those persecutions, which are utterly opposed to the teaching of Christ, but no Pope has ever condemned the cruel policy of former Popes; all are regarded as alike Vicars of Christ and infallible heads of his Church. All the persecuting doctrines of Rome are held as strongly as ever; and if she had the power she would be bound by her own unchangeable decrees again to put them in practice. The Syllabus of Pio Nono of 1864 contains in substance all the persecuting doctrines of the Middle Ages, and the present Pope upholds every jot and tittle of it. It is vain therefore to condemn us for restating these facts; by them the Papacy stands or falls. It matters nothing that an amiable Pontiff of blameless life now occupies the Vatican; he dare not and cannot escape from the terrible chain of former falsehoods and crimes. The policy of Rome is *semper eadem*; she may be broken, but she will never bend.

III.

I WILL conclude this treatise with a few general remarks. I have no intention to travel over the whole ground of the Romish controversy; it would expand this *brochure* into a volume, and I am not competent to undertake the task. Those who wish to have a compact view of the subject can find it in the admirable Charge of Archdeacon Sinclair last year (Elliot Stock, London), or in the copious writings of the Rev. J. A. Wylie, especially the one entitled *The Papacy*, or the unanswerable work of Dr. Salmon on *The Infallibility of the Church* (John Murray), not to speak of the ponderous and learned tomes of the Puritan Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, both in and out of the National Church.* But ecclesiastical works are not attractive to the ordinary lay mind, and I thought that a simple sketch of the arguments by a layman might be read by some who are repelled by more learned treatises.

No adequate attempt is here made to show the utter opposition of many of the practices of the Roman Church to the express commands of Scripture; take, for instance, the worship of images, and the adoration of relics, but I will quote from Archdeacon Sinclair on the subject of "Image Worship":—

"The 25th Session of the Council of Trent decrees that 'the images of Christ and of the Virgin Mary, and of the other saints, are especially to be had and retained in churches, and that honour and veneration are to be paid to them.' St. Thomas Aquinas says: 'To the image of Christ, on account of His Divinity, divine worship is due To the image

* See also the writings of Froude, especially his *Erasmus* and *Council of Trent*.

of Christ, considered as an object—a sculptured or painted piece of wood—no reverence is paid; but reverence is due only to a rational nature. It remains, therefore, that that reverence is paid to it only inasmuch as it is an image; and thus it follows that the same reverence is paid to the image of Christ as to Christ himself. Since, then, Christ is adored with the adoration of Latria, it follows that His image is to be adored with the adoration of Latria.’”*

With regard to the worship of relics I quote as follows:—

“The Church of Rome teaches that the Relics of the Saints are to be venerated (Decrees of the Council of Trent, Sess. XXV.; Creed of Pope Pius IV., No. 7). ‘Relics,’ says the Catholic Dictionary, (p. 783), ‘are exposed in their cases with burning lights upon the Altar, and are often placed there at High Mass and incensed.’

“There is no trace in Holy Scripture of such veneration being paid to the remains of departed saints.

“Before the Reformation, the worship of relics and images was universal in England. You may read about them in Strype, Fuller, and Burnet. At Reading they had an angel with one wing, the spear-head which pierced our Saviour’s side, two pieces of the Holy Cross, St. James’s hand, St. Philip’s stole, a bone of St. Mary Magdalene, a bone of Salome. At Bury St. Edmund’s were exhibited the coals that roasted St. Lawrence, the parings of St. Edmund’s toe-nails. Thomas à Becket’s penknife and boots, and as many pieces of our Saviour’s Cross as would have made, when put together, one large whole Cross. At Maiden Bradley the objects of reverence were the Virgin Mary’s smock, a piece of the stone on which our Lord was born at Bethlehem, and a part of the bread used by Christ and the Apostles at the Last Supper. At Bruton, in Somerset, was a girdle of the Virgin in red silk, used in childbirths. At Farley Abbey, in Wiltshire, they used a white girdle of St. Mary Magdalene. At St. Mary’s Nunnery, in Derby, the nuns had a piece of St. Thomas’s shirt, worshipped by women expecting confinement. At Dale Abbey, near Derby, they worshipped part of another girdle of the Virgin Mary, and some of her milk.

* “Latria” is the Worship due to the Supreme Being.

At Repton, the bell of St. Guthlac was in great honour, and those with headache used to put their heads under it. At Grace-Dieu, in Leicestershire, they worshipped the girdle and part of the cast of St. Francis. At Hales, in Gloucestershire, a vial was shown on great occasions which was said to contain the blood of Christ. On examination by the Royal Commissioners of Henry VIII. it was found to contain the blood of a duck, renewed every week. At Worcester, in one of the churches, was a huge image of the Virgin, covered with a veil, which on inquiry was found to be the statue of an old bishop. At Boxley a crucifix was shown which, when copper was offered to it, looked grave; when silver, it relaxed its severity; when gold, it smiled. On examination it was found to be worked by wires. To such a low ebb has religion sunk when the Bible was kept from the people. The boast of the unreformed Western Church is, that it is always the same; and these absurdities may be matched on the Continent to this day.”*

It passes comprehension how holy men could ever have believed in such drivelling superstition; but all this can be witnessed to-day in Naples, and Sicily, and many other countries, just as in England before the Reformation. It is a mystery which I have never been able to fathom, how the Church of Rome has persuaded a large part of mankind to abdicate their reason, and accept such mummery. But one invariable result follows, the educated classes become sceptics in all countries where Romanism has long reigned supreme; so it is to-day in France, the North of Italy, and Spain. The invariable recoil of the human mind from slavish superstition is to agnosticism and atheism.

The question may be asked, how comes it that in this enlightened country there is such a thirsting after union with Rome by many members of the Anglican Church; how comes it that in nearly half the Anglican churches forms of worship are revived which have no meaning except

* I may mention that Roman Catholic Catechisms sometimes omit the second commandment. I bought one in Dublin which made up the number to ten by dividing the tenth commandment into two.

as a revival of Romish doctrine? Cardinal Vaughan stated not long since, and it has scarcely been denied, that:—

“The doctrines of the Catholic Church, which had been rejected and condemned as being blasphemous, superstitious and fond inventions, have been re-examined and taken back, one by one, until the Thirty-nine Articles have been banished and buried as a rule of faith. The real presence, the sacrifice of the mass, offered for the living and the dead—sometimes even in Latin—not infrequent reservation of the sacrament, regular auricular confession, extreme unction, Purgatory, prayers for the dead, devotions to Our Lady, to her immaculate conception, the use of the rosary and the invocation of saints, are doctrines taught and accepted with a growing desire and relish for them in the Church of England. A celibate clergy, the institution of monks and nuns under vows, retreats for clergy, missions for the people, fasting and other penitential exercises—candles, lamps, incense, crucifixes, images of the Blessed Virgin and the saints held in honour, stations of the cross, cassocks, cottas, Roman collars, birettas, copes, dalmatics, vestments, mitres, croziers, the adoption of an ornate Catholic ritual, and now recently an elaborate display of the whole ceremonial of the Catholic Pontifical—all this speaks of a change and a movement towards the Church that would have appeared absolutely incredible at the beginning of this century.”

What is the explanation of this? The only reason that I can give is that the Tractarian and Sacerdotal movement contained the seeds of Romanism, and we are now witnessing the harvest. It was founded on the absolutely unscriptural belief that the minister of religion was a sacrificing priest deriving miraculous power to work sacramental miracles* from being in the line of what is called the Apostolical succession. It is true there is not a hint of such doctrine in the teaching of Christ and his Apostles; it is just as much an addition to “the faith

* It is worthy of note that the term “sacrament” is never used in Scripture, the magical powers which priestcraft has ascribed to “the sacraments” are foreign to the teaching of the New Testament. Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are simply ordinances appointed by Christ.

once delivered to the saints," as is the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, or the Immaculate Conception. It is a denial of the fundamental teaching of Christ that every sinner has direct access to God through Christ, and needs no priest or human intercessor; it is in fact salvation by sacraments not by faith in Christ; it is what the Apostle Paul describes in the Epistle to the Galatians as "another gospel." His words are very solemn: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed" (*Gal. i. 8*).

This priestly doctrine marvellously suits the weakness of human nature. To the clerical order it means the pride of caste, to the devotees it means the handing over of the responsibility of their salvation to priests, and it inevitably leads to the confessional. No doubt with many this is adopted with a sincere desire for holiness of life; no doubt there are good priests, both in and out of the Church of Rome, who use it to condemn sin; but its invariable effect when adopted on a large scale, and for length of time, is to enfeeble the conscience and often to promote gross irreligion. Such is the account that one hears of it in Italy, Spain, and all the old Roman Catholic countries. It needs no argument to those who know what human nature is that to put women under the absolute control of unmarried priests, and to oblige them to reveal the inmost secrets of their hearts, is sure, sooner or later, to end in revolting evils.*

I take the following description by Dr. H. Grattan Guinness:—

"Look again at the Confessional where every priest sits as an image of the Pope his Master, with the sacred consciences of men and women beneath his feet, as though he were a god.

* See Appendix, p 86.

For mark, he searches the heart, the very secrets of the soul; he demands the discovery and confession of all its sins; he makes himself master of all its thoughts and intents; he sits in that temple, the temple of the human conscience, which God claims solely for Himself. Oh, awful position! And there he presumes to reign, to decide, to absolve from sin; *Absolvo te*, I absolve thee, is his word. The sinner regards him as holding the place of Jesus Christ. This Romish work is a witness that it is so. This is the *Ursuline Manual*. Here, in the chapter for the direction of those who go to confession, and every Papist does, are these words 'Confessors should not be viewed in any other light than as holding the place of Jesus Christ' (p. 177). And again, 'When you leave the Confessional do not disturb your mind by examining whether you have confessed well, or have forgotten any of your sins; but rest assured that if you have made your confession with sincerity, and the other requisite dispositions, you are, according to the express decisions of the Council of Trent, fully absolved from every sin.' Who can forgive sins but God only? See how the 'man of sin' sits in God's temple, and robs Him of His place and His prerogative." (*Romanism and the Reformation*, by H. Grattan Guinness, D.D.)

Yet this awful device for subjugating human souls is fast returning to England, and many women and even children are now in slavish subjection to their Father Confessors, often without the knowledge of their husbands and fathers, and in direct disobedience to their commands. Is it not the case that this country needs a second Reformation? "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance." "While men slept the enemy sowed tares." We are confronted with the necessity of again going to the root of Christian doctrine, and restating the fundamental truths of Christianity. It has often struck me as marvellous that truly good and learned men should be captivated by the vain dream that their "Orders" derive validity because they have passed from the Apostles through the corrupt channel of the Roman Church.* There was no other channel through

* All true Protestants must thank the present Pope for pronouncing Anglican orders 'utterly null and void.'

which they could pass ; and they must hold that a wicked Pope like Alexander Borgia could transmit this ineffable power called the Apostolic Succession,* whereas holy men of God like John Bunyan, or C. H. Spurgeon, or saintly Rutherford did not possess it. It is true that tens of thousands of bad men have become good men in consequence of the teaching of these Nonconformist Saints. It is true that Christ said, "every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit—wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them" (*Matt.* vii. 17–20). Yet we are told we must not look at the "fruits" of these men ; they were "unauthorised teachers;" therefore God could not bless them, yet he could bless the worst men who had the apostolic succession! Baptism and the Eucharist administered by Pope Borgia, or Cardinal Beaton, or some worldly ecclesiastic of Queen Anne's time, were Divine means of grace because these men had "the apostolic succession" and were rightfully ordained, but they were not "sacraments" at all in the hands of Baptists and Presbyterians. It was impossible Christ could work through the holiest men outside of the mechanical line of episcopal ordination and apostolic succession! Does this preposterous claim not remind one of the prayer of the Pharisee? "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican" (*Luke* xviii. 11). No doubt many pious High Churchmen would not go to quite this length, but there are some who do, and they are all on the inclined plane that leads to it. These words are written in the hope that some will re-consider their position even yet in the light of Scripture and sanctified common-sense. We love them for the beauty of their lives, and their genuine self-devotion ; can these graces not be retained without forfeiting their Christian charity ?

* See Appendix, p 82.

Let me say, in conclusion, that even in the Church of Rome there have been true saints of God. The whole Christian world is under a deep obligation to Thomas à Kempis, and there are pious Catholics, I hope, who will say the same of the writer of the "Pilgrim's Progress." The best of men overleap all Church barriers, and yield "the fruits of the Spirit" even in the worst systems. We must always widely distinguish between a system and individual souls. Many English and Irish Catholics live truly pious and beautiful lives; many of them are sincere and devout men, but they are as a rule ignorant of the historical facts mentioned in this treatise. Their religion forbids free enquiry, and they are hardly responsible for what they do not know. We must cultivate charity towards such men while firm in our views of truth. In this mixed and composite world some are better than their creed; many also are worse. Truth requires it to be said that many so-called Protestants are little better than Agnostics; they have parted with all supernatural religion; they no longer believe in an atoning Saviour, or a resurrection from the dead. Many Protestant pulpits have forsaken the oracles of God, and sunk into schools of morals and philosophy; but the soul of man cannot live on this meagre fare. The Roman Church retains the fundamental truth of salvation through the sacrifice on Calvary. True it is grossly overlaid with superstition; still the vital truth is there, it responds in a measure to the deep need of the human soul. No religion without atonement will appease the conscience. The Gospel is "the power of God unto salvation to every one who believeth." That Gospel in its essence has given peace to many Romanists as well as Protestants; it is "the everlasting Gospel." "Without shedding of blood there is no remission" (*Heb. ix. 22.*) "The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth us from all sin" (*I. John, i. 7.*)

“If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous” (I. *John*, ii. 1). If the Romeward movement is to be arrested it must be by the deep spiritual preaching of the same Gospel that Paul preached; it then “turned the world upside down,” and it can do so still. Many Catholics are accessible to the Gospel lovingly preached without controversy: the best way to expel error is to show “the more excellent way.” There is about the Romish system, when fervently believed, a seeming reverence that is very impressive to devout minds. There is about the Protestant service, when cold and rationalistic, a great want of reverence, and this is one reason why many are attracted to the Catholic ceremonial. The fault is in the decayed power of the Protestant pulpit; if it were restored to its pristine vigour we should soon see a turn in the tide. Ritualism and Romanism would wither under the earnest preaching of God’s word, “with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven.” May God speed and prosper that day!

APPENDIX.

To show the extraordinary power claimed by the priesthood in consequence of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, I make a further quotation from Archdeacon Sinclair's Charge; and I may add that the tendency, even among the High Church sacerdotalists, is to go a considerable way in the same direction. Once regard the priest as a miracle worker, and no bounds can be set to his assumptions.

ROMAN DEDUCTIONS AS TO THE POWER OF THE
PRIESTHOOD.

"On this theory, unsupported as it is by Scripture, and contrary to Scripture, the Roman Catholics have established a tremendous theory of the power and dignity of the priesthood. According to Cassian, 'The priest of God is exalted above all earthly sovereignties, and above all celestial heights. He is inferior only to God.' Innocent III. says 'That the priest is placed between God and man: inferior to God, but superior to man The priestly dignity is also superior even to all celestial dignities To priests every door is open. Jesus has died to institute the priesthood. It was not necessary for the Redeemer to die in order to save the world; a drop of his blood, a single tear, or prayer, was sufficient to procure salvation for all But to institute the priesthood, the death of Jesus Christ was necessary. Had He not died, *where should we find the victim that the priests of the New Law now offer?* With regard to the power of priests over the real Body of Jesus Christ, it is of faith that when they pronounce the words of consecration the Incarnate Word has obliged himself *to obey* and to come into their hands under the Sacramental species We find that in obedience to the words of his priests—*Hoc est corpus meum*—God himself descends on the altar, that He comes wherever they call Him, and as often as they call Him, and places Himself in their hands,

even though they should be His enemies. And after having come, He remains entirely at their disposal; they move Him as they please, from one place to another; they may, if they wish, shut Him up in the tabernacle, or expose Him on the altar, or carry Him outside the Church; they may, if they choose, eat His flesh, and give Him for the food of others . . . *God is Himself obliged to abide by the judgment of His priests,* and either not to pardon or to pardon, according as they refuse to give absolution, provided the penitent is capable of it . . . The sacerdotal dignity also surpasses the dignity of the angels. . . . St. Francis of Assisi used to say, 'If I saw an angel and a priest, I would bend my knee first to the priest and then to the angel . . . Besides, the power of the priest surpasses that of the Blessed Virgin Mary; for although this Divine Mother can pray for us, and by her prayers obtain whatever she wishes, yet she cannot absolve a Christian from even the smallest sin.' . . . St. Bernardine of Sienna has written: 'Holy Virgin, excuse me, for I speak not against thee: the Lord has raised the priesthood above thee.' The saint assigns the reason of the superiority of the priesthood over Mary: she conceived Jesus Christ only once; but by consecrating the Eucharist, the priest, as it were, conceives Him as often as he wishes, so that if the person of the Redeemer had not as yet been in the world, the priest, by pronouncing the words of consecration, would produce the great person of a Man-God . . . Hence priests are called the parents of Jesus Christ . . . Thus the priest may, in a certain manner, be called the Creator of his Creator, since by saying the words of consecration, he creates, as it were, Jesus in the sacrament, by giving Him a sacramental existence, and produces Him as a victim to be offered to the eternal Father. As in creating the world it was sufficient for the Father to have said, 'Let it be made, and it was created,' . . . so it is sufficient for the priest to say, '*Hoc est corpus meum,*' and behold the bread is no longer bread, but the body of Jesus Christ. 'The power of the priest,' says St. Bernardine of Sienna, 'is the power of the Divine Person; for the transubstantiation of the bread requires as much power as the creation of the world. . . . The dignity of the priest is so great that he even blesses Jesus Christ on the altar as a victim to be offered to the Eternal Father.' . . . 'Who is it that has an arm like the arm of God, and thunders with a voice

like the thundering voice of God? It is the priest, who, in giving absolution, exerts the arm and voice of God, by which he rescues souls from hell."—*Dignity and Duties of the Priest*, by St. Alphonsus Liguori, Doctor of the Church, p. 23, &c. New York: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See, 1889.

SACERDOTALISM.

[From Dean Farrar's "*The Bible and the Ministry*."] .

Now what are the facts? According to the Sacerdotalists, Priests, *iespis*, "sacrificing Priests" are of Divine institution, and are essential to the existence of the Christian Church. According to the whole body of the Reformers, and all Evangelical members of the Church of England, and the distinct teaching of all the formularies of the Church of England, and the vast bodies of Nonconformist Christians of every class and division throughout the world, Priests are Presbyters and nothing more; representative, and in no single sense of the word vicarious; ministers only, not superior either in ability, or power, or religious authority to any true Christian; in no sense necessary intermediaries between God and the individual soul, and in no sense entitled to thrust themselves for a moment between any individual soul and that free, acceptable, unimpeded, immediate access to God, which is the highest and most indefeasible privilege of every Christian man.

We turn then at once to the New Testament, and what do we find?

i. We find that though the New Testament, from end to end, is full of accounts of Christian ministers, their lives and doings, the name of *hiercus*, or "priest," is never once applied to them, or to any one of them. Surely this alone should be decisive to every plain mind. It would be an absurdity to suppose that the *one* name which Romanists and Ritualists apply to Christian ministers, and regard as so important, should be exactly the one name which the New Testament resolutely and deliberately refuses them.

ii. I say resolutely and deliberately refuses them; for that it is not and cannot be the result of accident may be proved at once, to say nothing of the fact that had the New Testament been the sport and prey of such accidents it could not possibly

be our final guide; since it would then say much about less essential points in the Christian ministry, and nothing about the very point which the sacerdotalists regard as the most important of all.

iii. We all know that the New Testament does apply ten other names to Christian ministers of every class, and never once even strays into this name of *hiercis*, or sacrificing priests. It calls them Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers, Ministers, Overseers, Presbyters, Deacons, Stewards. Would it not be strange indeed that it should never give them the one name which so many of them covet, if that were an admissible name? Even St. Peter, one of the greatest of the Apostles, so far from coveting the name "priest" says, "The presbyters which are among you I exhort, who am also a presbyter." Even St. John, the disciple whom Jesus loved, chose no name for himself but "John the Presbyter."

iv. And that the refusal of the name "sacrificing priests" to the Christian presbyters were deliberate is transparently obvious from the fact that this name *hiercus*—if the Christian minister had even in any secondary and analogical sense been meant to be a *hiercus*—was the very one which lay most easily, obviously, and intelligibly at hand. For the ancient world was full of sacrificing priests, and of sacrificing priests only. The only priests of the pagan world were sacrificing priests. The only priests among the Jews were sacrificing priests. Yet while Christ, and all the Evangelists, and all the Apostles, and all the earliest Christian writers deliberately went out of their way to shun this word, they at the same time chose such purely civil words as Presbyter, Overseer, and Deacon. That "Presbyter" was a non-priestly word, and that the word Priest in our Prayer-Book was never meant for anything but Presbyter, and is derived from it, every one knows; and recent explorations in Palestine have conclusively shown that the two other names chosen to describe the Christian ministry, namely *Episkopoi* and *Diakonoi*, which were deliberately selected by the apostles and early Christians, were the names of purely civil offices.

v. But even that is not all. As though to prove decisively that there was deep reason for not giving the title *hiercis* to Christian ministers, the word *is* used of Christians as a whole, but *not* of ministers. For instance, St. Peter by analogy, in a

secondary and metaphorical sense, twice calls *all Christians* "a sacrificial priesthood"; but to prevent any mistake in the metaphor he expressly adds a defining clause in both verses, that the only *sacrifices* they can offer are "*spiritual sacrifices*" and "the praises of God." And in the Apocalypse *hieréis* is used three times of *all Christians*, and not once of ministers. In the four Gospels it is not once used either of Christ, or of any one of His disciples, but only of Jewish priests—who ultimately murdered Christ. The Acts of the Apostles is the first and the best of all ecclesiastical histories, and is entirely about the doings of the first Christian ministers. The word occurs in that book three times of Jewish priests, once of a heathen priest, not once of any Christian minister. There are thirteen epistles of St. Paul. The word *hieréis* does not once occur in any one of them. Three of these epistles are especially addressed to Christian ministers. Yet they, and those which they are to guide, are not once called by this name, though they are called by various other names. There are two epistles of the great apostle St. Peter; three of the beloved disciple, St. John; one of St. Jude; one of St. James, the Lord's brother—not one of these, even when directly addressing ministers, or speaking of them, ever calls them by this name. On the other hand, in the Acts of the Apostles, where we read how the Christian ministry was organised by the infant Church, "Presbyter" is applied to Christian ministers at least ten times; and in the pastoral epistles five times;* and in St. Peter twice; and in St. John twice; and in the Apocalypse twelve times.

MARIOLATRY.

To show how active is the superstitious teaching about the Virgin Mary and the efficacy of Indulgences at the present day, I quote from a little tract written in 1884 by the present Cardinal Vaughan (then Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford), 4th edition, 20th thousand, entitled, "The Meaning and Use of the Scapular of our Lady of Mount Carmel," Conditions of Membership, page 19.

(2) "The Scapular consists of two pieces of brown or black cloth to be worn over the shoulders, on the breast and back.

* The analogous words *presbutides*, *presbutai*, *presbuterion*, occur in St. Paul four times.

When a person has once had his Scapular blessed, no further blessing is required however often the Scapular be renewed."

(3) "It must be worn night and day."

(4) "If a person ceases to wear it for some time through forgetfulness or neglect it may be resumed without further ceremonial, unless it had been cast away with an intention of leaving the confraternity. A member neglecting to wear the Scapular forfeits a right to the Indulgences during the period of that neglect."

"The Sabbatine Indulgence, first published by Pope John XXII., and then republished by many of his successors, means that Our Lady will obtain the deliverance from Purgatory, on the Saturday after their death, of those who during life shall have worn the Scapular and faithfully complied with the other conditions required. There can be no difficulty in believing this, if we consider the meaning of a Plenary Indulgence granted by the Church, and applicable to the holy souls. A Plenary Indulgence is the remission by virtue of the merits of Christ and His Saints, of all the temporal punishment due to forgiven sin, upon certain conditions which are specified by the Pope when he grants an Indulgence. The Sabbatine Indulgence is in fact a Plenary Indulgence granted by God, through the prayers of the Blessed Virgin, to the deceased who are in Purgatory, provided they shall have fulfilled upon earth certain specified conditions. The *doctrine* then presents no difficulty whatever to an instructed Catholic: the only question that can arise is the one of *facts*,—Is there evidence whereupon a pious belief may be founded as to the promise and concession of this extraordinary Indulgence at the prayer of the Holy Mother of God" (pp. 14, 15).

THE VIRGIN MARY.

[From Dr. Salmon's "*Infallibility of the Church.*"]

"The most prevalent extravagance of Roman teaching at the present day is an exaggeration of the honour due to the Blessed Virgin Mary. She is represented, in many sermons and popular books of devotion, as almost a fourth Person of the Blessed Trinity, and as a sharer on nearly equal terms, with our Lord in the work of our redemption. These extravagances are such as to shock one so little disposed to judge harshly of Roman

doctrine as Dr. Pusey, and they formed the main subject of his book, *The Eirenicon*. We ask, is this teaching authorized? and no one can tell us. The infallible guide will not commit himself.

“It might seem, however, that he has committed himself. One of the most active teachers of these new doctrines is St. Alphonso dei Liguori, who was canonized by the late Pope. Liguori’s writings have been a mark for Protestant attack, not only on account of his Mariolatry, but also on account of his casuistry. For though in his work on Moral Theology he professes to hold the mean between extreme laxity and extreme rigour, his decisions lean so much to the side of what we count laxity as very much to scandalize weak minds. Now, our first impression is that the Pope is fairly responsible for all Liguori’s teaching, for before anyone can be canonized as a saint a most rigorous examination must be made whether his published writings contain anything objectionable. This examination was made in Liguori’s case in the year 1803, when he was a candidate for beatification. All his works then came under the examination of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, who decreed that in all the writings of Alphonso dei Liguori, severely examined according to the discipline of the Apostolic See, there was found nothing worthy of censure. And there is testimony that this examination was made with particular severity; that his system of morality had been more than twenty times rigorously discussed by the Sacred Congregation; and that in all their decrees the Cardinals had agreed ‘voce concordi, unanimes consensu, una voce, una mente.’”

WORSHIP OF THE VIRGIN.

[From Dr. Sinclair’s “Points at Issue between the Church of England and the Church of Rome.”]

In the case of the Virgin this worship has gone far. The Church of Rome teaches that she was:—

1. Born without sin.
2. Taken bodily up into heaven.
3. That she is ‘the Refuge of Sinners.’

In the Breviary she is addressed thus—

‘Hail, Star of the Sea!
 God’s gracious Mother
 Thou happy gate of heaven.’

‘O Lady most glorious,
 Exalted above the heavens . . .
 Thou art become the window of heaven;
 ’Tis thou that art the gate of the King on high,
 And of bright light the portal thou art.’

St. Alphonsus Liguori writes thus in his ‘Glories of Mary’ (chap. v. ‘Of the Necessity of Mary’s Intervention in order to obtain Salvation’): ‘This *necessity* arises from the will of God, who wishes us to receive all graces through the prayers of Mary . . . That God has constituted Mary the dispensatrix of His grace was the opinion of St. Bernard; it is now common among theologians. . . . The sentiment is by no means contrary to Catholic doctrine. Nay, far from it: the Church in her public service teaches us to recur to Mary under the titles of Health of the Sick, Refuge of Sinners, Help of Christians. In her offices for the festivals of Mary she applies to her these words of wisdom, “In me is all hope of life and virtue.” Again, “He who finds me shall find life;” “They that work by me shall not sin;” “They that explain me shall have life everlasting.” Now all these texts go to prove that the intercession of Mary is morally necessary for us. In a work entitled ‘Devotions of the Sacred Heart,’ it is said: ‘Jesus is our guide and light in the way of life; *Mary is the star which guides and conducts us to the harbour of salvation.* Jesus is the author of grace; *Mary is the mother of grace.* In a word *Mary participates by grace in all the titles which Jesus enjoys by nature*’ (p. 43: Dublin, 1840).

Here is a passage from Liguori, who has been canonized, and his works freed from all censure: ‘Brother Leo once saw in a vision two ladders, one red, at the summit of which was Jesus Christ; and the other white, at the top of which presided His blessed Mother. He observed that many who endeavoured to ascend the first ladder, after mounting a few steps, fell down, and on trying again were equally unsuccessful, so that they never reached the summit; but a voice having told them to make trial of the white ladder, they soon gained the top, the blessed Virgin having held forth her hands to help them (‘Glories of Mary,’ p. 176: Dublin, 1841).

In 1834 the ‘Psalter of St. Bonaventure’ was reprinted at Rome, with the imprimatur of the Roman authorities.

This is his version of Psalm xxiv:—

‘Unto Thee, O Lady, will I lift up my soul; in the judgment of God through Thy prayer I shall not be afraid.

‘And let not mine enemies triumph over me: for all they that hope in Thee are strengthened.’ And so forth.

This is his version of Psalm cxlviii:—

‘O praise our Lady of heaven; praise Her in the heights.’

‘Praise Her, all ye men and beasts; fowls of the heaven and fishes of the sea.’

‘Praise Her, sun and moon: stars and orbits of the planets.’

‘Praise Her, cherubim and seraphim: thrones and dominions and powers.’

‘Praise Her, all ye legions of Angels: praise Her, all ye orders of spirit above.’

PURGATORY.

[From Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*].

“There is in the Roman Church an amazing amount of literature recording revelations such as I have described; but whether these revelations are genuine or not the Pope will not tell, and it is at anyone's choice to accept or reject. Some of the Oxford converts made it a point of honour to show how much they were able to believe, and with what ease they could swallow down what old-fashioned Roman Catholics were straining at. Among these there was none more influential than the late Father Faber (far more so, indeed, than Dr. Newman), whose devotional and theological works had a rapid and extensive sale. You can hardly read half a dozen pages of these without meeting as proof of his assertious, ‘Our Lord said to St. Gertrude,’ ‘It was revealed to St. Teresa,’ ‘Let us listen to the testimony of God Himself: He made known to a holy nun,’ &c.* These

* ‘Our Lord said to St. Gertrude, that as often as anyone says to God: “My love, my sweetest, my best beloved,” and the like, with a devout intention, he receives a pledge of his salvation, in virtue of which if he perseveres he shall receive in heaven a special privilege of the same sort as the special grace which St. John, the beloved disciple, had on earth.’—*All for Jesus*, p. 60.

‘Our Lord said to St. Teresa, that one soul, not a saint, but seeking perfection, was more precious to Him than thousands living common lives,’ page 117.

‘St. Gertrude was divinely instructed, that as often as the Angelic Salutation is devoutly recited by the faithful on earth, three efficacious streamlets proceed

quotations are made as much as a matter of course as you or I might cite texts of Scripture. A number of new things about Purgatory are stated on this authority, and being incorporated into widely circulated devotional works, pass rapidly into popular belief: for instance, that the Virgin Mary is queen of Purgatory, that the Archangel Michael is her prime minister, that the souls there are quite unable to help themselves, and that our Lord has so tied up His own hands that He is unable to help them except as satisfactions are made for them by living Christians; with a number of other details as to the causes for which souls are sent there, the length of time for which they are punished, and the manner in which they are relieved. I regret to have to mention that, according to the revelations of St. Francesca, bishops seem on the whole to remain longest in Purgatory, and to be visited with the greatest rigour. One holy bishop, for some negligence in his high office, had been fifty-nine years in Purgatory at the date of her information; another, so generous of his revenues that he was named the Almsgiver, had been there five years because, before his election, he had wished for the dignity.*

More recently a French admirer of Father Faber has made a systematic treatise on Purgatory, based on modern revelations. The book is called 'Purgatory, according to the Revelations of the Saints,' by the Abbé Louvet.†

Louvet makes a calculation, by the help of his revelations, how long an ordinary Christian may expect to have to stay in Purgatory. I cannot trouble you with the details of his proof, but his result is, that a Christian of more than usual sanctity, who has never committed a mortal sin, who has carefully avoided all the graver venial sins, and has satisfied by penance for three-fourths of the lighter sins into which frailty has led him, must expect to spend in Purgatory 123 years, 3 months,

from the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, most sweetly penetrating the Virgin's heart,' p. 104.

'Once more let us listen to the testimony of God Himself: a holy nun pressed God in prayer to reveal to her what it was in which His Divine Majesty took so much pleasure in His beloved Gertrude,' &c. p. 323.

* *All for Jesus*, p. 367.

† *Le Purgatoire d'après les révélations des Saints*, per M. l'Abbé Louvet, Missionnaire Apostolique: Paris, 1880.

and 15 days. 'A truly terrifying result,' says Louvet, 'for if it is so with righteous souls, what will become of poor sinners like me?''*

But these 123 years are only years of earthly measurement; they would be more than centuries if measured by the sensations of the suffering souls. This Louvet proves by several authentic histories. One is of two priests who loved each other like brethren. It was revealed to one on his death-bed that he should be released from Purgatory the first Mass that was offered for him. He sent for his friend, and made him promise that he would lose no time after his death in fulfilling the conditions of his release. The friend promised, and the moment the sick man expired, flew to the altar, and celebrated the Mass with all the devotion he was capable of. Immediately afterwards his friend appeared to him radiant with glory, but with an air of reproach on his countenance. 'O faithless friend,' he cried, 'you would deserve to be treated with the same cruelty you have exercised towards me! Here I have been years in the avenging flames, and to think that neither you nor one of my brethren should have had the charity to offer a single Mass for me!' 'Nay,' returned his friend, 'you had no sooner closed your eyes than I fulfilled my promise; and you may satisfy yourself by examining your body, which you will find is not yet cold.' 'Is that so?' returned the deceased. 'How frightful are the torments of Purgatory when one hour seems more than a year!' Another case was that of an abbot, who on returning from a journey found that the most promising of his young monks had just died. As the abbot was praying in the choir after matins he saw a phantom enveloped in flames. 'O charitable Father,' said the novice, with deep groans, "give me your blessing. I had committed a small breach of rule, not a sin in itself. As this is the only cause of my detention in Purgatory, I have been allowed by special favour to address myself to you. You are to impose my penance, and I shall then be released.' The abbot replied: 'As far as it depends on me, my son, I absolve you, and give you my blessing; and for penance I appoint you to stay in Purgatory till the hour of prime:' that was the next service, usually held at eight o'clock in the morning. At these words, the novice, filled with despair, ran shrieking

* *Ibid.* p. 178.

through the church, crying: 'O merciless father! O heart pitiless towards your unhappy son! What! for a fault for which in my lifetime you would have thought the lightest penance enough, to impose on me so fearful a penalty. Little do you know the atrocity of the sufferings of Purgatory.' And shrieking out, 'O uncharitable penance!' he disappeared. The abbot's hair stood on end with horror; gladly would he have recalled his severe sentence. But the word had been spoken. At last a happy thought struck him. He rang the bell, called up his monks, told them of the facts, and celebrated the Office of prime immediately. But all his life he retained the impression of this horrible scene, and often said that till then he had no idea of the punishments of the other world, and could not have imagined that a few hours in Purgatory could form so fearful an expiation.

But we shall be less disposed to pity the souls in Purgatory when we learn what exceptional good fortune it is to get there. To the question, 'Are there few that be saved?' Louvet would return a most gloomy answer. His arguments and calculations are very interesting, but would take me too long to repeat. But (p. 26) he clinches his opinion by a revelation. St. Bernard, it appears, was privileged on two successive days to stand by the judgment-seat of God, and hear the sentences pronounced on all the souls that died on these two days. He was horrified to find that of 80,000 souls only three souls of adults were saved the first day, and only two on the second; and that of these five not one went direct to heaven: all must visit Purgatory.

INDULGENCES.

[From Wylie's "*History of Protestantism*," Vol. 1., bk. 4, chap. viii., pp. 256—258.]

"The Pontiff (Leo X.) was not in the least burdened with religious beliefs and convictions. To have such was the fashion of neither his house nor his age. His office as Pontiff, it is true, connected him with a 'gigantic fable' which had come down from early times; but to have exploded that fable would have been to dissolve the chair in which he sat, and the throne that brought him so much magnificence and power. Leo was, therefore, content to vent his scepticism in the well-known sneer,

‘What a profitable affair this fable of Christ has been to us!’ To this had it come! Christianity was now worked solely as a source of profit to the Popes.¹

“Leo, combining, as we have said, the love of art with that of pleasure, conceived the idea of beautifying Rome. His family had adorned Florence with the noblest edifices. Its glory was spoken of in all countries, and men came from afar to gaze upon its monuments. Leo would do for the Eternal City what his ancestors had done for the capital of Etruria. War, and the slovenliness or penury of the Popes, had permitted the Church of St. Peter to fall into disrepair. He would clear away the ruinous fabric, and replace it with a pile more glorious than any that Christendom contained. But to execute such a project millions would be needed. Where were they to come from? The shows or entertainments with which Leo had gratified the vanity of his courtiers, and amused the indolence of the Romans, had emptied his exchequer. But the magnificent conception must not be permitted to fall through from want of money. If the earthly treasury of the Pope was empty, his spiritual treasury was full; and there was wealth enough there to rear a temple that would eclipse all existing structures, and be worthy of being the metropolitan church of Christendom. In short, it was resolved to open a special sale of indulgences in all the countries of Europe.² This traffic would enrich all parties. From the Seven Hills would flow a river of spiritual blessing. To Rome would flow back a river of gold.

“Arrangements were made for opening this great market (1517). The licence to sell in the different countries of Europe was disposed of to the highest bidder, and the price was paid beforehand to the Pontiff. The indulgences in Germany were farmed out to Albert, Archbishop of Mainz and Magdeburg.³ The archbishop was in Germany what Leo X. was in Rome. He loved to see himself surrounded with a brilliant court; he denied himself no pleasure; was profuse in entertainments; never went abroad without a long retinue of servants; and, as

¹ Paul of Venice says that this Pope laboured under two grievous faults: “ignorance of religion, and impiety or atheism” (*ignorantia religionis, et impietate sive atheismo*).—Sackendorf, *Hist. Lutheran*, lib. i., sec. 47, p. 190.

² Polano, *Hist. Council. Trent*, bk. i., p. 4; Lond., 1629. Sarpi, *Hist. Council. Trent*, livr. i., p. 14; Basle, 1738. Sleidan, *Hist. Reform.*, bk. i.; Lond. 1689.

³ Sackendorf, *Hist. Lutheran.*, lib. i., sec. 6, p. 12.

a consequence, was greatly in want of money. Besides, he owed to the Pope for his pall—some said, 26,000, others, 30,000 florins.⁴ There could be no harm in diverting a little of the wealth that was about to flow to Rome, into channels that might profit himself. The bargain was struck, and the archbishop sought out a suitable person to perambulate Germany, and preach up the indulgences. He found a man every way suited to his purpose. This was a Dominican monk, named John Diezel, or Tetzal, the son of a goldsmith of Leipsic. He had filled the odious office of inquisitor, and having added thereto a huckstering trade in indulgences, he had acquired a large experience in that sort of business. He had been convicted of a shameful crime at Innspruck, and sentenced to be put into a sack and drowned; but powerful intercession being made for him, he was reprieved, and lived to help unconsciously in the overthrow of the system that had nourished him.⁵

“Tetzal lacked no quality necessary for success in his scandalous occupation. He had the voice of a town-crier, and the eloquence of a mountebank. This latter quality enabled him to paint in the most glowing colours the marvellous virtues of the wares which he offered for sale. The resources of his invention, the power of his effrontery, and the efficacy of his indulgences were all alike limitless.⁶

“This man made a progress through Germany. The line of the procession as it moved from place to place might be traced at a distance by the great red cross, which was carried by Tetzal himself, and on which were suspended the arms of the Pope. In front of the procession, on a velvet cushion, was borne the Pontiff's bull of grace; in the rear came the mules laden with bales of pardons, to be given, not to those who had penitence in the heart, but to those who had money in the hand.

“When the procession approached a town it was announced to the inhabitants that ‘The Grace of God and of the Holy Fathers was at their gates.’ The welcome accorded was commonly such as the extraordinary honour was fitted to draw forth. The gates were opened, and the tall red cross, with all the spiritual riches of which it was the sign, passed in, followed by a long and

⁴ Gerdesius, *Hist. Evam. Renov.*, tom. 1. p. 92.

⁵ Hechtius, *Vita Tezelii*, p. 21. Seckendorf, *Hist. Luth.*, lib. i., sec. 7, p. 16. Sleidan, bk. xiii., p. 273.

⁶ Melanethon, *Vita Mart. Luth.*, p. 15.

imposing array of the ecclesiastical and civic authorities, the religious orders, the various trades, and the whole population of the place, which had come out to welcome the great pardon-monger. The procession advanced amid the beating of drums, the waving of flags, the blaze of tapers, and the pealing of bells.⁷

“When he entered a city, Tetzal and his company went straight to the cathedral. The crowd pressed in and filled the church. The cross was set up in front of the high altar, a strong iron box was put down beside it, in which the money received for pardons was deposited, and Tetzal, in the garb of the Dominicans, mounting the pulpit began to set forth with stentorian voice the incomparable merit of his wares. He bade the people think what it was that had come to them. Never before in their times, nor in the times of their fathers, had there been a day of privilege like this. Never before had the gates of Paradise been opened so widely: ‘Press in now: come and buy while the market lasts,’ shouted the Dominican; ‘should that cross be taken down the market will close, heaven will depart, and then you will begin to knock, and bewail your folly in neglecting to avail yourselves of blessings which will then have gone beyond your reach.’ So in effect did Tetzal harangue the crowd. But his words have a plainness and a vigour which no paraphrase can convey. Let us cull a few specimens from his orations.

“‘Indulgences are the most precious and the most noble of God’s gifts,’ said Tetzal. Then pointing to the red cross, which stood full in view of the multitude, he would exclaim, ‘This cross has as much efficacy as the very cross of Christ.’⁸ ‘Come, and I will give you letters all properly sealed, by which even the sins you intend to commit may be pardoned.’⁹ ‘I would not change my privileges for those of St. Peter in heaven, for I have saved more souls by my indulgences than the apostle did by his sermons.’¹⁰ The Dominican knew how to extol his own office as well as the pardons he was so desirous to bestow on those who had money to buy. ‘But more than this,’ said Tetzal, for he had not as yet disclosed the whole wonderful

⁷ Myconius, *Hist. Reform.*, p. 106. Gerdesius, *Hist. Evan. Renov.*, tom. i., p. 84.

⁸ Myconius, *Hist. Reform.*, p. 14; Ten. edit.

⁹ Sleidan, *Hist. Reform.* bk. xiii., p. 273.

¹⁰ Gerdesius, *Hist. Evan. Renov.*, tom. i., p. 82.

virtues of his merchandise, 'indulgences avail not only for the living but for the dead.' So had Boniface VIII. enacted two centuries before; and Tetzel goes on to the particular application of the dogma. 'Priest, noble, merchant, wife, youth, maiden, do you not hear your parents and your other friends who are dead, and who cry from the bottom of the abyss: 'We are suffering horrible torments! A trifling alms would deliver us; you can give it, and you will not?''¹¹

"These words, shouted in a voice of thunder by the monk, made the hearers shudder.

"'At the very instant,' continues Tetzel, 'that the money rattles at the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from purgatory, and flies liberated to heaven.'¹² Now you can ransom so many souls, stiff-necked and thoughtless man; with twelve groats you can deliver your father from purgatory, and you are ungrateful enough not to save him! I shall be justified in the Day of Judgment; but you—you will be punished so much the more severely for having neglected so great salvation. I declare to you, though you have but a single coat, you ought to strip it off and sell it, in order to obtain this grace. . . . The Lord our God no longer reigns, he has resigned all power to the Pope.'

"No argument was spared by the monk which could prevail with the people to receive his pardons; in other words, to fill his iron box. From the fires of purgatory—dreadful realities to men of that age, for even Luther as yet believed in such a place—Tetzel would pass to the ruinous condition of St. Peter's, and draw an affecting picture of the exposure to the rain and hail of the bodies of the two apostles, Peter and Paul, and the other martyrs buried within its precincts.¹³ Pausing, he would launch a sudden anathema at all who despised the grace which the Pope and himself were offering to men; and then, changing to a more meek and pious strain, he would wind up with a quotation from Scripture, 'Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see: for I tell you that many prophets have desired to see those things that ye see, and have not seen them, and to hear those things that ye hear, and have not heard them.'¹⁴

¹¹ D'Aubigné, *Hist. Reform.*, vol. i., p. 242.

¹² Sackendorf, *Hist. Lutheran.*, lib. i., sec. 6, pp. 12—17.

¹³ *Alberti Moguntini Summaria Instructio Sub-Commissariorum in Causa Indulgentia.* (Gerdesius, tom. i., App. No. 9, p. 83.)

¹⁴ D'Aubigné, *Hist. Reform.*, vol. i., pp. 241—243.

And having made an end, the monk would rush down the pulpit stairs and throw a piece of money into the box, which, as if the rattle of the coin were infectious, was sure to be followed by a torrent of pieces.

“All round the church were erected confessional stalls. The shrift was a short one, as if intended only to form another opportunity to the penancer of impressing anew upon the penitent the importance of the indulgences. From confession the person passed to the counter behind which stood Tetzal. He sharply scrutinized all who approached him, that he might guess at their rank in life, and proportion accordingly the sum to be exacted. From kings and princes twenty-five ducats were demanded for an ordinary indulgence; from abbots and barons, ten; from those who had an income of five hundred florins, six; and from those who had only two hundred, one.¹⁵ For particular sins there was a special schedule of prices. Polygamy cost six ducats; church robbery and perjury, nine; murder, eight; and witchcraft, two. Samson, who carried on the same trade in Switzerland as Tetzal in Germany, charged for parricide or fratricide one ducat. The same hand that gave the pardon could not receive the money. The penitent himself must drop it into the box. There were three keys for the box. Tetzal kept one, another was in the possession of the cashier of the house of Fugger in Augsburg, the agent of the Archbishop and Elector of Mainz, who farmed the indulgences; the third was in the keeping of the civil authority. From time to time the box was opened in the presence of a notary-public, and its contents counted and registered.

“The form in which the pardon was given was that of a letter of absolution. Those letters ran in the following terms:— ‘May our Lord Jesus Christ have pity on thee, N. N., and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy passion. And I, by virtue of the apostolic power which has been confided to me, do absolve thee from all ecclesiastical censures, judgments, and penalties which thou mayest have merited, and from all excesses, sins, and crimes which thou mayest have committed, however great and enormous they may be, and for whatsoever cause, even though they had been reserved to our most Holy Father the Pope and the Apostolic See. I efface all attainders of

¹⁵ *Summario Instructio*. (Gerdesius, tom. i., App. No. 9.)

unfitness and all marks of infamy thou mayest have drawn on thee on this occasion; I remit the punishment thou shouldest have had to endure in purgatory; I make thee anew a participator in the Sacraments of the Church; I incorporate thee afresh in the communion of saints; and I reinstate thee in the innocence and purity in which thou wast at the hour of thy baptism; so that, at the hour of thy death, the gate through which is the entrance to the place of torments and punishments shall be closed against thee, and that which leads to the Paradise of joy shall be open. And shouldest thou be spared long, this grace shall remain immutable to the time of thy last end. In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

“ ‘Brother John Tetzels, Commissioner, has signed it with his own hand.’ ” ¹⁶

THE HOLY HOUSE OF LORETTO.

[From Dr. Salmon's "*Infallibility of the Church*."]]

Something of the kind occurred in the case of Mr. Ffoulkes, whose name is, no doubt, familiar to you. He tells us of one miraculous story in particular, which we are so uncandid as to reject without examination, and which he subjected to careful investigation. You have all, I dare say, heard the story of the holy house at Loretto. The Virgin Mary's house at Nazareth, when the land fell into the possession of unbelievers, and worshippers could no longer resort to it, was carried by the angels across the seas on the 9th May, 1291 (for I like to be exact), and after taking three temporary resting-places, finally settled down at Loretto in the year 1295. There, on the credit of so great a miracle, it attracted many pilgrims, and was by them enriched with abundant gifts. Several Popes pledged their credit to the truth of the story, and rewarded pious visitors with indulgences. I possess a history of the holy house, written by Tursellinus, a Jesuit, and printed at Loretto itself in 1837, from which I find that the story is proved by such irrefragable evidence that 'de ea ambigere aut dubitare sit nefas,' and that no one can doubt it who is not prepared to deny the power and providence of God, and to remove all faith in the testimony of

¹⁶ D'Aubigné, *Hist. Reform.*, vol. i., p. 247.

man. Mr. Ffoulkes, whose turn of mind was such that he seemed to find it as hard as the holy house itself to find a resting place, either among Protestants or Roman Catholics, neither accepted this story without inquiry, as might a thorough-going Roman Catholic, nor rejected it without inquiry, as might a thorough-going Protestant. He took the trouble of going both to Loretto and to Nazareth, and making laborious investigations on the spot; and the result of his inquiry was, that he came back thoroughly convinced of the fictitious character of the Santa Casa, notwithstanding the privileges bestowed by so many Popes. On stating this conviction to the excellent French priest who had received him into the Roman communion his only reply was, "There are many things in the Breviary which I do not believe myself."

EXTRACT FROM W. E. GLADSTONE'S "VATICAN DECREES."

Rome has refurbished, and paraded anew, every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused.

Is this then a fact, or is it not?

I must assume that it is denied; and therefore I cannot wholly pass by the work of proof. But I will state in the fewest possible words, and with references, a few propositions, all the holders of which have been *condemned* by the See of Rome during my own generation, and especially within the last twelve or fifteen years. And, in order that I may do nothing towards importing passion into what is matter of pure argument, I will avoid citing any of the fearfully energetic epithets in which the condemnations are sometimes clothed.

1. Those who maintain the Liberty of the Press. Encyclical Letter of Pope Gregory XVI., in 1831: and of Pope Pius IX., in 1864.

2. Or the liberty of conscience and of worship. Encyclical of Pius IX., December 8, 1864.

3. Or the liberty of speech. 'Syllabus' of March 18, 1861. Prop. lxxix. Encyclical of Pius IX., December 8, 1864.

4. Or who contend that Papal judgments and decrees may, without sin, be disobeyed, or differed from, unless they treat of the rules (*dogmata*) of faith or morals. Ibid.

5. Or who assign to the State the power of defining the civil

rights (*jura*) and province of the Church. 'Syllabus' of Pope Pius IX., March 8, 1861. Ibid. Prop. xix.

6. Or who hold that Roman Pontiffs and Ecumenical Councils have transgressed the limits of their power, and usurped the rights of princes. Ibid. Prop. xxiii.

(It must be borne in mind, that "Ecumenical Councils" here mean Roman Councils, not recognised by the rest of the Church. The Councils of the early Church did not interfere with the jurisdiction of the civil power.)

7. Or that the Church may not employ force. (*Ecclesia vis inferendæ potestatem non habet.*) 'Syllabus,' Prop. xxiv.

8. Or that power, not inherent in the office of the Episcopate, but granted to it by the civil authority, may be withdrawn from it at the discretion of that authority. Ibid. Prop. xxv.

9. Or that the civil immunity (*immunitas*) of the Church and its ministers depends upon civil right. Ibid. Prop. xxx.

10. Or that in the conflict of laws civil and ecclesiastical, the civil law should prevail. Ibid. Prop. xlii.

11. Or that any method of instruction of youth, solely secular, may be approved. Ibid. Prop. xlvi.

12. Or that knowledge of things philosophical and civil, may and should decline to be guided by Divine and Ecclesiastical authority. Ibid. Prop. lvii.

13. Or that marriage is not in its essence a Sacrament. Ib., Prop. lxvi.

14. Or that marriage, not sacramentally contracted, (*si sacramentum excludatur*) has a binding force. Ibid. Prop. lxxiii.

15. Or that the abolition of the Temporal Power of the Popedom would be highly advantageous to the Church. Ibid. Prop. lxxvi. Also lxx.

16. Or that any other religion than the Roman religion may be established by a State. Ibid. Prop. lxxvii.

17. Or that in "Countries called Catholic," the free exercise of other religions may laudably be allowed. 'Syllabus,' Prop. lxxviii.

18. Or that the Roman Pontiff ought to come to terms with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization. Ibid. Prop. lxxx.

To show how truly the Church of Rome claims these powers still, I copy from the *Pall Mall Gazette* of 18th January, 1897,

the following statement of the action of the Roman Catholic bishops in Quebec in regard to the Manitoba School controversy:

THE CHURCH WAR IN QUEBEC.—THREATS OF THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY.

Montreal, January 4, 1897.—The Catholic Church has declared war against the Liberal party. *L'Electeur*, the principal newspaper in Quebec, criticised clerical interference in the campaign of last year when the Liberal party was swept into power, mainly by the French Catholic vote and in spite of a mandement issued by the bishops of Quebec. The same paper praised Mr. Laurier's settlement of the Manitoba school question.

The eastern or lower half of this province constitutes the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Quebec, administered by five bishops. Their joint pastoral letter, read from every parish pulpit, clearly indicates that Liberal doctrines are to be fought with all the forces at the disposal of a powerful hierarchy. After the formal opening the pastoral letter proceeds as follows:—

“The Catholic bishops, intrusted by Jesus Christ Himself with the protection of sound doctrines and Christian morality, not only have the right, but it is also their duty to warn the faithful against all dangerous publications, and even to interdict the reading of newspapers which they consider detrimental to the interests of faith and the Church.

“Therefore, we come before you to-day to publicly denounce to the faithful intrusted to our pastoral care the newspaper *L'Electeur*, printed at Quebec, whose unwholesome ideas and false articles, especially for some time past, constitute a religious and social danger.”

After reciting several offences, now a year old, the letter continues with these charges:—

“To this were added further insults, recriminations and invectives against some bishops who, using their rights to do so, considered it their duty to comment from the pulpit on the last collective letter published by the episcopacy on the occasion of the Federal elections. The diocesan authority was forced to again intervene and publicly protest against this unworthy conduct of a Quebec newspaper. Notwithstanding these repeated censures, false insinuations, lies and sensational despatches were spread among the public to deceive the

opinion of its readers and to neutralize the effect of the direction of the episcopacy. Moreover, *L'Electeur* reproduced with condensation, without any rectification, the pages of a pamphlet wherein we are openly taught:

“First—The right of aggression and revolt of subjects against a power lawfully constituted, but which they consider tyrannical in its exercise, a doctrine which the Church condemns.

“Second—That a Catholic may and should sometimes, in matters respecting politics and religious legislation, set aside the direction of the bishops and follow the advice of a lawyer or that of a professional politician, a doctrine which is manifestly contrary to the teachings of Leo XIII.

“Finally, on November 27, this same newspaper contained an article written after so many others to mask in the eyes of the people the violation of promises made to the electorate, an article in which were reproduced the doctrines already condemned by the episcopate, and particularly so in the last collective letter the ecclesiastical authority is denied:

“First—The right to determine the nature, the means, and the sufficiency of the religious instructions which should be given to Catholic children.

“Second—The right to exact anything or command so as to assure the efficacy of that instruction.

“Third—The right to forbid Catholic children from attending mixed, atheist, or Protestant schools when civil power concedes one half-hour's religious instruction after school hours, which pretensions are as contrary to the sacred rights of the Church as they are prejudicial to the interests of souls.

“That is sufficient, our dearly beloved brethren, and after mature examination we consider it an imperious duty for us to protect by a definite act your conscience as Christians and Catholics against the writings of such a dangerous sheet. Therefore, after having invoked the holy name of God and using powers formally assigned to our episcopal authority by the tenth rule of the index published by order of the Council of Trent, we, Archbishop and Bishops of the ecclesiastical Province of Quebec, formally forbid, under pain of grievous fault and refusal of the sacraments, the reading of the newspaper *L'Electeur*, the subscribing thereto, the assisting in the editing thereof, the selling or encouragement in any manner whatever.”

QUEMADERO—THE SPANISH SMITHFIELD.

The discovery of the Quemadero, where the so-called heretics were burned under the direction of the Inquisition, was made in 1868. The *Daily News* of May 15, 1869, gives the following account, forwarded by its own correspondent:—"Madrid, May 10. While the Cortes were debating upon religion, the workmen of the corporation of Madrid were laying bare one of the most conclusive historical records of the awful deeds committed in its name by the fanatics of olden times, who sought to perpetuate Catholic unity by the destruction of all who opposed it. I allude to the time of the Inquisition, when the Church of Rome believed that the best way to put down error was to burn the heretics. In making some new streets it became necessary to cut through the spot where tradition recorded that the burnings of the Inquisition used to take place, and which has always gone by the name of the 'Quemadura de la Cruz,' or 'Burning-place of the Cross.' These excavations have not only confirmed tradition as to the spot, but have revealed something of the sad and cruel deeds themselves. The remains of the fires have been exposed in regular layers of long black bands, some of them 150 feet in length, and of varying thicknesses, with the spaces between them, which are from one to two feet, filled in with earth. A new road had been cut through the spot, at a level of some twenty or thirty feet, and the cutting thus effected having been neatly faced, leaves the original sandstone and clay formation each side like a wall. There the black bands I have alluded to are distinctly seen, and at first sight seem like geological strata. There is nothing of the coal formation in the hills on which Madrid is built. It is 2,400 feet above the level of the sea, and the formation is exclusively sandy limestone. One must seek in other than geological causes the presence of these black bands or layers. They are the veritable remains of the Inquisition fires—pulverised and blackened earth and coal, greasy even yet with human grease! Pieces of burnt clothing, calcined bones, and partially burnt hair, have been taken out. All Madrid has been to the spot, and thousands have carried away some of the black mass itself, or of the cruel records found in it. To-day's *Imparcial* speaking of it, says:—It was the place where Catholics, pious and bewitched monarchs, permitted

rational human creatures of all ages and conditions, and of both sexes, to be burnt alive, victims of implacable Inquisitors, slippery monks, and impious defenders of the faith, as those executioners of human thought called themselves. It is where that unjust and dark tribunal did its work, where they caused men and women, boys and girls, accused of sacrilege, heresy, compacts with Satan, and such like, to breathe their last breath in the midst of horrible torments. There the coal, whose remains we now see, after being blessed by the Dominican fathers, burnt all who did not think or believe as the king and the monks thought or believed, or who would not serve the interests of tyranny, royal or clerical. There, in the bands, one over another, in the manner of geological strata, we see mixed up with fatty black earth pulverised remains of muscles consumed by the live coal, calcined bones, remains of garments singed by the flames, halters stiff with coagulated blood, locks of hair imperfectly burnt, irresistible witnesses to the fact that brothers of ours expired amidst the flames, their hearts beating with energetic protests against men worse than hyænas, judges of perfidious heart and granite soul, who condemned them to die amidst agonies without number and in the name of Christ delivered them to those fires.”

EXTRACT FROM “ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA,” UNDER HEADING
“SPANISH INQUISITION.”

“In Spain alone, according to Lorenté, upwards of three hundred and forty thousand persons were judged and punished, one way or another, by this tribunal. Of these nearly thirty-two thousand were burned alive; and if to this number be added all the unfortunates who were condemned by the tribunals in Mexico, Lima, Carthagena, Sicily, Sardinia, Oran, Malta, together with Naples, Milan and Flanders, whilst these countries were under the dominion of Spain, it would probably be found that more than half a million of human beings had been condemned by this inexorable tribunal to undergo various punishments, a large proportion of which inferred infamy.”

GALILEO AND THE INFALLIBLE TRIBUNAL.

On March 5th, 1616, the Congregation of the Index, a Committee of Cardinals appointed by the Pope for the prevention

of the circulation of dangerous books, published the following decree:—

“ Since it has come to the knowledge of this Holy Congregation that the false Pythagorean doctrine, altogether opposed to the Divine Scripture, of the mobility of the earth, and the immobility of the sun, which Nicolas Copernicus, in his work *De revolutionibus orbium caelestium*, and Didacus a Stunica in his Commentary on Job, teach, is being promulgated and accepted by many, as may be seen from a printed letter of a certain Carmelite Father (Foscarini), entitled, &c. wherein the said Father has attempted to show that the said doctrine is consonant to truth, and not opposed to Holy Scripture; therefore, lest this opinion insinuate itself further to the damage of Catholic truth, this Congregation has decreed that the said books, Copernicus *De revolutionibus*, and Stunica on Job, be suspended till they are corrected, but that the book of Foscarini the Carmelite be altogether prohibited and condemned, and all other books that teach the same thing.”

The result of the trial is well known. Galileo pleaded in vain that he had not infringed the injunction laid on him by defending an opinion already condemned, and the condemnation of which had been made known to him. When he urged that he had left the question undetermined, and had only discussed the probability of the Copernican hypothesis, he was told that therein he had committed a grave error, for that an opinion can in no manner be probable which has already been declared and defined to be contrary to the Divine Scriptures. The Inquisitors were certainly justified by the evidence when they arrived at the conclusion that there were very strong grounds for suspecting that Galileo held the heretical doctrine of the earth's motion, and also the heresy that an opinion can be held and defended as probable after it has been declared and defined to be contrary to Holy Scripture. Accordingly, in order to remove from the minds of all Catholic Christians this vehement suspicion legitimately conceived against him, he was ordered to swear that with a sincere heart and faith unfeigned he abjured, cursed, and detested the above-named and all other heresies; and to swear further that for the future he would not assert, either by word of mouth or in writing, anything to bring upon him similar suspicion. And in order that his grave

and pernicious error might not remain altogether unpunished, that he might be more cautious for the future, and be an example to others to abstain from offences of this sort, his book was prohibited by public edict; he was condemned to the prisons of the Holy Office during the Pope's pleasure, and was commanded for three weeks to recite the seven Penitential Psalms once a week.—*Dr. Salmon's "Infallibility of the Church."*

THE ROMAN CHURCH IN THE TENTH CENTURY—TESTIMONY OF
A ROMAN CATHOLIC HISTORIAN.

I will quote the well-known words with which Baronius begins his account of the tenth century:—"A new age begins, which, from its asperity and barrenness of good, has been wont to be called the Iron Age; from the deformity of its overflowing wickedness, the Leaden Age; and, from the paucity of writers, the Dark Age. Standing on the threshold of which, we have thought it necessary to premise something, lest the weak-minded should be scandalized if he should happen to behold the abomination of desolation in the Temple. . . . * The case is plainly such, that scarcely anyone can believe, nay, scarcely, ever shall believe, unless he see it with his own eyes, and handle it with his own hands, what unworthy, foul, and deformed, yea, what execrable and abominable things the sacred Apostolic See, upon whose hinge the universal Catholic Church turns, has been compelled to suffer. O shame! O grief! how many monsters, horrible to be seen, were intruded by secular princes into that

* In the passage which I here omit, Baronius turns it into an argument in favour of the Roman Church, that the fact that she survived a period which, according to all human calculation, ought to have been fatal to her, proves that she must have been under Divine protection. He borrowed this paradox from Boccaccio, who had presented it in the shape of a tale about a Jew, who, being pressed to embrace Christianity, declared his intention of visiting Rome, and judging of the religion by the lives of Christ's Vicar, his cardinals and bishops. His Christian friends were horrified, knowing that the spectacle of sensuality, avarice, and simony which tainted all at Rome, from the least to the greatest, was better calculated to make a Christian turn Jew than a Jew become a Christian. But the Jewish visitor, on his return, presented himself for baptism, declaring himself convinced of the divinity of a religion which survived, notwithstanding that its chief ministers were doing their very best to destroy it. The popularity of this tale in pre-Reformation times shows that, if the Bishop of Rome was then believed to be a guide to truth, he was not imagined to be an example of moral purity.

seat which is to be revered by angels; how many tragedies were consummated; with what filth was it her fate to be spattered, who was herself without spot or wrinkle; with what stench to be infected; with what loathsome impurities to be defiled, and by these to be blackened with perpetual infamy." And, again, the same historian writes (*Ann.* 912):—"What was then the fate of the Holy Roman Church! How most foul, when harlots, at once most powerful and most base, ruled at Rome, at whose will sees were changed, bishops were presented, and what is horrible to hear and unutterable, pseudo-bishops, their paramours, were intruded into the See of St. Peter, who are enrolled in the catalogue of Roman pontiffs, only for the sake of marking the times!"—*Dr. Salmon's "Infallibility of the Church."*

POPE ALEXANDER VI. AND HIS TIMES.

"At the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century the representative of St. Peter was Alexander VI. It was the era (and it is well to observe this) when Italian art was rising to the meridian, and the virgins and saints were being painted, which affect so devotionally the modern mind. That the Pope was Antichrist is considered now an extravagance of Protestant fanaticism. That title was given to Alexander by an earnest Catholic, in a letter to Cardinal Savelli, who was then at the court of the Emperor Maximilian. The purpose of the letter was to describe the enormities at the Vatican, and to invite Maximilian's interference. The writer says that imagination could not conceive such a monster as Alexander:—

"The benefices and offices which ought to be given to persons of merit are offered for public sale to the highest bidder. Men go with gold to the palace to buy the mysteries of the faith. Everything can be had for money—dignities, honours, marriages, dissolution of marriages, divorces—things which our fathers never heard of, and which Christian custom forbids. Crimes grosser than Scythian, acts of treachery worse than Carthaginian, are committed without disguise in the Vatican itself, under the eyes of the Pope. There are rapes, murders, incests, debaucheries, cruelties exceeding those of the Neros and Caligulas. None are spared, not even the highest. Licentiousness, past description, is paraded in contempt of God and man.

Sons and daughters are polluted. Harlots and procuresses are gathered together in the mansion of St. Peter. On All Saints' day fifty women of the town were invited to dinner.' The details of what followed are totally unmentionable. 'Gold is gathered in from all quarters. Indulgences are sold in all churches of Christendom to provide a portion for the Pope's daughter Lucretia. The son, Cæsar Borgia, is so like his father that it is hard to say which is the greater monster. The Cardinals of the better sort, if such there be, are silent or affect not to see. They bought their rank with money. They preserve it with criminal compliance, and continue to speak smoothly to the Pope, and praise and flatter.'"—*Froude's "Lectures on the Council of Trent,"* pp. 20-21.

IMMORALITY OF THE CLERGY BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

[From "*The Pope and the Council,*" by Janus.]

"There is something almost enigmatical about the universal profligacy of that age. In whole dioceses and countries of Christian Europe clerical concubinage was so general that it no longer excited any surprise; and it might be said of certain provinces that hardly one clergyman in thirty was chaste, while in our own day there are countries where the great majority of the clergy are free even from the suspicion of incontinence. This distinction is to be explained by the universally corrupt state of the ecclesiastical administration. There could be no thought of any selection or careful training for the ministry where everything was matter of sale, where both ordination and preferment were bought and begged in Rome, where the conscientious, who would not be tainted with simony, had to stand aside, while the men of no conscience prospered, and rapidly attained the highest posts, and the clerical profession was that of all others which offered the easiest and idlest life, with the largest privileges and the least of corporate obligations. The *Curia* had abundantly provided for the universal security and impunity of the clergy. Where the heads themselves gave the example of contempt for all laws, human and divine, it could not be expected that their subordinates would submit to the oppressive yoke of continence, and so the contagion was sure to spread. Every one who came from Rome brought back word

that in the metropolis of Christendom, and in the bosom of the great mother and mistress of all Churches, the clergy, with scarcely an exception, kept concubines.”*

PROHIBITION OF THE BIBLE.

[*From the Monthly Letter of the Protestant Alliance.*]

3272.—At the Council of Trent, the Fathers of the Synod ordered that an Index of the prohibited books should be laid before the then Pope, Pius IV., who approved of it, and it was published with the rules at the head of it, as by order of the Council itself.

The fourth rule was as follows:—

“Whereas it is manifest by experience, that if the Holy Bible translated into the vulgar tongue be allowed indifferently to anybody, then on account of men’s rashness will arise from hence a greater detriment than advantage. . . . If any one *without a licence* presume to read or keep by him the Bible, he shall be disqualified to receive the absolution of his sins till he deliver it up to the ordinary.”
Regulæ Indicis S. S. Synodi Tridentinæ jussu editæ. De Libr. prohib. reg. 4.

This does not look very like an *encouragement* of the circulation of the Scriptures. But let us hear Pope Clement VIII.’s annotation on the rule of Pius IV. Pope Clement declares:—

“This law is not to be understood as if by it the bishops, inquisitors, or heads of convents were invested with power to grant licences to read, buy, or keep the Bible translated into vulgar language, seeing hitherto by the order and practice of the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition *the power had been taken away from them* to grant licences to read or keep the whole Bible in the vulgar tongue, or any other part of the Holy Scriptures of the Old or New Testaments, published in any vulgar language, even not so much as the summaries or compendiums of the said Bibles, or books of the Holy Scriptures, translated into any

* When the vicar of Innocent VIII. wanted to forbid this, the Pope made him withdraw his edict, “propter quod talis effecta est vita sacerdotum et curialium ut vix reperitur qui concubinam non retineat vel saltem meretricem.” So too the Roman annualist *Infessura*, in his diary, given in *Eccard. Corp. Hist.* ii. 1997.

vulgar language, all which is to be inviolably observed."—*Index lib. Prohib. S. D. N. Clementis P. P. VIII. jussu recognitus et publicatus.—Romæ, Apud. Impréssores Camerales.*

3273.— . . . Cardinal Bellarmine, the great oracle of the Roman Catholic Church, writes as plainly as he well can to the same effect. "We maintain," he says (speaking apparently the settled doctrine and opinion of his Church upon this point), "that the Scriptures ought NOT to be read publicly in the vulgar tongue, nor allowed to be read indifferently by everybody."

3276.—The latest authorities are such as even Roman Catholics will find it hard to disavow. Cardinal Wiseman, in his "Catholic Doctrine of the Bible," published in London in 1853, writes as follows, p. 20:—"If therefore we be asked why we do not give the Bible indifferently to all, *and the shutting up of God's word be disdainfully thrown in our face*, we will not seek to elude the question, or meet the taunts by *denial*, or by attempts to prove that our principles on the subject are not antagonistic to those of Protestants. *They are antagonistic, and we glory in avowing it.*"

Cardinal Wiseman further says, in the Moorfield "Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church," Introduction, pp. 18 and 19:—"I have told you that in perusing the works of men who have within these few years become members of the (Roman) Catholic Church—men of talent and erudition—I have hardly found two of them agree upon the grounds which they record as having induced them to embrace the (Roman) Catholic religion. But I have also read similar works on the other side, purporting to give the grounds upon which several individuals have abandoned the (Roman) Catholic Church, and become members of some Protestant communion. . . Now, I have read many of these, and have noted that instead of the rich variety of motives which have brought learned men to the (Roman) Catholic Church, there is a sad meagreness of reasoning in them, indeed that they all, without exception, give me but one argument. The history in every single case is simply this: that the individual by some chance or other, probably through the ministry of some pious person, became possessed of the Word of God, of the Bible; that he perused the book; that he could not find in it Transub-

stantiation or Auricular Confession; that he could not discover in it one word of Purgatory or of worshipping of Images. He perhaps goes to the priest and tells him that he cannot find these doctrines in the Bible. His priest argues with him, and endeavours to convince him that he should shut up the book that is leading him astray;—he perseveres, he abandons the communion of the Church of Rome,—that is, as is commonly expressed, the errors of that Church, and becomes a Protestant.”

Again, Dr. Cahill, a Roman Catholic Priest, recently said, “he would rather a (Roman) Catholic should read the worst works of immorality than the Protestant Bible—that forgery of God’s Word, that slander of Christ.”—*Tablet* (R. C. Paper), December 17th, 1853, p. 804.

3278.—In 1816, Pope Pius VII. issued his Bull against Bible Societies, addressed to the Primate of Poland, in which he represents the circulation of the Scriptures by Bible Societies as *a crafty device by which the very foundations of religion are undermined. A pestilence which must be remedied and abolished. A defilement of the faith, eminently dangerous to souls, impious machinations of innovators, wickedness of a nefarious scheme, snares prepared for men’s everlasting ruin. A new species of tares which an adversary has abundantly sown.* This Bull further declares “that agreeably to the Index the Bible printed by heretics is to be numbered among other prohibited books, for it is evident from experience that the Holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have through the temerity of men produced more harm than benefit.” (Rule IV. above referred to.)

3283.—No trust, however, can be placed in the Romish translations of the Scriptures into the vernacular, for, though almost incredible, yet it is a fact that the Rhemish Testament includes the forged so-called 1st Epistle of Clement to St. James.* This is clearly shown to be a forgery by the blunders it contains. For instance: Clement in this Epistle is made to recite that St. Peter, who “had been appointed to be *the foundation of the true Church,*” when about to die, said to all the people:

* I think it would be more correct to state, that it quotes it, in a note, as authentic.

“I ordain Clement as your Bishop; I deliver to him that power of binding or loosing which was delivered to me by the Lord.” Clement then proceeds to “instruct” St. James about the ordering of the Sacraments and the celebration of Mass, and other matters. Considering that St. James was present when our Lord instituted the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, it would seem that such instructions were unnecessary; but the whole Epistle is a forgery, for Eusebius tells us that St. James died *before* St. Peter (Book II. c. 23, 25); yet here we find Clement, *after* St. Peter’s death, writing to St. James. What, however, will be thought of the fact, that though this Epistle is acknowledged to be a forgery, yet it is but a few years ago that the Church of Rome has ceased to impose this forged letter upon ignorant Romanists as being thoroughly genuine. This spurious Epistle to St. James is quoted not only in the Rheims Edition of the New Testament, published in 1582, but in the Douay Bible, printed in Dublin in 1816, with the sanction of Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. (*See note in each Edition on 2 Peter, c. 1, v. 15.*)

DISCOURAGEMENT OF BIBLE READING.

“I have not troubled myself to give formal proof of the discouragement of Bible reading by the modern Church of Rome, because I consider that, as I have said before, if her theory be true, her practice is quite right. But as her advocates are now often apt to be ashamed of this practice, I copy the conditions under which, according to the fourth Rule of the Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books, approved of Pope Pius IV. the exceptional favour of being allowed to read the Bible was granted to persons only able to read it in the vernacular:— ‘Since it is manifest by experience that if the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue be suffered to be read everywhere without distinction, more evil than good arises, let the judgment of the bishop or inquisitor be abided by in this respect; so that, after consulting with the parish priest or the confessor, they may grant permission to read translations of the Scriptures made by Catholic writers, to those whom they understand to be able to receive no harm, but an increase of faith and piety, from such

reading; which faculty let them have in writing. But whosoever shall presume to read these Bibles, or have them in possession without such faculty, shall not be capable of receiving absolution of their sins, unless they have first given up the Bible to the ordinary.'—See Littledale's *Plain Reasons*, p. 90, where some account is given of subsequent dealings of the Roman Catholic authorities with this subject. But it is needless to produce documentary evidence to anyone who knows the small circulation of the Scriptures in Roman Catholic countries; and even in this country, the small knowledge of the Bible possessed by Roman Catholics in other respects well educated."—*From a Note in Salmon's "Infallibility of the Church."*

THE BIBLE IN BRITTANY.

The rooted antipathy of the Romish Church to the circulation of the Christian Scriptures was illustrated in a marked manner lately in Brittany. The island of Molène, near which the *Drummond Castle* recently went down, is inhabited only by Roman Catholics. In view of the recent disaster the committee of the Trinitarian Bible Society sent some colporteurs to the island for the purpose of presenting a copy of the Bible to every inhabitant. They were heartily welcomed by all except the parish priest, who was furious at this interference with his special domain, and spoke against it from the pulpit. Next day the priest went to pay a visit to the Mayor, and saw a copy of the Bible. He said: "Mons. le Maire, you have one of those Protestant books." "Yes, Mons. le Curé," replied the Mayor, "and yesterday you surprised us all very much by saying that the book was a good one, and yet you asked us to destroy it. Please explain this." The priest invented an excuse, and went back to his presbytery. The true policy of the Church of Rome is to be seen in such incidents as these, and not by her attitude in a country like England, where she is in the minority and face to face with deep-rooted liberties.

THE POPE'S RECENT DECREE CONCERNING THE PROHIBITION
OF BIBLE READING.

No statement in this pamphlet has been more vehemently controverted than my assertion that Rome prohibits the circulation of the Bible when it has the power. Evidence has reached me from all sides of the substantial truth of this assertion. I am now able to add the very latest decree issued by the present Pope, which is copied from the *Weekly Register* (Roman Catholic paper) of 27th February, 1897.

It is headed—

“THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION.”

The following is the Authorised Translation of the Apostolic Constitution of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. concerning the Prohibition and Censorship of Books :—

LEO, BISHOP.

Servant of the Servants of God.

For a Perpetual Memorial.

GENERAL DECREES CONCERNING THE PROHIBITION AND
CENSORSHIP OF BOOKS.

Article I. Of the Prohibition of Books.

CHAPTER II.

*Of Editions of the Original Text of Holy Scripture and of
Versions not in the Vernacular.*

5. Editions of the original text and of the ancient Catholic versions of Holy Scripture, as well as those of the Eastern Church, if published by non-Catholics, even though apparently edited in a faithful and complete manner, are allowed only to those engaged in theological and Biblical studies, provided also that the dogmas of Catholic faith are not impugned in the prolegomena or annotations.

6. In the same manner, and under the same conditions, other versions of the Holy Bible, whether in Latin, or in any other dead language, published by non-Catholics, are permitted.

CHAPTER III.

Of Vernacular Versions of Holy Scripture.

7. As it has been clearly shown by experience that, if the Holy Bible in the vernacular is generally permitted without any distinction, more harm than utility is thereby caused, owing to human temerity: all versions in the vernacular, even by Catholics, are altogether prohibited, unless approved by the Holy See, or published, under the vigilant care of the Bishops, with annotations taken from the Fathers of the Church and learned Catholic writers.

8. All versions of the Holy Bible, in any vernacular language, made by non-Catholics, are prohibited, and especially those published by the Bible Societies, which have been more than once condemned by the Roman Pontiffs, because in them the wise laws of the Church concerning the publication of the sacred books are entirely disregarded.

Nevertheless, these versions are permitted to students of theological or Biblical science, under the conditions laid down above (No. 5).

CARDINAL NEWMAN ON INFALLIBILITY—LETTER TO BISHOP
ULLATHORNE.

“When, however, it was proposed to declare the Pope’s personal infallibility, this was a doctrine so directly in the teeth of history, that Newman made no secret of his persuasion that the authoritative adoption of it would be attended with ruinous consequences to his Church, by placing what seemed an insuperable obstacle to any man of learning entering her fold. He wrote in passionate alarm to an English Roman Catholic bishop (Ullathorne): ‘Why,’ he said, ‘should an aggressive insolent faction be allowed “to make the heart of the just sad, whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful”? Why cannot we be let alone when we have pursued peace and think no evil? I assure you, my Lord, some of the truest minds are driven one way and another, and do not know where to rest their feet—one day determining to give up all theology as a bad job, and recklessly

to believe henceforth almost that the Pope is impeccable, at another tempted to believe all the worst which a book like Janus says: . . . Then, again, think of the store of Pontifical scandals in the history of eighteen centuries, which have partly been poured forth and partly are still to come. . . . And then, again, the blight which is falling upon the multitude of Anglican ritualists, &c. who themselves perhaps—at least their leaders—may never become Catholics, but who are leavening the various English denominations and parties far beyond their own range, with principles and sentiments tending towards their ultimate absorption with the Catholic Church. With these thoughts ever before me, I am continually asking myself whether I ought not to make my feelings public: but all I do is to pray those early doctors of the Church, whose intercession would decide the matter (Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Basil), to avert this great calamity. If it is God's will that the Pope's infallibility be defined, then it is God's will to throw back the "times and moments" of that triumph which He has destined for His kingdom; and I feel that I shall have but to bow my head to His adorable inscrutable Providence."—*Salmon's "Infallibility of the Church,"* pp. 21, 22.

PETER'S ALLEGED ROMAN EPISCOPATE.

"To return now to the story of Peter's Roman episcopate, the real inventor of that story was an editor of the Clementine Romance, of which I spoke when lecturing on the New Testament Canon. This work was brought to Rome at the very end of the second or beginning of the third century; and it had then prefixed a letter from Clement to James at Jerusalem, telling how Peter had ordained him, and set him in his own chair of teaching as bishop of Rome. Though the doctrinal teaching of the Clementines was rejected as heretical, the narrative part of the book was readily believed; and in particular this story of Clement's ordination by Peter was felt to be so honourable to the Church of Rome that it was at once adopted there, and has been the traditional Roman account ever since.

"But the adoption of this fable sadly perplexed the chronology. For, according to the list of Irenæus, Clement was but

the third Roman bishop since the Apostles; and this is confirmed by the internal evidence of Clement's epistle, which, according to the judgment of the best critics, cannot be earlier than about A.D. 97. It was felt that unless Clement could be pushed back to an earlier period, his ordination by Peter would not be chronologically possible. Accordingly, another list of Roman bishops was published,* which puts up Clement to the second, and pushes down Anacletus to the third place. This double list has been very perplexing to historical inquirers; but that the earlier order of Irenæus is really correct is proved by a kind of evidence which I count peculiarly trustworthy. In the Roman Liturgy to this day the names of its first bishops are commemorated in the order of Irenæus, viz. Linus, Anacletus, Clement. If this were the original order we can understand its being preserved in the Church of Rome (which was very conservative in liturgical matters), notwithstanding that subsequent chronologers of eminence placed Clement second. But if Clement had been really originally in the second place, it is quite impossible that the name of Anacletus, who is unknown to Church history, should have been placed before him. These Clementine legends have so filled with fable the whole history of St. Peter, that I should even think the story of Peter's coming to Rome at all to be open to question, were it not, as I already said, that no rival Church claims the martyrdom."—*Dr. Salmon's "Infallibility of the Church."*

THE FORGED DECRETALS—GROWTH OF THE PAPAL POWER.

[*From Dr. Salmon's "Infallibility of the Church."*]

"After the death of Nicolas there came more than a century of darkness and immorality, described in the extract I formerly read from Baronius, during which the papacy fell to the lowest point of degradation. From that it emerged, at the middle of

* My own opinion is that this innovation was made by Hippolytus, the first in the Roman Church to take up the study of chronology—a science, however, in which he deserves credit for zeal and industry, rather than for skill. His list appears to have been published in the third decade of the third century—a time when the story of Clement's ordination by Peter had come to be fully believed in.

the eleventh century, by the appointment of German pontiffs—men of pure lives and high aims. They saw the Church under complete bondage to the mighty of this world; ecclesiastical offices bought and sold without shame; vice universally prevalent, and clergy unable to rebuke it, because they were themselves deeply tainted with it. The movement of papal aggrandizement, of which the celebrated Hildebrand (afterwards Gregory VII.) was the life and soul, owed its success to the moral weight which it gained from the belief that it was an honest attempt to grapple with great abuses, and to the general satisfaction that was felt at seeing the empire of brute force confronted by a more mighty spiritual power. Pope Gregory, accepting with entire faith the decretal epistles as authentic records of the powers exercised by his predecessors, felt himself authorized to push the principles involved in them to what he regarded as their legitimate consequences. From these epistles it followed at once that the pope was the sole source of spiritual power; without his consent no council could be held; every bishop, priest, or layman might appeal to him from every other judgment; the Church must be withdrawn from the control of all secular power, and be subjected to a single spiritual despot, whose errors and faults, if such there were, must be borne in silence, for from him there could be no appeal. One of the cardinals, whose assistance Gregory employed in drawing up his new system of Church law, attributes to St. Boniface the doctrine, that even if a Pope is so bad that he drags down whole nations to hell with him in troops, nobody can rebuke him, for he who judges all can be judged of no man; the only exception is the case of his swerving from the faith.

“One main pillar of Gregory’s system was borrowed from the false decretals. The Church of Rome, by a singular privilege, has the right of opening and shutting the kingdom of heaven to whom she will. It is plain that if the pope has this power he can constrain to obey his will any man who values his eternal salvation; and so Gregory was able to use his power of binding and loosing in dethroning kings, and loosing subjects from their oath of allegiance. Another doctrine Gregory got from the false decretals was, that no one dare hold speech with an excommunicated person; and as kings and emperors were not exempt from the operation of this rule, it followed that if the pope

excommunicated a king, nobody could, even in matters of business, hold communication with him; so that he was no longer fit to reign, and must be deposed. This business, however, of deposing kings is a matter on which I shall have something more to say presently. But on these spurious decretals is built the whole fabric of the Canon Law. The great schoolman, Thomas Aquinas, was taken in by them, and he was induced by them to set the example of making a chapter on the prerogatives of the pope an essential part of treatises on the Church. Bellarmine, and a number of other Roman controversialists, were similarly misled. Yet completely successful as was this forgery, I suppose there never was a more clumsy one. These decretal epistles had undisputed authority for some seven hundred years, that is to say, down to the time of the Reformation; yet the moment they were seriously assailed (as they were by the Magdeburg Centuriators*), defence was soon found to be hopeless; and there is not a single Roman Catholic divine at the present day who would venture to maintain their genuineness. In fact the letters are full of the most outrageous anachronisms. Persons who lived centuries apart are represented as corresponding with one another. The early bishops of Rome quote the Scriptures according to Jerome's version, including the text of the three heavenly witnesses.† Some of them who lived in pagan times are made to complain of the invasion of Church property by laymen. There is a uniformity of style between letters written by popes separated by long intervals: one egg, say the Centuriators, being not more like another than one of these epistles to another. The same phrases recur; the subjects are all of the same sort, such as the primacy of the Roman see, the allowance of appeals, &c. The style is barbarous, and full of expressions not used in early times, but common in Frankish writers of the ninth century. They say nothing of the events, the heresies, and other controversies of their supposed date, but are full of questions which

* The first great Church history on a large scale, so described because arranged according to centuries, and because the originator, Flacius Illyricus, commenced the preparation of the work at Magdeburg. The first volume appeared in 1559.

† There is an unlucky blunder at the outset. In a letter, purporting to be addressed by Clement to James, James is favoured with an extract from his own epistle, which is ascribed to Peter.

had not then arisen; and they name Church officers and Church ceremonies which had not been introduced.

“We can fix with tolerable precision the date of this forgery. The letters borrow matter from the decrees of more than one council that was held in the first half of the ninth century; among others one that was held in 845; and they are themselves quoted in 857; so between these two dates the forgery was made; and if we say 850, we cannot be very far wrong.

“If we want to know what share these letters had in the building of the Roman fabric we have only to look at the Canon Law. The ‘Decretum,’* of Gratian quotes three hundred and twenty-four times epistles of the popes of the first four centuries; and of these three hundred and twenty-four quotations, three hundred and thirteen are from the letters which are now universally known to be spurious. I will not pledge myself to the genuineness of the remaining eleven. In writing a former Lecture I had occasion to refer to Bellarmine, to see whether he could cite any Father as applying to Rome the text in which Christ prays that Peter’s faith should not fail. I found he could allege no writer who was not a pope; and the popes he begins by citing are taken from the spurious decretals. The treatise of Bellarmine is founded on that of Melchior Canus; and of twenty quotations which he gives on this subject, eighteen are out of the false decretals. So idle is it to deny that this forgery is the foundation on which the Romish belief in papal power has been founded.”

IRISH BISHOPS AND THE POPE’S INFALLIBILITY.

[*From Gladstone’s “Vatican Decrees.”*]

Not less explicit was the Hierarchy of the Roman Communion in its “Pastoral Address to the Clergy and Laity of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland,” dated January 25, 1826. This

* This work, published in 1151, was intended as a collection of everything that Gratian could find having the force of law in the Church; and it had such success that it became the standard work on the law of the Roman Church.

address contains a Declaration, from which I extract the following words:—

“It is a duty which they owe to themselves, *as well as to their Protestant fellow-subjects*, whose good opinion they value, to endeavour once more to remove the false imputations that have been frequently cast upon the faith and discipline of the Church which is intrusted to their care, *that all may be enabled to know with accuracy their genuine principles.*”

In Article 11:—

“They declare on oath their belief that it is not an article of the Catholic Faith, neither are they thereby required to believe, that the Pope is infallible.”

THE VATICAN COUNCIL OF 1870.

“There was no fair representation of bishops. In the first place, the assembly included some three hundred titular bishops—bishops not presiding over any real sees, but holding mere titles of honour given them by the Pope, or else missionary bishops deriving their titles from places where there were few or no Christian congregations. In addition, the German bishops, who constituted the main strength of the minority, complained that they were swamped by the multitude of Italian and Sicilian bishops. The twelve millions of Roman Catholics in Germany proper were represented at the Council by fourteen bishops; the seven hundred thousand inhabitants of the Papal States by sixty-two; three bishops of the minority—Cologne, Paris, and Cambray—represented five million; and these might be outvoted by any four of the seventy Neapolitan and Sicilian bishops. The German theologians compared their learning with that of the bishops of these highly favoured localities, amongst whom a clean sweep would have been made if it had been a condition of admission to the Council that the bishop should be able to read the New Testament in its original language, or have Greek enough to be able to consult the writings of Greek Fathers or the acts of Greek Councils—a qualification without which, north of the Alps, one does not rank as a theologian. The German visitors, too, compared the

activity of religious thought in the country from which they came with that in those regions which provided the predominant element at the Council. It was said, and I believe with truth, that more religious books are printed in England, or Germany, or North America in one year than in Italy in half a century. And to the list of Italian publications the States of the Church contributed hardly anything. In Rome a lottery dream-book might be found in every house, but never a New Testament, and extremely seldom any religious book at all. So that it seemed as if it were a recognized principle, that the more ignorant a people, the greater must be the share of their hierarchy in the government of the Church.

“But now appeared the mischief of the claim to infallibility. In our Parliament a law may be passed in the teeth of opposition, and the minority must submit and obey the law; but their thoughts and words are free: they can avow still that what has been done is opposed to their judgment. But at a Council, when a vote is arrived at, the minority are required to blot from their mind all the tricks and manœuvres, all the unworthy means by which they know their resistance has been overpowered, and to accept the vote of a majority, no matter how obtained, as the voice of the Spirit of God. The moment the decision is pronounced, they are bound to yield not only a decorous obedience, but from the bottom of their hearts to believe that to be true which the moment before they had been protesting was false, and to publish this belief to the world. No wonder the bishops of the minority shrank from the humiliation of saying ‘non placet’ one moment, and ‘ex animo credo’ the next. So, with two exceptions, they all ran away, leaving behind them a protest which was not regarded.”—*Dr. Salmon’s “Infallibility of the Church.”*

THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

[*From the Monthly Letter of the Protestant Alliance.*]

4189.—The election of Clement VI. by the French Cardinals, in opposition to Urban VI. was the commencement of the Great Western Schism, which lasted more than fifty years. During

this period the world saw with astonishment two, and sometimes even three, persons claiming to be the infallible representatives of Christ upon earth. The Italian Cardinals elected in succession Urban VI., Boniface IX. and Innocent VII. The French Cardinals elected Clement VII. and Benedict XIII. Upon the death of Innocent VII. the Italian Cardinals elected Gregory XII., and he and his rival, Benedict XIII., as usual, endeavoured to undermine each other. But Christendom became weary of this game of treachery and falsehood. The College of Cardinals summoned the Council of Pisa, A.D. 1409, deprived both Popes of their Pontifical Dignities, and then elected Alexander V. (l'Enfant, "Hist. du Conc. de Pise," p. 273). Upon the death of Alexander, John XXIII. was elected by the Conclave. He was a Pope guilty of every species of extortion and debauchery. The schism burst out afresh until, at length, the Emperor Sigismund summoned the Council of Constance, a Council rendered for ever infamous by the breach of faith with, and by the burning of, the Martyr Huss. Deputies from the deposed Popes were received by this Council, and John XXIII. was deposed for the crimes of heresy, simony, and the most atrocious licentiousness. (*Vide Gobelinus*, p. 344, and *Von der Hardt*, vol. iv.) Will the Compilers of the *R. C. Directories* explain how the succession is handed down through these Popes, who were all living at the same time?

It would be impossible to refer fully to all the broken links that may be observed in the chain of succession, as given in the *R. C. Directories*, but it may be remarked that no mention is made of the *Vacancies* in the See of Rome, as given in the list of Labbe and Cossart, who state, A.D. 1268, "the See was vacant 2 years, 6 months, 2 days."—A.D. 1291, "the See was vacant 2 years, 3 months, 2 days."—A.D. 1313, "the See was vacant 2 years, 3 months, 17 days."—A.D. 1415, "the See was vacant 2 years, 5 months, 10 days." No reference either is made to the innumerable schisms created by rival Popes, as given by Labbe and Cossart, nor is there any allusion to the Great Western Schism above referred to, which rent the Church of Rome, commencing in the year 1378, when for fifty years rival Popes disputed the right to the Papal Chair. High Roman Catholic authorities can be produced in support of the claims of each of the rival Popes. Christendom was about equally divided

in their support. They not only cursed and excommunicated one another, but also the adherents and followers of their opponent. The main Romish argument for the existence of an infallible guide in the Church is, that it is inconceivable that God could have left Christians exposed to the risk of error in matters concerning their eternal salvation, but during these fifty years private persons were consigned to eternal damnation by one or other of these infallible Popes for acknowledging the rights of his rival, and Christendom was kept in a state of miserable perplexity.

The Jesuit writers, Labbe and Cossart, and other Romish historians, describe some of the Popes as "**monsters, heretics, usurpers, murderers, robbers, tyrants, adulterers, and apostates.**" The testimony of the Cardinals Baronius and Bellarmine, and of the pious Father Paul Sarpi, is conclusive for their condemnation, and it may well be said, Were such Popes under the direction of the Holy Ghost, and was the Church to follow the guidance of apostates, murderers, and robbers? Does not our Saviour say that **His** sheep will not follow a robber, but fly from him? (*John* x. 1, 5, 8, Douay Bible.) Yet a list of these Popes is now put forward in the (*R.*) *Catholic Directories* (published *permissu superiorum*), to confirm Romanists in their delusion, and to beguile weak-minded Protestants into the erroneous belief that the Pope possesses **Supreme Authority**, derived from the Apostolic succession from St. Peter.

EXCOMMUNICATION OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

[From C. H. Collette's "*Queen Elizabeth and the Penal Laws.*"]

"We, seeing that impieties and wickednesses are multiplied upon one another, and, moreover, that the persecutions of the faithful, and affliction for religion increase every day in weight, through the instigation and means of the said Elizabeth—because we understand her mind to be so stubborn and hardened, that she has not only contemned the godly requests and admonition of Catholic princes for her healing and conversion, but has not even permitted the nuncios of this See to cross the

seas into England—being of necessity constrained to betake ourselves to the weapons of justice against her, are not able to assuage our sorrow that we are induced to inflict punishment upon one to whose ancestors the whole state of Christendom has been so bounden. Supported therefore by his authority, whose pleasure it was to place us, although unequal to so great a burthen, on this supreme throne of justice, we do, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being heretic, and a favourer of heretics, and her adherents in the matters aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ.*

“And moreover we do declare Her to be deprived of her *pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity and privilege whatsoever.*

“And also the nobility, subjects and people of the said kingdom, and all others who have in any manner sworn to her, to be for ever *absolved from any such oath*, and all kind of duty, fidelity and obedience, as we do by authority of these presents absolve them, and do deprive the same Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things aforesaid. And we do command and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, people and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her monitions, mandates, and laws; and those who shall do the contrary we do involve in the same sentence of anathema.

“And because it were a matter of too much difficulty to convey these presents to all places where it shall be needful, our will is, that the copies of it, under a public notary’s hand and seal, with the seal of an ecclesiastic prelate, or of his court, shall carry altogether the same credit with all people, judicial and extra-judicial, as these presents should do if they were exhibited and shown.

“Given at Rome, at St. Peter’s, in the year of the incarnation of our Lord 1570, the 5th of the Kalends of March, and the fifth year of our Pontificate.”

* We read in the Book of Canon Law of the Roman Church even of the present day:—“We judge that they are not murderers who, burning with zeal for their Catholic mother against the excommunicated, should happen to kill any of them.” (*Can. Excommunicatorum*, xlvi., Caus. xxiii., qu. v.)

"One John Felton was caught in the act of fixing a copy of this Bull on the Bishop of London's palace gate; he gloried in the act. He was hanged as a traitor. Leo XIII. has selected the jubilee year of Queen Victoria (1887) to beatify this Felton and several other traitors of the period in question, who are declared to be 'martyrs of the cause of Christ.'"

THE ROMISH CONFESSORIAL AND ITS DANGERS.

[From Collette's "*Roman Priests as Described by Themselves.*"]

Liguori says, in his "*Selva*," p. 276 :—"The Confessor also stands in need of great fortitude, and at first, in hearing confession of women, *how many priests have lost their souls in hearing these confessions?* We must treat in the confessional with young girls and young women; we must hear their temptations and often the avowal of their falls; for they are also of flesh and blood. We have a natural affection for persons of the other sex, and this affection increases whenever they confide to us their miseries. But if these persons are pious, devoted to spirituality, says St. Thomas, the danger of an inordinate attachment is yet greater, since their natural affection is still more strongly attracted; but, continues the Saint, if mutual affection increases, the attachment will also increase in the same proportion; it will assume at first the appearance of piety, and the Devil will easily succeed in making the spiritual devotion change into carnal devotion."

This same Liguori, in his famous—or rather infamous—work on "*Moral Theology*," also expressly written for the instruction of Priests in the Confessional, exclaims: "Oh, how many confessors have lost their own souls and those of their penitents on account of some negligence in hearing confession of Women! . . . Oh, how many priests who before were innocent on account of similar transactions which began in the spirit have lost God and their own souls!" And in anguish of his heart, he adds, "Would to God it were not so."*

Every Roman Catholic woman in a parish, old or young, married or maid, is bound, under pain of mortal sin, to disclose

* Tom. ix. p. 145, n. 93, cap. x. and p. 104, Mechlin Edition, 1845.

to a celibate priest all her acts and inmost thoughts "to the minutest particular."* But hear Liguori's apology:—

"It grieves me concerning this matter which contains so much filthiness, as by its very name will disturb pure minds, to give a longer dissertation; but, oh, that this subject were not so frequent as it is in confessions, that it would not behove the confessor altogether to be fully, but only briefly instructed;—besides, let the chaste reader pardon me if I speak largely, and enter into details which exhibit a more unseemly ugliness; but if it appear strange to any one that authors, moreover prudent and pious, should have treated largely concerning this matter, and describe even minutest circumstances of various cases, let him hear the most illustrious Ludovicus, who vindicates the excellent work *on matrimony* of the most learned Thomas Sanchez, from this censure, in the following words:—

"'Although he treats concerning the matter of filthy acts, yet hell is more filthy, and if the discourse be filthy, it is more to be corrupt in sin, as Peter Blessensis says, that author stirs up the filthy mire, for the purpose of curing the diseased. If men were angels, they would not need such things.'"[†]

CELIBACY AND THE CONFSSIONAL.

A friend of mine just writes to me from Venice as follows. The case he cites is most instructive, as showing the awful opportunities for abuse given by the confessional:—

"I have many friends who are Roman Catholics, and one a most devoted and beautiful character who is a Jesuit, but I hate sacerdotalism with my whole heart, and believe it to be the most deadly enemy of spiritual religion. Anything which substitutes an unreal 'hocus-pocus,' whether of ritual or dogma,

* This statement is vehemently denied by the Romanists, but it seems to follow from the 21st Canon of the 4th Council of Lateran, A.D. 1415, which compels under pain of excommunication "every believer of both sexes, after he has come to years of discretion, faithfully to make salutary confession of all his sins at least once a year to a priest."

[†] Theol. Morale, p. 402, Tom. vi., n. 900, Cap. ii., *De Usu Matrim.*, Lib. vi. Mechlin, 1845.

for a change of heart and life, is, to my thinking, the heresy of heresies, and this sacerdotalism does, and it does more, it calls good evil and evil good, and teaches men so. Hell itself could not have devised a combination more damnable than an enforced celibacy of the clergy and auricular confession. I do not know whether I pity the poor priests, persuaded before they know what they are about to take vows against nature, or the young women who in later life confess to them."

CONVENTS.

The vast increase of Monasteries and Convents in Great Britain, said to be from forty in 1846, to 740 in 1896, is an alarming symptom of the times.

Those who have studied the history of Romanism know well that dreadful abuses have prevailed in these institutions, and nearly every country at one time or other has been obliged to dissolve them. I fully believe that the great majority of monks and nuns in Great Britain and Ireland are earnest, and of pure life, according to their light. I fear it is not so in some parts on the Continent, and it was not so in England before the Reformation. The Convent Commission appointed in the time of Henry VIII. reported a horrible condition of things.* I much fear that even still, scandals are sometimes hushed up that ought to be exposed, and I feel strongly that no establishments in the country, whether Protestant or Catholic, should be exempt from inspection, when sufficient cause for it can be shown.

All experience proves that where irresponsible power is vested in fallible mortals, sooner or later fearful abuses are certain to arise.

I may add that a "Convent Enquiry Society has been formed," their report issued this year (S. J. Abbott, Secretary, 12, St. Bride Street, London, E.C.) makes some dreadful charges of barbarity and wickedness which I do not quote, as I have no means of judging of their truth, but I think the public should know that they sum up their charges in the following words, page 16:—

"The facts which have come to the knowledge of the C.E.S.

* See Strype, xlvi. Chap. of his *Ecclesiastical Memoirs*.

are such, that the Committee are convinced that there is enough iniquity and crime secretly practised in Convents to insure their immediate dissolution, if the evidence could be brought out and proved to the public; and the hope of the Society is, that something may come before them which will enable them to arouse the public to a sense of their duty upon this great and serious question."

PRIESTLY ASSUMPTIONS.

To show how completely the Romish priesthood maintains its monstrous assumptions to-day, I append a report of a sermon recently preached in Ireland.

The *Derry Journal*, in a recent issue, published a lengthy report of a sermon preached by Father Gildea on the occasion of the Month's Mind of Father Bernard Walker. The following extract, taken from the sermon, illustrates to a fearful extent the blasphemous assumptions of the papal priesthood. In the course of his address Father Gildea is reported to have said as follows :—

"In ancient times the servants of God possessed wonderful powers. By a single word Moses divided the Red Sea, and the multitude passed over on dry land. While wandering in the desert he struck the rock, and water flowed therefrom. The prophets of old predicted future events. Elias raised the widow's son to life. The rulers of this earth have powers almost as great. They issue commands and thousands obey; but a greater power far is given to the priest of God. Every day, in the sacrifice of the Mass, he can say to the Son of God, 'Come down from heaven,' and immediately Christ obeys. At the bidding of a mere creature the great King of heaven and earth, He whose majesty fills all places, leaves His throne at the right hand of God, and comes and meekly rests on our altars, within the little chalice or in the cold ciborium. What earthly power can vie with this, or, might I add, what heavenly power either? The angels, indeed, see our Lord, face to face, but then they are not permitted to hold Him in their hands or to control His movements. Besides the power which the priest has over the body of our Lord, he possesses another, if possible, a greater power still, and one which almost seems to make him omnipotent.

The rulers of this world have power to open and close the prison gates of earth, but the priest can open and close the gates of heaven and hell. An earthly judge can restore the innocent alone to freedom, but the priest can give that blessing even to the guilty. Take a poor sinner whose soul is weighed down with the accumulated sins of many years, and see to whom he must have recourse, if he seeks for mercy. Is it to the angels in heaven? Is it to his guardian angel, to St. Michael, the prince of the heavenly hosts, to Mary the Mother of God? The angels, indeed, may keep away the evil spirits which surround this poor child of Adam; Mary may pray for him; but neither the angels nor Mary can remove one single sin from off his soul. Who can do this for him? The priest of God. He can rescue the sinner from hell, and make him worthy to be received into heaven. Go, therefore, where you will, to heaven or through this earth, you will find only one created being who can forgive the sinner, and that being is the Catholic priest. Thus we see that the priest is raised beyond the brightest spirits which God has created or ever will create, and that to him are given powers, which have been denied to the Mother of God, and to the angels in heaven. Are we any longer, then, surprised to hear our Lord addressing those solemn words of warning to the Church at large:—‘Beware of touching My anointed ones, he who touches them touches the apple of My eye.’ Is it any wonder that St. Francis of Assisi should have exclaimed, ‘If I met an angel and a priest at the same time, I would first bow my knee to the priest, and then to the angel.’”

RITUALISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The following facts ought to be pondered, not only by Churchmen, but by all who wish well to Britain and to God’s work in it:—“The eastward position is now adopted in nearly 6000 churches, an increase of nearly 1000 since 1894, and 3500 use altar lights, more than three times as many as ten years ago, and an increase of nearly 1000 in two years. In 1632 churches the chasuble is used, against 509 in 1886, and 307 churches in the Church of England use incense.”—*Word and Work*, July 30th, 1896.

NOVELTY OF ROMISH DOCTRINES.

Novelty of some of the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome shown by the dates of their admission among the *Articles of Faith* ("Catechism of Differences between Church of England and the Church of Rome," Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row):—

1. Transubstantiation—first book on the subject, by Paschase Radbert, A.D. 831. Strongly opposed at the time by many Doctors of the Western Church—defined and declared an Article of Faith in the fourth Council of Lateran - - - - - 1215
2. Communion in one kind. Council of Constance - - - - - 1415
3. The Seven Sacraments—first mentioned by Peter Lombard, A.D. 1140—stated in a decree of instruction for the Armenians, which has been claimed as a decree of the Council of Florence, 1439, but which was drawn up after the Greeks and Armenians had left the Council, and which runs only in the name of Pope Eugenius IV., though he claims for it the sanction of the Council. Made an Article of the Faith by the Council of Trent - - - - - 1547
4. Purgatory taught by Pope Gregory, A.D. 600. Made an Article of Faith in the Council of Florence - - - - - 1439
5. Tradition placed on an equal footing with Scripture. Council of Trent - - - - - 1546
6. Roman Catholic doctrine of Justification. Council of Trent - - - - - 1547
7. The necessity of the Priest's intention to give validity to the Sacraments was stated in Pope Eugenius' decree to the Armenians. Made an Article of the Faith by the Council of Trent - - - - - 1547
8. The Sacrifice of the Mass as a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice. Council of Trent - - - - - 1562
9. Invocation of Saints made an Article of the Faith. Council of Trent - - - - - 1563

10. Adoration of Images. Condemned by Council of Constantinople, A.D. 754; approved by Council of Nice, A.D. 787; rejected by Council of Frankfort, A.D. 794. Made an Article of the Faith by the Council of Trent 1563
11. Scripture to be interpreted only in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers. Creed of Pope Pius IV. - - - - - 1564
12. The Supremacy of the Pope first promulgated as an Article of the Faith by Pope Pius IV. in his Creed - 1564
13. Indulgences. Restrictions imposed on the practice of issuing Indulgences by the fourth Council of Lateran, 1215. Council of Trent decrees that the use of them is to be retained in the Church, and anathematizes those who declare them to be useless - - - 1563
14. The Immaculate Conception made an Article of the Faith by Pope Pius IX. - - - - - 1854
15. The Infallibility of the Pope proclaimed by the Vatican Council - - - - - 1870

THE CORONATION OATH.

As few persons are aware of the very stringent declarations taken by the Sovereign of this country on his, or her, coronation in order to uphold the Protestant Constitution of the Church of England, of which the Sovereign is by law the earthly Head or Governor. I subjoin a copy of the Oath and Declaration:—

“The ARCHBISHOP shall say—

‘ Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the Laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the PROTESTANT REFORMED RELIGION ESTABLISHED BY LAW? and will you preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of this Realm and to the Churches committed to their charge all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them or any of them?’

The KING and QUEEN shall say—

‘ All this I promise to do.’

After this the King and Queen, laying his and her hand upon the Holy Gospel, shall say—

KING and QUEEN—

‘The things which I have before promised, I will perform and keep. So help me God.’

Then the KING and QUEEN shall kiss the Book.

“And be it further enacted that the said Oath shall be in like manner administered to every King or Queen who shall succeed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm at their respective Coronations by one of the Archbishops or Bishops of this Realm of England for the time being, to be thereunto appointed by such King or Queen respectively and in the presence of all persons that shall be attending, assisting or otherwise present at such their respective Coronations; any Law, Statute or Usage to the contrary notwithstanding.”

BILL OF RIGHTS.

Act declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and settling the Succession of the Crown. (1689. 1. W. & M., Sess. 2, cap. 2, § 9 and 8. *Commonly called the Bill of Rights.*)

“And whereas it hath been found by experience that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this *Protestant Kingdom* to be governed by a Popish Prince, or by any King or Queen marrying a Papist, the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, do further pray that it may be enacted that all and every Person and Persons that is, are, or shall be, reconciled to, or *shall hold Communion with the See or Church of Rome*, or shall profess the Popish Religion, or shall marry a Papist, shall be excluded, and be for ever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy the Crown and Government of this Realm and Ireland and the Dominions thereunto belonging, or any part of the same, or to have, use, or exercise any Royal Power, Authority, or Jurisdiction within the same; and in all and every such Case or Cases the People of these Realms shall be and are hereby absolved of their Allegiance, and the said Crown and Government shall from time to time descend to, and be enjoyed by such Person or Persons, being *Protestants*, as should have inherited and enjoyed the same in case the Person or Persons so reconciled, holding Communion, or professing, or marrying as aforesaid, were naturally dead.”

DECLARATION

Which, under Sec. 2 of the 12th and 13th W. III., c. 2, commonly called the "ACT OF SETTLEMENT," and by the law of England, every Sovereign of this country at his or her coronation must "make, subscribe, and audibly repeat."

"I, Victoria, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God profess and testify and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by *English Protestants*, without any Evasion, Equivocation, or mental Reservation, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope, or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope or any other person or persons or power whatsoever shall dispense with or annul the same or declare that it was null and void from its beginning."

Her Majesty made and signed this declaration in presence of the Houses of Parliament on the 20th day of November, 1837.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

The subjoined quotation is from an address recently delivered in Liverpool by the well known Father Chiniquy, who left the Church of Rome nearly forty years ago, and who is now eighty-eight years old. He was for twenty-five years an earnest French-Canadian priest in the Province of Quebec, but was compelled by the voice of conscience to leave that Church; and

since his conversion a great number of French-Canadians have followed his example, including thirty-seven priests.

The Roman Catholic Church is an idolatrous Church. When I was in their midst, my God was speaking to me every day, saying: 'Chiniquy, are you not ashamed to make a God with a wafer?' Every morning I used to say to my servant girl what other priests of Rome say to their servant girls every day, or two or three times a week, 'make me some wafers.' And the girl of the priest takes a little flour, puts the dough between two well heated irons, then in a moment the dough is baked and the wafer comes out a little cake, and the girl gives them 25, sometimes 100, according to the orders, to the priest and the priest goes to the altar, performs his ceremony called 'Mass,' and pronounces on these wafers five ridiculous words, and then the poor priest is obliged to believe that he is infinitely above God, that God is infinitely below him, that he has a power over God so great that God becomes absolutely powerless in the presence of the priest. The priest of Rome is obliged to believe and he makes his people believe that as soon as he has pronounced these five ridiculous, magical words, the Second Person of the Trinity, the Word of God, has been obliged, in spite of Himself, to come down more quickly than lightning, into the hands of the priest, and He has been obliged to change Himself into the wafer, and He has been obliged to change the wafer into Himself, into the body, blood, soul, and Divinity of Christ. This is Romanism, the accomplishment of the terrible prophecy which you read in your Gospel; that, in the latter days there will be a man called 'Anti-christ,' the enemy of Christ, who will go into the Church of God, and make people believe that he is above God. Where is that man? it is the Pope, it is the priest. And to-day, it is your Ritualists, your miserable Ritualists to-day are becoming apostates, idolaters. I saw one last week prostrate himself before his so-called altar, and adoring the god he had made himself with a wafer in the morning. I was an idolater at one time, and my God was looking down upon me in His compassion and speaking to me words of truth, saying, 'Chiniquy, a man cannot make God with his own hands.' But I had to take God's word before the word of the devil. God was approaching me in His mercy, in His compassion, in His desire to save me, telling me to come out from that Church, where you are adoring a god, baked by your servant girl. My God was asking me, Have you not seen in your Bible my second commandment, where I say, you shall not take a created thing, that you shall not put an image upon it, and that you shall not turn that into your God, and adore and bow down before it. God was asking me, 'Why do you do that every morning?' He was telling me 'Every morning you take the created thing called a wafer, put an image upon it (a cross), and change it into a god. You cannot do it.' But the Pope was telling me that this voice was the voice of the devil, and, my friends, when my God was speaking to me I was obliged to take His voice for that of the devil, and I thought it was the devil tempting me to leave my Holy Church of Rome. O! how many times I fell on my knees with tears and said, 'O! my God, silence this voice which speaks to me against my Holy Church of Rome. I want to live and die in the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church. Do not allow me to become an apostate.' God with His merciful hand was trying to take me away from the false system of religion, and I was taking that hand of my God for the hand of the devil, and was resisting and fighting against God, with tears sometimes; and I could keep you here all night were I to tell you of the battles I have fought against God and the efforts I made to silence His voice; and when I see a priest of Rome to-day, my heart is filled with compassion. I cannot hate them though they hate and curse me.

In that long struggle of 25 years my God was to conquer me. The day was coming when God would speak to me with such power that I should see it was no use fighting against the Almighty.

I was the great confessor 'a la mode,' father confessor to the bishops, priests,

and nuns, and to the fair boys and girls and men who were coming to me, but I never heard confession without hearing the voice of God saying 'Shame on you. A man has no right to hear those stories.'

The day came when God was to conquer me, to come to me as a mighty warrior and to show me the light, the truth, and the way to eternal life. After 25 years of priesthood I was in Illinois, near Chicago, and there alone in my little chamber when the blessed hour came, my bible was before my eyes. Then suddenly God came to me with mighty power and His voice was like the voice of a mighty hurricane when He told me to come out from the Church of Rome. I had no doubt, I felt it was the voice of God. 'Come out from Rome. You are an idolater, you worship a God made with your own hands. You are in a Church where the bible is forbidden, where you have made an oath never to interpret the word of the bible according to your own conscience and intelligence but according to the unanimous consent of the holy fathers.' O! friends, on my knees, with tears I said 'My God, is it possible that the Church of Rome is not Thy Church, that Church so great, the Church of so many mighty nations. Of my dear mother! Of my country and what has raised me so high in the esteem of my countrymen? My God! Is it possible the Pope has deceived me? But if the Church of Rome is not Thy Church, O! God, where is Thy Church? Where can I go to be saved? Speak! give me rays of Thy saving light, that I may know where to go to find that Church.' For more than one hour on my knees, I cried for rays of light in order to see and understand where is the Church of Christ. The more I prayed, the greater was the dark cloud over my trembling soul. O! that one hour of prayer and tears and desolation, I was in fear that God had completely forsaken me, because no answer, no light came. But I was not mistaken. My God was very near and merciful; for after that hour of prayer and tears for light, I saw God in the very midst of that dark spiritual night. I saw God with the eyes of my soul. A beautiful light it was, and in the midst of the light, I was not mistaken, my dear Jesus was there. I saw His crown of thorns on His head. I saw the nails in His hands and the heavy cross was on his bleeding shoulders and my beloved Saviour was looking on me so kindly. I heard His sweet voice within my soul, saying, 'My friend, I have seen thy tears, I have heard thy cries, and I come to bring thee eternal life as a gift. My Father has so loved thee that He has sent me His Eternal Son Jesus to save thee, and on the cross I have saved thy soul. On the cross I have payed thy debts, I have bought for thee a crown in My Kingdom and a throne to sit on during all eternity. Look up.' And, friends, I looked up, and I hope you will look up too, every one of you, and you will see what I saw. I saw a crown, so beautiful, so rich, so precious, and on the crown was written, with the blood of Christ, my name. Again I looked up and saw a throne, a rich, splendid throne, and on it my name written with the blood of Christ, and Jesus was telling me: 'On the cross I bought that throne. Take it as a gift, take it in thy heart, believe in my love and consent to bless and love Me during eternity.' When my Saviour was telling me these marvellous things He was in His mercy giving me the grace to understand as much as a man can do that great mystery of the love of God, which the Pope has completely thrown overboard.