





Albany Page 150



THE
TRUTHS
OF THE
CATHOLIC RELIGION

PROVED FROM SCRIPTURE ALONE,
IN A SERIES OF POPULAR DISCOURSES CHIEFLY
ADDRESSED TO NON-CATHOLICS.

BY A CATHOLIC PRIEST.

“To the Greeks and to the barbarians—to the wise and to the unwise, I am a debtor.”
ROM. 1, 14.

“This is the word of faith, which we preach.”—ROM. 10, 8.

VOL. II.

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON:
T. JONES, CATHOLIC BOOKSELLER,
PATERNOSTER ROW.

M.D.CCC.LVII.

1878

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

540 EAST 57TH STREET

CHICAGO, ILL.

1878

1878

1878

1878

1878

1878

1878

CONTENTS.



LECTURE I.

	Page
On the veneration of Relics ; on the veneration of Images ; on the veneration of the Cross ; on the festivals of our Lord, blessed Virgin Mary, and Saints	1

LECTURE II.

Objections against the veneration of Relics ; the veneration of Images ; the veneration of the Cross ; the festivals of our Lord, blessed Virgin Mary, and Saints	37
--	----

LECTURE III.

The singular devotion of the Catholic Church to the blessed Virgin Mary justified	88
--	----

LECTURE IV.

On the Sacraments in general, and on the Sacrament of Penance in particular	120
--	-----

LECTURE V.

Objections against the several parts of the Sacrament of Penance	198
---	-----

Calhoun 150-157-182-187
J. Taylor on

LECTURE VI.

	Page
On the existence of a Middle State, called Purgatory, and on Prayers for the Dead	269

LECTURE VII.

Objections against Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead	295
--	-----

LECTURE VIII.

On the Supremacy of the Pope	322
-------------------------------------	-----

LECTURE IX.

Objections against the Doctrine of the Supremacy of St. Peter, and his Successors—the Supreme Pontiffs	347
---	-----

LECTURE X.

On the Rule of Faith	362
-----------------------------	-----

LECTURE I.

ON THE VENERATION OF RELICS; ON THE VENERATION OF IMAGES; ON THE VENERATION OF THE CROSS; ON THE FESTIVALS OF OUR LORD, BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, AND SAINTS.

THE Doctrine of the Catholic Church, regarding the veneration of relics, is thus defined by the Fathers of the Council of Trent.

The Holy Synod decrees: "That the bodies of holy martyrs and of others now living with Christ, which were the members of Christ and the temples of the Holy Spirit, and which shall be raised by him to eternal life and be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful. Through them many benefits are bestowed on men by God; so that they who affirm that no veneration and honour are due to the relics of Saints, or that to honour them and other sacred monuments is useless, as likewise to celebrate the memories of Saints in order to obtain their aid, are absolutely to be condemned, as the Church has condemned and does condemn them."—*Sess. xxv. de Invocat. SS.*

In these relics we Catholics do not imagine any inherent power, any supernatural and divine efficacy. But when we behold the Almighty God, who is so jealous of his own

honour, evincing in a most singular manner his love to them by the miracles wrought by their means, we hesitate not to honour them, but by no means, or on no account, to adore them. These are our sentiments—we have never entertained any other. Hence, we emphatically declare with St. Jerom, “that we do not worship and adore, I do not say only the relics of the martyrs, but not even the sun and moon, not the angels and archangels, not the Cherubim nor Seraphim, nor any name that is named in this world or the world to come, lest we should serve the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever more. But we honour the relics of the martyrs, in order to adore Him whose martyrs they are. We honour the servants, that the honour of the servants may redound to the Lord, who says: “He that receiveth you, receiveth me.”—St. Hierom, Epist. 53, ad Ripar. Presb. adv. Vigilant.

After this clear and simple explanation of the doctrine of the Catholic Church on this point, it is obvious, that if men professing themselves ministers of Christ were guided by Christian charity, to act candidly, they would cease to reproach us with adoration (in the proper acceptation of the term) of the relics of the Saints. We adore but one God in three persons. To this God, the Creator, and the Lord of all things, we solemnly declare we pay divine worship; and we cheerfully subscribe to the declaration, which says, “Cursed is he who commits idolatry, who prays to images or relics, or worships them for God.”

Of this veneration paid to the relics and even to the garments of the Saints, and of the singular benefits obtained by their means, the Old and New Testament abound with many distinguished instances. Commencing from the very garments, I beg to refer my reader to—

Catholic Version.

4 Kings, 2.*

14 And he (Eliseus or Elisha) struck the waters with the mantle of Elias, that had fallen from him, and they were not divided. And he said, Where is now the God of Elias? And he struck the waters, and they were divided hither and thither, and Elias passed over.

Protestant Version.

2 Kings, 2.

14 And he took the mantle of Elijah that fell from him, and smote the waters, and said, Where is the Lord God of Elijah? And when he also had smitten the waters, they parted hither and thither, and Elijah went over.

Here, then, a supernatural operation was achieved by means of the mantle of Elijah; for no sooner did Eliseus or Elisha touch the waters of the Jordan with it than they were divided, and permitted him a free passage; as took place

* This, which is the 4th Book of Kings in the Catholic Bible, is thus marked in the Protestant, "Second Book of Kings, commonly called the Fourth Book of Kings." And the 3rd Book of Kings in the Catholic Bible is thus marked in the Protestant, "First Book of Kings, commonly called the Third Book of Kings." Protestants in this follow the custom of the Hebrews; Catholics, on the contrary, the custom of the holy Fathers. It is the received opinion that Samuel composed the first book, so far as the 25th chapter; and that the Prophets Nathan and Gad finished the first, and wrote the second book. (See 1 Paralipomenon, *alias* 1 Chronicles, 19, v. 19.) With respect to the writer of the third and fourth books, it seems most probable they were not written by one man, nor at one time; but as there was all along a succession of prophets in Israel, who recorded by divine inspiration the most remarkable things that happened in those days, these books seem to have been written by these prophets. (See 2 Paralipomenon, *alias* 2 Chron. 9, v. 29; 12, v. 15; 15, v. 22; 20, v. 34; 26, v. 22; 32, v. 32.)

when Elias or Elijah had once before used it for the same purpose, as we read—

Catholic Version.

4 Kings, 2.

8 And Elias took his mantle, and folded it together, and struck the waters, and they were divided hither and thither, and they both (Elias and Eliseus) passed over on dry ground.

Protestant Version.

2 Kings, 2.

8 And Elijah took his mantle, and wrapped it together, and smote the waters, and they were divided hither and thither, so that they two went over on dry ground.

To these instances may be added the miraculous effects performed by the rod of Moses (Exodus, 7), and the following miraculous interpositions of Providence in behalf of the Ark, by the accident which befell Dagon (1 Kings, *alias* Samuel, 5, v. 4); by the punishment of those who looked curiously into it, when 50,000 and more perished (*Ibid.* 6, v. 19); and by the destruction of Uzzah for his imprudent officiousness (2 Kings, *alias* Samuel, 6, v. 6, 7). If God, therefore, considered it proper to show such clear and evident tokens of his almighty power in the Old Law in honour of inanimate objects, what should prevent the Spouse of Jesus Christ, the Catholic Church, from exhibiting respect and honour to the relics of the Saints in the New Law, whose souls dwell above, associated with the choirs of Angels?

Next (Matthew, 9, v. 20, 21, and 14, v. 36,) we read, that it was our beloved Redeemer's pleasure that the woman troubled with the issue of blood, and several other sick, should be healed by the touch of his garment. I shall submit the two texts; but the latter is peculiarly striking—

Catholic Version.

Matthew, 9.

20 And behold a woman who was troubled with an issue of blood twelve years, came behind him, and touched the hem of his garment.

21 For she said within herself, if I shall touch only his garment, I shall be healed.

Protestant Version.

Matthew, 9.

20 And behold, a woman which was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years, came behind him, and touched the hem of his garment.

21 For she said within herself, If I may but touch his garment, I shall be whole.

In consequence of this Scriptural and undeniable fact, I beg leave to put one plain question. Had this same woman, or any other labouring under a similar lingering disorder, when the blessed Jesus was raised up on the cross, or when His body was placed in the sepulchre (there being no access to His sacred person), had she, I say, said then, as she did on the other occasion, "*If I can but get to touch His garment, lying at the foot of the cross, or near the sepulchre, I doubt not but I shall be healed,*" would such an inward persuasion within herself have been more irregular, presumptuous, or reprobable in this, than it was in the first circumstance? In the former, we have heard our blessed Saviour's approbation of the woman's faith, and rewarding it with a present cure, the faith in both cases would have been specifically the same, grounded on a steadfast belief of a divine virtue emanating from Christ's person, although communicated by means of a bare touch of his garment; therefore, we must conclude, that the faith in both cases would have been equally lawful and commendable. But to return. Again we read—

Catholic Version.

Matth. 14.

36 And they besought him that they might touch the hem of his garment. And as many as touched were made whole.

Protestant Version.

Matth. 14.

36 And besought him that they might only touch the hem of his garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole.

What is more mean than the latchet of a shoe? And yet St. John the Baptist professed himself unworthy to loosen that used by the Blessed Jesus. (John, 1, v. 27.) Again, does not the Holy Scripture represent to us the faithful as showing respect to places which have been distinguished by God's particular presence? "Put off the shoes from thy feet," said God to Moses, "for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." (Exodus, 3, v. 5.) "Loose," said the Angel to Joshua, "thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy." (Joshua, 5, v. 16.—Protestant Bible, v. 15.) And the Holy Ghost commands like honour to be paid to the House of God: "Keep thy foot when thou goest into the House of God." (Ecclesiastes, 4, v. 17.—Protestant Bible, 5, v. 1.) Respect, consequently, may be paid to the relics of the Saints, which Heaven has made frequent use of as instruments of Divine miracles.

But do not our Protestant brethren, to a man, without the least apprehension of superstition or idolatry, respectfully and gratefully preserve a lock of hair, a trinket, or some other thing that formerly belonged to a parent, a husband, a wife, a child, a benefactor, now deceased? Do they set little or no value on these things, though they are mere trifles? Do they mislay, abuse, or suffer any other person to do so by them? Do they not keep or preserve them carefully? Do they not keep them often in gold and silver

cases, and place them near the heart? Suppose we Catholics ask them what they mean by all these different marks of respect? Is it to the lock of hair, the trinket, or any other thing they have as a keepsake, they pay respect? Or do they imagine that any of them or all contain any real and intrinsic virtue or value? No, by no means, they immediately reply; they tell us, they assure us, any one of these things is but a mere keepsake of a parent, husband, &c., &c.; a token of their remembrance of former love, affection, respect, gratitude, &c. towards the person now deceased, but who when living possessed it.

We Catholics believe them, because common sense, reason, religion, will not permit us to think otherwise. Yes, we give them credit. And why, let me ask, do they not believe us, when we assert the same and the very same, with respect to the relics of the Saints, seeing, I say, that we do no more, with this exception only, that the veneration we pay to the relics of the Saints, we show to those who, we have the strongest reasons to believe, are now happy souls in the Heavenly Jerusalem, and this the Protestant cannot assure, because the case on his side is dubious, at least not ascertained by any warranted testimony. Consequently, the honour and veneration paid by Catholics to the relics of the Saints is therefore more consistent with religion, and even with common sense and reason, than the veneration Protestants, or even Catholics, may pay to keepsakes of departed friends. For the Saints, whose relics we venerate, living here on earth, led virtuous, exemplary, edifying lives, and thereby were living examples of God,—“Always bearing about in their bodies the mortification of Jesus,” (2 Cor., 4, 10),—sanctified by the abundance of grace, and loved and esteemed by all who knew them; and now crowned with heavenly glory, where they behold “God

face to face, and know him even as they are known." (1 Cor., 13, 12.)

Coming now to the Acts of the Apostles, we are told by the inspired writer, c. 19, that the handkerchiefs and aprons which had touched the body of St. Paul removed diseases, and expelled devils—

Catholic Version.

12 So that even there were brought from his body (Paul) to the sick handkerchiefs and aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the wicked spirits went out of them.

Protestant Version.

12 So that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them.

Here, with the learned Dr. Coombes (*Essence of Controversy*), let me ask the liberal Protestant, "If by an extraordinary combination of circumstances, any of these handkerchiefs or aprons which had touched the body of St. Paul had been preserved amidst the general wreck of ancient monuments, and should be in their possession, with what eyes they would view such relics? Would they deem it superstitious to retain them with reverence, to treat them with honour and respect, because they had been applied to the body of St. Paul, and because God had honoured them with such signal marks of approbation? The answer is too obvious to be waited for: they treat the tokens of regard left them by their friends with affection and respect, and would their religious feelings be less awakened in the case here supposed? I am justified in saying that their conduct would rival the practice of the Catholic Church in reverencing whatever belongs to God and holy things; and

that they would thus sanction the principle of the question under discussion.”

Proceeding now to the Scriptural proofs for the benefits received by means of the relics of the Saints, I beg to call attention to a splendid miracle, the restoration of a dead man to life, performed the instant the dead body came in contact with the bones of Eliseus. The fact is related—

Catholic Version.

4 Kings, 13.

21 And some that were burying a man saw the rovers, and cast the body into the sepulchre of Eliseus. And when it had touched the bones of Eliseus the man came to life, and stood upon his feet.

Protestant Version.

2 Kings, 13.

21 And it came to pass as they were burying a man, that behold they spied a band of men ; and they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha ; and when the man was let down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood upon his feet.

And, in allusion to this fact, it is said that after death his body prophesied, as we read Ecclesiasticus, 48, v. 14.*

* This book is so called from a Greek word that signifies a preacher : because, like an excellent preacher, it gives admirable lessons of all virtues. The author was Jesus the Son of Sirach of Jerusalem, who flourished about two hundred years before Christ. As it was written after the time of Esdras, it is not in the Jewish canon : but is received as canonical and divine by the Catholic Church, instructed by Apostolical tradition, and directed by the Spirit of God. It was first wrote in the Hebrew, but afterwards translated into Greek by another Jesus, the grandson of the author. I beg to subjoin, for the present, a few of the Holy Fathers who have cited this book as Canonical Scripture :—
1st Century—St. Clement. Epist. ad Corinthios, cap. 9.

On the same miracle writes thus St. Cyril (Greek church, who flourished or wrote a full and very accurate abridgment of Christian doctrine in twenty-three Catechetical Discourses in 351)—“ I have passed by Eliseus also, who twice raised persons to life,—in his lifetime, and after his death. When alive, indeed, he effected resurrection by his soul. But that not only the souls of the just might be honoured, but that power might be believed to reside in the bodies of the just also, the dead man, cast into the tomb of Eliseus, having come in contact with the dead body of the prophet, was raised to life. And the dead body of the prophet performed the work of the soul; and that which lay dead gave life to that which had been dead; and that which gave life remained in the same manner among the dead. Why was this? Lest if Eliseus had risen, the thing might have been attributed to the soul alone: and to show that in the absence of the soul there resides a certain virtue in the bodies of Saints, on account of the just souls which inhabited them so many years, and made use of their ministry. And let us not foolishly disbelieve this, as if it were not so. For if handkerchiefs and aprons worn outside, when applied to the bodies of the sick, raised up the infirm, how much more would the body itself of the prophet

3rd Century—Origen. *Contra Cels.*, 1, 6, and 1, 8.

Tertullian—*de Exhortat. Castit.*, cap. 2.

St. Cyprian—*de Mortal.*, No. 6.

4th Century—Eusebius—*de vita Constan.*, c. xi. Valesii. And Præpar
Evan. 1, 8, c. 2.

St. Athanasius—*Contra Arian. Orat.* 1, T. 1, p. 285.

St. Ambrose—*de bono mortis*, cap. 8.

St. Jerom—*Epist.* 34, ad Julianum.

St. Chrysostom—*Hom.* 33, ad popul.

5th Century—St. Augustin—*Lib.* 11. *de Doct. Christ.*, cap. 8, and in
several other places.

resuscitate the dead man ?” (S. Cyril. Hieros. Cat. 18 and 16.)

Next, the author of the Acts of the Apostles, chap. 5, v. 15, 16, tells us, that the fervent disciples of the first fathers of Christianity brought forward their sick, that the shadow of Peter might relieve them : and, we are assured, that many of those persons, and others tormented with evil spirits, received benefit or were cured. I submit the texts to the calm and dispassionate attention of my Protestant reader—

Catholic Version.

15 they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that when Peter came, his shadow at the least might overshadow any of them, and they might be delivered from their infirmities.

16 And there came also together to Jerusalem a multitude out of the neighbouring cities, bringing sick persons, and such as were troubled with unclean spirits : who were healed.

Protestant Version.

15 they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid *them* on beds and couches, that at the least the shadow of Peter passing by, might overshadow some of them.

16 There came also a multitude out of the cities round about unto Jerusalem, bringing sick folks, and them which were vexed with unclean spirits : and they were healed every one.

I am aware it is objected against the last-mentioned proofs, especially that of Eliseus ; that devout men, carried St. Stephen’s body to the burial, but no stir was made with his relics ; great lamentation was only made over him. (Acts, 8, v. 2.) But, then, this is barely a negative argu-

ment, it by no means destroys, or in the slightest degree weakens, the force of the positive demonstration drawn from the miracles with which Almighty God was pleased to honour the bones of Eliseus, the shadow of Peter, or the aprons that had touched the body of Paul. Besides, though St. Luke is silent as to the precaution taken about the relics of St. Stephen, they were unquestionably honoured and preserved with care, for at a subsequent period they were discovered; and the great St. Augustine records many miracles performed by means of these relics, of some of which he was an ocular witness. (See the whole of the long chapter on this subject, c. 8, lib. 22, de civit. Dei.) However, I trust, that the Scriptural texts I have adduced are sufficient of themselves to confirm the truth of the declaration of the Fathers of the Council of Trent. “ 1st. That the bodies of Holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ, which were the members of Christ, and the temples of the Holy Spirit, and which shall be raised by him to eternal life, and be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful, since God has honoured them.* 2nd. “ That through them, many benefits are bestowed on man by God.”

* Eusebius (Eccles. Hist. Lib. 7, c. 18,) informs us, that the chair of St. James, the public episcopal seat in which the Bishops of Jerusalem were regularly enthroned, was originally venerated and carefully preserved in his time, a splendid proof of the Apostolical origin of the pious honour paid to Holy relics. But this is not the only instance of such veneration paid to the chairs of Holy men. The Acts of St. Mark relate, that his chair of antique ivory was long preserved at Alexandria, and humbly honoured by every succeeding Bishop. (Act. Pass. S. Marci. in notis Valesii apud Euseb.) And the Acts of St. Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, who was martyred in 311, relate, that out of respect he would never sit in that Holy chair, but only on his footstool. (Act. S. Pet. Alex. apud Baron. ad an. 310.) There is a noted passage in Tertullian which seems plainly to indicate, that the

Considering, also, that any miracle wrought is by the sole will and power of Almighty God, it follows that, venerating their relics, so highly honoured by God, is no ways injurious nor offensive to God, nor lessens the honour due and paid to Him, but, on the contrary, agreeable and acceptable, seeing that the Catholic Church refers the whole to God himself, the source and author of all good, and the giver of all good gifts. Therefore, if the relics of the Saints are chiefly preserved in Churches, and set on the altars, or near them, it is done through respect and reverence to the Saints themselves, who, in Heaven, are near to God, and there glorify Him with the whole triumphant

actual chairs of the Apostles were carefully preserved in the Apostolic Churches. “Run through the Apostolic Churches, in which the very seats of the Apostles still preside in their places, in which their very authentic epistles are recited, sounding the voice, and bringing the face of each one again before us.” “*Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsentur, apud quas ipsæ authenticæ litteræ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem, et repræsentantes faciem unius cujusque.* (Tertull. *De Præscrip*, cap. 36.) “As the learned Dr. Wiseman observes, (Remarks on Lady Morgan’s Statements regarding St. Peter’s Chair, preserved in the Vatican Basilic,) “it would not be in accordance with Tertullian’s usual terse reasoning to say, with so much emphasis, that the very sees of the Apostles were as yet preserved. The words *ipsæ* and *adhuc* seem to imply something extraordinary, such as the preservation of their identical chairs.” Besides, as the reading of their Epistles would recall the very voices of the authors to the minds of the hearers, so Tertullian, by parity, remarks that the very figures of those venerable men were forcibly brought to the imagination by the presence of their identical chairs. It is difficult to understand any rational application of this latter phrase, without supposing it to refer to the very chairs themselves; *ipsæ Cathedræ...representantes faciem unius cujusque.* Whoever weighs these observations impartially, will, I think, admit they afford no slight evidence of the veneration of Holy relics having descended from the age of the Apostles.

Church of blessed Angels and Spirits. Hence if a Catholic bear any relic about him, it is through devotion, love, and respect towards the Saint; a pious keepsake and memorandum to copy his virtuous life, by which he has attained eternal happiness; hoping his patronage by intercession; but not believing any intrinsic virtue in the relic itself. And surely if Almighty God was pleased to honour the relics of Saints, why may we not equally do so? For if Israel carefully preserved the bones of Joseph, and removed them into the land of Canaan, why may we not preserve and respect the bones and other remains of the illustrious Saints of the Christian dispensation? “The affection,” says the immortal Bossuet, “which, in the cases of human friendship, a friend experiences for a friend, extends not only to the cherished individual, but to his children and relations; and not merely to those, but even to whatever represents him; to whatever once belonged to him, or that brings back to the mind the pleasing remembrance of him. This is the dictate of the instincts of nature. Did the Protestant again weigh this, then would he likewise understand how the progress of honour is similar to that of friendship; since honour is nothing else, in reality, than affection, united with fear, and mingled with respect. In short, did the Protestant consider that the whole exterior worship which the Catholic cultivates, derives its origin from God alone, and returns solely to God again,—did he consider this, then would he also conceive clearly that such worship, animated as it thus is, merely by the author of sanctity, cannot possibly be displeasing to any one of His divine perfections. He would, on the contrary, conceive, that if God, jealous as He is of the love of men, does yet permit them to love each other for the love of Him, nor deems such love the division of our affections,—just so

jealous as He likewise is of the respect and veneration of the faithful, still does He allow them also—without looking upon such act, as any partition of the worship which is due to Him—to honour, for His sake, those happy beings whom himself has honoured so greatly.” (Exposition of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church, chap. 6, on Relics.)

Proceeding now to the veneration paid to Images, the Doctrine of the Catholic Church on this point is thus defined by the Fathers of the Council of Trent.

The Holy Synod decrees :—“ That Images of Christ, of the Blessed Virgin, and of other Saints, are to be exposed and retained particularly in Churches, and that due honour and veneration are to be shewn to them ; not as believing that any divinity or virtue is in them, for which they should be honoured, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or any trust be placed in them as the Gentiles once did in their idols ; but because the honour given to pictures is referred to the prototypes, which they represent, so that through the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads and kneel, we may learn to adore Christ and to venerate his Saints.” Sess. xxv. de Invocat. SS.

I hope my kind Protestant reader will have observed, that the Council of Trent does not decree that we are obliged to use Images ; it only says, that it is wholesome to have them, and that they are to be treated with respect, that is, such as is shown to the portrait of a father or of any one whom we esteem and reverence. Again, in its directions to the Parochial Clergy, it expressly enjoins them to explain this doctrine to the faithful ; it commands them to warn the people and make them understand, that these images are nothing but mere representations, that any honour paid to them is to be referred to the prototype, or being represented ; but that the image itself cannot have any virtue, nor give

them the slightest help. The learned Petavius says—
 “ We must lay it down as a principle that images are reckoned among the adiaphora, which do not belong to the substance of religion, and which the Church may retain or take away as the best judge.” (L. 15. de. Incarn.) Hence Dr. Hawarden, on images, p. 853, teaches with Delphinus, “ That, if, in any place, there is danger of real idolatry or superstition from pictures, they ought to be removed by the pastor.”

Such is the explanation of our doctrine on this point by these venerable fathers, and, if but calmly and dispassionately examined, it will be found more than amply sufficient to remove all doubts from Protestant minds regarding it. The Holy Synod teaches, that the images of Christ and his Saints are to be retained particularly in Churches, and that due honour and veneration are to be paid to them. Surely this is agreeable to the light of nature, and to the dictates of common sense. To doubt the truth of it would be to question the received notions of all mankind. Hence, I must confess, it has at all times appeared difficult to me, to conceive on what grounds Protestants regard this veneration as unlawful. Do they not see daily families retaining, and holding in the highest respect, likenesses of their ancestors, parents, husbands, wives, intimate friends, and benefactors; of eminent persons formerly in life? Do they not only carefully preserve them, but hand them down with the most scrupulous care from generation to generation? Do they not occasionally look up to them and express by every outward token, their grateful remembrance of the person represented? Now, why do they do all this? Is it not in remembrance, respect, gratitude, and affection for the deceased? I never shall be of the opinion, they look upon the picture itself, which is nothing more than a painted

piece of canvass, &c., as able to see or hear, or help them in the least manner. Why not, then, believe us Catholics, when we most solemnly declare that whatever respect or veneration we pay to the images or pictures of Christ and of the Saints, is on the same ground, and to the object thus represented, only with the difference before mentioned as to the real object. Let it be also considered, that the images, &c., in our temples of religion are at the same time the most moving representations of all that is affecting in religion itself. They may be justly styled the volume of the simple and ignorant, who though unable to peruse learned treatises, may understand subjects exhibited in pictures. Finally, they contribute to preserve the minds of the learned equally as the unlearned from distractions during the time of prayer; they become the occasions of pious and fervent desires, and unquestionably tend to promote a holy and laudable emulation to follow those examples which are so affectingly exhibited. But to the Scriptural proofs.—

Catholic Version.

Exodus, 25.

18 God said to Moses, Thou shalt make also, two cherubims of beaten gold, on the two sides of the oracle.

19 Let one cherub be on one side, and the other on the other.

Protestant Version.

Exodus, 25.

18 And thou shalt make two cherubims of gold, of beaten work shalt thou make them, in the two ends of the mercy seat.

19 And make one cherub on the one end, and the other cherub on the other end: even of the mercy seat shall ye make the cherubims on the two ends thereof.

Catholic Version.

20 Let them cover both sides of the propitiatory spreading their wings, and covering the oracle, and let them look one towards the other, their faces being turned towards the propitiatory wherewith the ark is to be covered.

21 In which thou shalt put the testimony that I will give thee.

22 Thence will I give orders, I will speak to thee over the propitiatory, and from the midst of the two cherubims, which shall be upon the ark of the testimony, all things which I will command the children of Israel by thee.

Behold in how many places cherubim are spoken of; in other words the Almighty God himself commands images to be made.

I might set down here the other sacred memorials mentioned in the Holy Scriptures. Joshua, for example, chose twelve persons by an express order of God, and commanded them to go before the ark and to take each a stone out of

Protestant Version.

20 And the cherubims shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; toward the mercy seat shall the faces of the cherubims be,

21 And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee.

22 And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.

the Jordan, to set it in the place of the camp as a sign that when their children should ask their fathers what these stones meant, they should answer them that they had taken them from the bottom of the Jordan when it was dried up, at the passage of the ark. (Joshua, 4, v. 5.) Now this memorial was nothing but an image of this miraculous event. Besides, the letters themselves that compose the Holy Scriptures are so many images of the things taught in them. Hence, if this species of imagery be permitted, and even necessary, why should the others be positively prohibited, since they are only for the same use, namely, to excite in our minds the memory of things past or of spiritual things? Besides, we see in the Sacred Writings that all the Prophets spoke of God as if he had eyes, ears, arms, &c. It is not then more criminal to form images in our imaginations by objects presented to our eyes, than to form them there by words resounded in our ears, both being designed to assist our minds by these material images, at which we do not stop, but raise them up to the spiritual objects which we respect.

Next. We have an order given to the high priest to have pomegranates of purple on his vestment—

Catholic Version.

Exodus, 28.

33 And beneath at the feet of the same tunick, round about, thou shalt make it as it were pomegranates, of violet, and purple, and scarlet, twice died, with little bells set between.

Protestant Version.

Exodus, 28.

33 And beneath upon the hem of it thou shalt make pomegranates of blue, and of purple, and of scarlet, round about the hem thereof: and bells of gold between them round about.

Catholic Version.

34 So that there shall be a golden bell and a pomegranate, and again another golden bell and a pomegranate.

35 And Aaron shall be vested with it in the office of his ministry, &c., &c.

Again, in the Temple a building raised by express command of God himself, in which he was pleased to declare through Solomon, "that his eyes would be open upon it day and night to his prayer, and the supplication of the people of Israel," we read that the wise king placed oxen, lions, and cherubim, about the smaller bases—

3 Kings, 7.

23 He made also a molten sea, of ten cubits from brim to brim, round all about the height of it was five cubits, and a line of thirty cubits compassed it round about.

24 And a graven work under the brim of it compassed it for ten cubits going about the sea: there were two rows cast of chamfered sculptures.

25 And it stood upon the twelve oxen, &c., &c.

Protestant Version.

34 A golden bell and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate, upon the hem of the robe round about.

35 And it shall be upon Aaron to minister, &c., &c.

1 Kings, 7.

23 And he made a molten sea, ten cubits from the one brim to the other: it was round all about, and his height was five cubits: and a line of thirty cubits did compass it round about.

24 And under the brim of it round about there were knops compassing it, ten in a cubit, compassing the sea round about: the knops were cast in two rows, when it was cast.

25 It stood upon twelve oxen, &c., &c.

Catholic Version.

29 And between the little crowns and the ledges were lions, and oxen, and cherubims: and in the joining likewise above: and under the lions and oxen as it were bands of brass hanging down.

And in the preceding chapter, v. 29, we are told—

3 Kings, 6.

29 All the walls of the temple round about he carved with divers figures and carvings: and he made in them cherubims and palm trees, and divers representations, as it were standing out, and coming forth from from the wall.

Surely these texts speak volumes regarding the religious use of images; as to the civil use of them we read—

3 Kings, 10.

19 It (Solomon's throne) had six steps: and the top of the throne was round behind: and there were two hands on either side, holding the seat: and two lions stood, one at each hand.

Protestant Version.

29 And on the borders that were between the ledges were lions, oxen, and cherubims: and upon the ledges there was a base above: and beneath the lions and oxen were certain additions made of this work.

1 Kings, 6.

29 And he carved all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of cherubims and palm trees and open flowers, within and without.

1 Kings, 10.

19 The throne had six steps, and the top of the throne *was* round behind: and *there were* stays on either side, on the place of the seat, and two lions stood behind the stays,

Also in Matt. 22, v. 20, Mark, 12, v. 16, Luke, 20, v. 24, we read that our beloved Redeemer did not censure the Jews for making use of money with the imprint of Cæsar.

Besides, Daniel 7, v. 9, we read that Almighty God appeared to this Prophet under the figure of an old man, and to St. John (Apoc. 5, v. 3.) with a face resembling the brightness of a jasper stone. Also the Holy Ghost was pleased to shew himself to men under the symbol of a dove at the baptism of Christ, (Matt. 3, 16,) and under the form of fiery tongues on the day of Pentecost, (Acts, 2, v. 3). Now are not these images, which God himself made use of to fix the human mind on those qualities to which he wanted most to draw attention? Why, then, should it be unlawful to represent these symbols which God himself hath made, and since he, so jealous as I have before remarked, has been pleased to do the same.

Again, in the prophecy of Osee (Hosea), we read the following remarkable passage :—

Catholic Version.

Chap. 3.

4 For the children of Israel shall sit many days without king, and without prince, and without sacrifice, and without altar, and without ephod, and without seraphim.

Protestant Version.

Chap. 3.

4 For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without *an image*, and without an ephod, and without teraphim.

Now, I ask, could the Prophet have dared to bewail the absence of these things, unless they were right and lawful in themselves? We dare not say the Prophet was wrong. He was, when making this prophecy, inspired by the Holy

Ghost, and guided by his immediate influence and vivifying spirit.

No Protestant will deny that external honour is to be paid to God in places of prayer erected to His divine honour, and that the good and pious, the beloved of God and man, always had most at heart their magnificence and beauty—

Catholic Version.

Psalm, 25.

8 I have loved, O Lord, (said David) the beauty of thy house, and the place where thy glory dwelleth.

2 Kings, 7.

2 He (David) said to Nathan, the Prophet. Dost thou see that I dwell in a house of cedar, and the ark of God is lodged within skins? (The tabernacle made by Moses was covered with skins, and in many respects not equally magnificent for the service of God.)

Psalm, 131.

1 O Lord, remember David, and all his meekness.

2 How he swore to the Lord, he vowed a vow to the God of Jacob.

3 If I shall enter into the tabernacle of my house: If I shall go up into the bed wherein I lie:

Protestant Version.

Psalm, 26.

8 Lord, I have loved the habitation of thy house, and the place where thine honour dwelleth.

2 Samuel, 7.

2 the King (David) said unto Nathan the Prophet, See now, I dwell in an house of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth within curtains.

Psalm, 132.

1 Lord, remember David, and all his afflictions;

2 How he sware unto the Lord, and vowed unto the mighty God of Jacob.

3 Surely, I will not come into the tabernacle of my house, nor go up into my bed;

Catholic Version.

4 If I shall give sleep to my eyes, or slumber to my eyelids.

5 Or rest to my temples : until I find out a place for the Lord, a tabernacle for the God of Jacob.

Protestant Version.

4 I will not give sleep to mine eyes, or slumber to mine eyelids.

5 Until I find out a place for the Lord, an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob.

Now we know, that God accepted his will, but reserved the execution of it to his son Solomon. With what magnificence and cost Solomon executed it, together with a scrupulous detail of its ornamental appendages, we have also in the Sacred Writings. Surely, then, it is not only lawful, but obligatory, on man to embellish the houses of prayer—the temples of God among men, since the most magnificent temple erected in the old dispensation was this of Solomon. But to return to my subject, I deem it necessary to request that our Protestant friends should bear in mind, that though God the Father and the Holy Ghost are represented in our temples of religion under the symbols in which they are represented in the Scriptures to have appeared, our intention is not to represent God himself; we believe that God is a pure spirit, and that it is impossible to represent him by corporeal images; our design is only to make imperfect symbols of his own perfections. And, except under the above-mentioned symbols, we have an unreserved abhorrence of representing God by images of any other kind. Images are, therefore, useful when they are designed to instruct men, or to recall to their minds mysteries in which they are instructed, or to animate and enliven their ideas in regard of those they reflect on.

Besides, does not the Scripture say—

Catholic Version.

Numbers, 21.

8 And the Lord said to him (Moses): Make a brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign: whosoever being struck shall look on it shall live.

9 Moses therefore made a brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign; which when they that were bitten looked upon, they were healed.

Protestant Version.

Numbers, 21.

8 And the Lord said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole: and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live.

9 And Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole, and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived.

Here we see that Moses, in obedience to the command of God, who unquestionably would not encourage any person to commit an act of idolatry, makes an image of a serpent in brass; and in John 3, v. 14, we read that Christ himself approves of the making and exalting it, and owns it to have been a type and figure of himself upon the cross. And why, let me ask, should we be called idolaters, for making images, and placing them in our Temples of Religion, that they may put us in remembrance that Christ was crucified for our sins? I see no disparity in the matter, but only that what they did was a sign of a thing to come to pass, and now what we do is a sign of that very thing which already came to pass.

Proceeding now to treat of the Veneration paid by Ca-

tholics to the cross,* I regret it has been often and recently attempted to impress on Protestant minds "that we pay gross and direct adoration to it, and that the inanimate and senseless wood is not only regarded as our exclusive hope, but is actually supplicated to increase righteousness to the pious, and to grant pardon to the guilty." I admit these words are to be found in the beautiful hymn *Pange Lingua* for Passion time: "Hail, O Cross, our only hope in this time of the passion, increase justice in the pious, and grant pardon to the guilty." But, then, does it follow from these words that we do in reality pay adoration, in the proper acception of the term, to the material wood of the cross? When we Catholics kneel before a crucifix, when we bow to it, or even salute it, or apply it to our hearts, we do all this internally to Christ himself, our Beloved Redeemer, once really hanging on the cross, and now presented to us in a representative which, reminding us of the great love of the Blessed Jesus, cannot but naturally stir us up to love and gratitude. Not that we imagine or believe that the material cross can see, hear, or help us. But, then, who is the Protestant that will not acknowledge how deeply he is indebted to Christ, our Redeemer, crucified for him? And let it be calmly replied to, whether the crucifix be not more powerful to excite pious and grateful sentiments of love,

* With regard to those things which appertained to Christ's passion, as his clothes, or which have any relation to him, as the cross, nails, and other instruments of his passion; whether considered as the *material* cause of our redemption resulting from them, or as memorials of that infinite and ineffable mercy, no liberal-minded Protestant can deem it repugnant to good sense or reason to pay a relative honour to them under these considerations, and according to the explanations I have given. I trust it will be looked upon as agreeable to *pious* sense to set an inestimable value on them, since they were thus sanctified by Christ's person at that ever memorable period.

|| sorrow, &c., than the bare thought, without any external lively representative before the sight? "It cannot, for example, be denied that the image of Christ Jesus crucified awakens in us, when we cast our eyes upon it, the lively remembrance of Him 'who hath loved us so, as to lay down his life for our salvation.' Whilst the contemplation of the image nourishes in the soul this useful recollection, we are of course inclined naturally to declare by some external expression the tenderness of our gratitude, and by humbling ourselves before the representation to testify the willingness of our submission to the divine original."—(*Bossuet.*) //

|| But, it may be said, what need is there of that external show of the internal sentiment? Does not the great Searcher of the Heart see into its inmost recesses? Unquestionably God does see into the bottom of the human heart, and therefore there is no absolute need of it. But as man consists of soul and body, both dependent on God, so He, the Lord of both, requires our bounden acknowledgment from soul and body jointly; the soul internally and directively, and the body externally by service. For, as St. Chrysostom observes, if man were incorporeal only, God would have given him simple, abstracted, incorporeal gifts; but seeing that the soul is conjoined with the body, He enables the body, and admits it to express by its outward operations the interior sentiments of the soul. Thus, in baptism, though God could have forgiven man the guilt of original sin, without the necessity of external washing of the body with water, yet such was not his will, but that the internal and invisible effect should be signified by the external. Such, then, is the external veneration paid to a crucifix, image, picture, &c. by a Catholic, with this difference, that the veneration paid, whether internal or external, to a crucifix is unlimited, as it is

paid to infinite majesty and sanctity—to Christ as Man God, the redeemer of mankind.* And the veneration paid to the object represented by the picture of a Saint is greatly inferior and limited; yet this redounds to God as to the sole source, and is ultimately referred to Him, crowning his own gifts, when he crowns the merits of his Saints. But to return to the objection made against our veneration of the cross. I beg to ask, did not St. Paul say (Gal. 6, v. 14), “God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross?” And who would dare charge the Apostle with making the senseless wood his exclusive glory? Would not every liberal Protestant exclaim that the Apostle is not here speaking of the material timber of the cross, as Faber has it (*Diff. of Rom. Fint. Ed. p. 282*), “by a very common figure of rhetoric, so far from blushing at the ignominious death of his Saviour, he professes himself even to glory in the despised circumstance of his crucifixion.” So we Catholics by a like figure address the instrument, always directing our prayer in reality to him who suffered upon it, and the very next words express that we adore

* No one can deny the devout and frequent use of the sign of the cross from the very cradle of Christianity. Let it be even regarded but as a bare symbol; still its constant use, and its introduction into the most solemn offices of religion, and the administration of every one of the sacraments, testify invincibly that it was regarded as a sacred sign, and used with pious veneration. Even the Protestant churches still retain it in one solitary ceremony—in administering baptism. Some pious enthusiasts may see, but I cannot, any difference between devoutly venerating the cross when simply signed, and the cross when formed more perfectly, and placed before us, or worn about our necks. The principle of veneration in each case is the same; and they who set themselves to oppose our veneration of the cross must therefore commit themselves in equal opposition to the indisputable veneration of the cross by the primitive Christians.

the blessed Trinity as the sole source of salvation: "Let every spirit praise thee, O Trinity, fountain of salvation;" and that from God alone, and not from senseless wood, do we look for the recompense purchased for us by Him who died upon the cross—"To those to whom thou grantest the victory of the cross add also its reward." Thus has the Church, inspired by the Holy Ghost, studiously explained her own expressions, and I sincerely trust her explanations are not made in vain. But why, let me ask, in conclusion of this remark regarding our veneration of the cross, should a man who professes the Bible to be his rule of faith, charge a Catholic with the unlawfulness of the veneration paid to it, when he recollects how scrupulously the Almighty God required a superior degree of religious respect to be paid to the ark, to the Holy of Holies, to the sacred vessels of the temple, aye, even to the mountain, whence he gave the ten commandments? Every one—

Catholic Version.

Exodus, 14.

12 That touched the
mount, dying, he shall die.

Protestant Version.

Exodus, 14.

12 Whosoever toucheth
the mount, shall be surely
put to death.

Speaking only of the ark, every veneration was paid to it which we Catholics pay to the cross; even Joshua prostrated himself before it, and prayed before it—he and all the ancients of Israel. (Joshua, 7, v. 6.) What will my kind Protestant reader say to this? Surely, he will not call it idolatrous worship. Yet where is the difference in principle or practice between this veneration and ours? The object in either case is a religious symbol. The ark was a symbol, or memorial, of God's bounty to his people;

and the cross is the precious memorial of the greatest of mercies and bounties, our redemption by his eternal Son. Yet the relative veneration of the Jews was a lawful act of religion, and that of Catholics must be branded as gross idolatry. Such injustice and uncharitableness are, however, put to shame by Bishop Montague, who does not hesitate to say "that learned Protestants do not deny that the cross has a power from God."

I shall now proceed to call attention to the festivals of our Lord, Blessed Virgin, and the Saints. Many Protestants regard the distinction of particular days for festivals as a ceremony condemned by the Holy Scriptures. But so far from it, the word of God obliges us to approve of it. We see there that the blessed Jesus authorized, by his attendance, the festival which the Synagogue had instituted to thank God for the dedication of the temple; a festival which, as was customary with the Jews, was celebrated during the space of eight days. (John, 10, v. 22, and 2 Maccabees, 1, v. 9.) The Holy Ghost in several places commends those who sanctified particular times by retiring from worldly occupations to employ themselves in works of piety. (See Luke, 2, v. 26, 27.)

For the information of the reader, I beg to subjoin the principal feasts observed under the old law.

"1st. The Dedication of the Temple, instituted by Solomon when the temple was first built by him in Jerusalem, as is related in 3 Kings, c. 8, and 2 Chron., c. 7. It was renewed again, when after the Babylonish captivity the temple was rebuilt: "And the children of Israel, the priests, and the Levites, and the rest of the children of the captivity, kept the dedication of the house of God with joy." 1 Esdr. 6, 16. After the temple had been polluted by the heathens, the same festival was renewed again, and

a new altar erected in it by Judas Maccabeus : “ And they kept the dedication of the altar eight days, and they offered holocausts with joy, and sacrifices of salvation and of praise.....and Judas and his brethren and all the church of Israel decreed that the day of the dedication of the altar should be kept in its season from year to year, for eight days with joy and gladness.” 1 Macc. 4, 56. This feast was still kept even in our Saviour’s time, who honoured it with his presence, for “ it was the Feast of the Dedication at Jerusalem, and it was winter; and Jesus walked in the temple in Solomon’s porch.” John, 10, v. 22.

“ 2nd. The Feast of Judith, in memory of her signal victory over Holofernes; of which it is said, “ The day of the festivity of this victory is received by the Hebrews in the number of holy days, and is religiously observed by the Jews from that time until this day.” Judith, 16, v. 31.

“ 3rd. The Feast of Esther, which was kept in memory of the deliverance of the people of God from the destruction intended for them by Hamaan; for, after that happy deliverance, Mordecai wrote the whole account of it, and sent it by letters to all the Jews, “ both those who lay near and those afar off, that they should receive the fourteenth and fifteenth days of the month of Adar for holy days, and always at the return of the year should celebrate them with solemn honour.....and the Jews undertook to observe with solemnity all that they had begun to do at that time, which Mordecai had commanded to be done.....which the Jews took upon themselves and their seed and upon all that had a mind to be joined to their religion; so that it should be lawful for none to pass these days without solemnity.” Esther, 9, v. 20, 23, 27.

“ Here, then, we have three holy days instituted by the Church of the Jews, and observed by them with very great

solemnity, besides several others of lesser note : all which were instituted and kept to commemorate certain temporal benefits bestowed by God upon his people, and were figures of those more excellent holy days in the new law afterwards instituted by the Church of Christ in memory of the more important benefits conferred by our Saviour Jesus Christ on all mankind.

“ Now who can call in question the authority of the Church of Christ—that Church with which he promised “ to abide all days even to the consummation of the world ”—to institute holy days in the new law, while he must admit the same authority was exercised by the people of God in the old ? And what Christian can refuse to keep holy such festivals as are commemorative of the great benefits of our redemption through Jesus Christ, who beholds, to his shame, the great solemnity with which holy days were kept by the Jewish people commemorative of far lesser benefits ? ”
—(*From a discourse lately delivered by Rev. Mr. Reed, Catholic Pastor of Dumfries.*)

Unquestionably, then, the Church of Christ has good grounds for consecrating particular days to meditate on the divine mysteries, to praise Almighty God for the favours he has conferred on us through Jesus Christ, or by the prayers of the Saints ; and to beg his grace that we may improve in virtue, and profit by their examples. Nor are these festivals contrary to the commandment of God, which says, “ six days shalt thou labour ” (Exodus, 20, v. 9), for the commandment is not contained in these words but in the following—

Catholic Version.

Exodus, 20.

10 But on the seventh day

Protestant Version.

Exodus, 20.

10 But the seventh day

Catholic Version.

is the sabbath of the Lord thy God : thou shalt do no work on it, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy beast, nor the stranger that is within thy gates.

Protestant Version.

is the sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates.

The law given to Moses was worded in similar terms—

Genesis, 2.

16 Of every tree of paradise thou shalt eat.

17 But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat.

Genesis, 2.

16 Of every tree of the garden thou may'st freely eat.

17 But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it.

He was not, therefore, bound to eat of the fruit of all the trees, but only had permission to eat of them. And this is more clear from the Scriptures, for they teach us that God, who did not dispense, at least ordinarily, with the moral law, established several solemnities on these six days: namely, the first day of the seventh month and the day of expiations, besides the great Feasts of the Pasch, of Pentecost, and of Tabernacles; and that servile work was prohibited on two days of each of these three last solemnities. The Church of Israel, as we are informed by the Sacred writers, likewise consecrated particular days of the week to be spent in holy exercises instead of labour, as it did in solemnizing the remembrance of Esther's deliverance (Es-

ther, 9, v. 17), and the dedication of the Temple (1 Maccabees, 4, v. 59.) Some pious enthusiasts, however, argue that if it were lawful to establish holidays in this manner, St. Paul would not have said to the Colossians—

Catholic Version.

2 Chapter.

16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a festival day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbaths.

Protestant Version.

2 Chapter.

16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holiday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days.

But, it appears from the passage itself, which mentions the sabbaths and new moons which the Jews were accustomed to observe; from the verse that follows, where it is said, that these things are a shadow of things to come, and that Jesus Christ is the body; finally, from the preceding verses, that the Apostle expressly speaks of the Old Law, which our Beloved Redeemer abolished by his death on the Cross. This passage, then, is not against the observance of the Festivals of the Catholic Church. For it does not follow from our ceasing to observe the Festivals, that were intended to represent the future coming of Jesus Christ, that we ought not to keep the Christian Festivals, which represent him as now come, such as those of his Nativity, Death, Resurrection, and of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon his Apostles—the most distinguished and holy of his servants. On the contrary, it rather follows that we ought to observe them at present; for the Festivals that represented our Lord as about to come, were only abolished that we might observe the Festivals which represent that he is come, and has redeemed us.

Another objection is made from the passage of St. Paul to the Galatians, where he says—

Catholic Version.

4 Chapter.

9 But now, after that you have known God, or rather, are known by God : how turn you again to the weak and needy elements, which you desire to serve again ?

10 You observe days, and months, and times, and years.

11 I am afraid of you, lest perhaps I have laboured in vain among you.

Protestant Version.

4 Chapter.

9 But now, after that ye have known God, or rather, are known by God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage ?

10 Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.

11 I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.

But then, as St. Paul, two verses before, puts the Galatians in mind of the Paganism in which they had lived, it may be said that they had retained the superstitious observances of the Pagans, who looked on certain days as unlucky, in which they would not begin any affair of importance, and that the Apostle reprimands them on this account. However, it is more probable that as several of the Galatians, after their conversion, had been seduced by false teachers, who mixed Judaism with the Christian Religion, as St. Paul shews through this whole Epistle, he here reproaches them for observing the Jewish Festivals. For this reason he speaks in the verses I have quoted, not only of days, but likewise of months, of times, and of years. This distinction bears also a manifest relation to the different Fes-

tivals of the Jews ; for they observed the Sabbaths and new moons, particular annual feasts, and particular years, as the seventh year of the Jubilee. This passage then to the Galatians, as likewise that to the Colossians, cannot be alleged against Christian Festivals, which have no connexion with those of the Jews.

LECTURE II.

OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE VENERATION OF RELICS; THE VENERATION OF IMAGES; THE VENERATION OF THE CROSS; THE FESTIVALS OF OUR LORD, BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, AND SAINTS.

FIRST Objection.

We are not commanded in the Holy Scriptures to venerate relics. Therefore this doctrine is unscriptural, and tends to turn away the minds of men from that rational and spiritual worship the sacred writings require.

Answer.

Though there is no positive and direct command to venerate relics, or one worded in such terms, still we are fully justified by that general principle laid down by St. Paul, in his letter to the Romans (c. 13, v, 7), “of rendering honour to whom honour is due,”—a principle which Almighty God has been pleased to observe, as we have seen in the body of the Lecture, by the various miracles wrought by the relics of the Saints. With respect to the second part of the objection, that “the doctrine of the veneration of relics tends to divert and turn away the minds of men from that rational and spiritual worship the sacred writings require,” I beg to state, that the superstition here charged on the Catholic Church exists only in the imagination of those who suppose that this doctrine forms an essential part of our religion, or that the relics of the Saints are entitled to

receive that primary worship due to God alone. From what has been said in the preceding Lecture, and the one on the Invocation of the Saints, it will be seen that it is agreed upon by all Catholic Divines, that this doctrine is not essentially necessary to be practised, in order to enter into the kingdom of God; but, as relics have a certain relation with holy persons and things, by representing them, they become entitled to a relative or secondary veneration in the manner already explained.

Second Objection.

Our Saviour says—

Catholic Version.

Matthew, 23.

29 Wo to you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites, that build the sepulchres of the Prophets, and adorn the monuments of the just.

Protestant Version.

Matthew, 23.

29 Wo unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites: because ye build the tombs of the Prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous.

From which supposed divine reproof our opponents conclude is divinely forbidden the veneration of relics.

Answer.

It is evident, from the drift of the whole chapter, that it was not the specific act of paying honour to the monuments of those deceased faithful servants of God which our Blessed Lord and Master found worthy of blame, but the hypocritical disposition and corruption of their hearts, accompanied with an outward show of devotion, which he justly inveighed against and reproved. They affected to honour the memory of their Prophets, and to celebrate their courageous sufferings in defence of truth, at the same time that

they were actually opposing themselves to the Fountain of Truth, and were copying the deeds of the enemies of Jesus in their own lives, by treading closely in their footsteps, and persecuting with equal inveteracy and hatred the Lord of the Prophets; therefore our Beloved Redeemer immediately and prophetically added, 32d verse, "fill ye up, then, the measure of your fathers." This spurious devotion, then—this mistaken religion—the Blessed Jesus justly and severely condemns, and so does every true member of the Catholic Church. Therefore this objection does not militate against the honour paid by the Catholic Church to the relics of Saints. I am aware that Protestants frequently receive grounds for such *irrelevant* objections, from looking narrowly into the character and religious conduct of Catholics in an humble grade of life, who, though proverbially attached to their Faith, must not be supposed to be so well informed in religious matters as those who make it their principal study to attain a perfect knowledge of the religion of Christ crucified. On this account, I have deemed it expedient to caution ignorant and illiterate Catholics against some errors in their invocation of Saints, veneration of relics, images, &c., which give scandal to Protestants.

1st Error. It is a vain and groundless persuasion, that whoever honours, venerates, or invokes this or that Saint, in some extraordinary manner, or by some particular or external performance of devotion, and for such a length of time, or wears a scapular, carries about him a relic of a Saint, or a picture, or enrolls himself in such or such a confraternity, will, by so doing, escape eternal damnation, purgatory, or not die without receiving the rites of the Church. This persuasion is condemned as an abominable, superstitious, and presumptuous error.

2. To make the veneration of a Saint to consist in great

part of a certain number of prayers, said in honour of the Saints, in placing lighted tapers before their images or pictures : this is condemned as superstitious.

3. To invoke or pray to any Saint, as if the Saint himself could grant what is asked : this is grossly erroneous. We may only so pray to any Saint, as to beg his intercession for us with God, from whom alone we may obtain what we demand by our prayers, united to the Saint praying for us. Hence to God we should say, "Have mercy on us," "Give us." To the Saint, "Pray for us," "Intercede for us."

4. So to have recourse to the Almighty God, as not to ask what we stand in need of in the name of Christ Jesus. On which account the Catholic Church concludes all her public and private prayers, "through Jesus Christ our Lord; through the same Jesus Christ our Lord."

Third Objection.

Another implicit forbiddance of the Catholic practice is taken from the providential concealment of the body of Moses from the Jews, after his decease.

But it is incumbent upon our opponents, in order to give weight to the fact, so as to render it of service to their purpose, to make it appear to have been designed, either as a divine disapprobation of *any degree* of religious honour to be given to this Prophet's body; or if directly intended to prevent a divine worship, they must prove in this particular the Catholic practice to be such. But, I apprehend, both the horns of this dilemma are faulty—have no reference at all to the Catholic doctrine.

First, the fact was not designed as a token of God Almighty's disapprobation of every kind of *religious honour*, but barely to prevent a *divine worship*, as is evident from several circumstances. The sacred pages everywhere unfold

the superlative superstition of the people of Israel, and their violent strong propensity to Idolatry. This supposed, there was an apparent and imminent danger, if the remains of Moses had continued among them, that the remembrance of his wonderful actions, and a false respect, or a mistaken gratitude, might have attracted to him divine honours from such a self-blinded people; the body being translated by the ministry of Angels to an unknown place, this mischief was actually prevented. Indeed, St. Jude, in his Catholic Epistle, does not obscurely insinuate this presumption, since he hints at a contention between St. Michael and Satan about this great Prophet's body; the latter being earnest to have it within the knowledge and view of the Jews, as an occasion to them, and object of Idolatry; the other, as has been said, by the divine appointment transferring it out of their sight, or knowledge, to prevent this great evil. But, no evil or irregularity of this nature can, with any colour of truth or justice, be charged on Catholics for venerating the relics of the Saints; since they do not venerate the Saints themselves, but with an inferior nature, much less their relics or other remains. Therefore, as I have said, the members or horns of this dilemma are faulty, and have no reference whatever to the Catholic practice; and therefore, this objection is as inconclusive as the former.

Fourth Objection,

Is from the "Free Inquiry into Miraculous Powers, by the late Dr. Conyers Middleton," who, leaving the beaten track of his friends, goes another way to impugn Catholic principles, and in an especial manner the veneration of relics—1st. he regards the miracles done by them as erroneous, and 2ndly, he endeavours to invalidate the evidences of their vouchers, and thus argues in behalf of the 1st :

“Miracles,” says he, “were attested to have been wrought by the means of relics, which gave a sanction to, and promoted, the veneration which was paid to them : but this practice is superstitious ;” therefore, the alleged miracles in support of them, he concludes to be spurious and counterfeit. The major, or first proposition, is one of the Catholic proofs I have for the lawfulness of the practice. The minor, or second proposition, which is wholly Protestant, begs the question, because it supposes the practice to be superstitious, which is the point to be proved, therefore the consequence inferred from it is inconclusive.

The same way of arguing was just as good in the mouths of the Jews and Infidels against the miracles of our Blessed Saviour, and of his Apostles. Our Blessed Lord urged to the Jews the signs and miracles he wrought as evidences to his Divine mission, or to his being their Messiah. The Jews perversely refused to acknowledge him in that capacity; and therefore, to cover their obstinacy, were constrained to blaspheme his miracles, overlooking the hand of God so conspicuous in them, and imputing them to a diabolical virtue. In the same manner, afterwards, the Infidel argued against the miracles of the Apostles. The Apostolic miracles were operated in confirmation of the Christian religion, which they preached to Infidel nations; but many of them could not prevail on themselves to submit to it, therefore they were under the necessity of rejecting its *miraculous* evidences, and hence they looked upon them as magical productions—proceeding from a diabolical power, and not from the Divine. Now, whether Dr. Middleton’s arguments against the point in question, and the Jews’ and Infidels’ against the miracles of CHRIST and his Apostles, are not exactly parallel, I submit to the judgment of the candid reader; both one and the other reject the respective

evidences upon the same grounds, namely, because they are attestations of what they were not inclined to believe. The second argument of the Doctor—namely, the pretended insufficiency of the vouchers, remains still to be examined. Certainly, with respect to us who live at a distance from the times in which *those miracles* were wrought, further proofs of the truth may be expected, and these proofs can be no other, as they are the objects of human faith, than the credit of their vouchers. The Holy Scriptures, whose authority is admitted by all sects and denominations, and are believed to be of Divine inspiration, are vouchers for the miracles of Christ and his Apostles; hence these truths are *objects of Divine Faith*. The contemporary fathers attest the miracles of succeeding ages; these miracles are hence objects of human faith. Now, the credit of the Fathers has been always established and never scrupled till lately by Dr. Middleton, who is unfortunately followed by many of the present day. I will subjoin a specimen of his opinion of them:—in his preface he tell us, “that the fathers are extremely credulous and superstitious, possessed with prejudices, and an enthusiastic zeal, and scrupling no art or means by which they could propagate their principles. In short, that they were of a character, from which nothing could be expected that was candid and impartial—especially where Religion was the subject, which, above all other motives, strengthens every bias, and influences every passion of the human mind.”—Pref. p. 31, 32. Can anything be more derogatory to the honour of these great men, or more reverse to the general repute they have possessed in the Christian World through all ages, than the picture of them the Doctor has here drawn? But it was his business to prepossess his reader against them in the beginning, that whatever indignities he should offer to them, in the body of his work,

might neither surprise him, nor be disrelished; and we also see that he makes as free with Religion in the above extract as he does with its faithful advocates, whilst he would have us believe it to be subservient to the worst of purposes, namely, to inflame every passion of the human mind: that he must mean evil passions, the drift of his discourse evinces, in which he contradicts the sense of every good man concerning this divine institution, which has always been thought to have been directed to the contrary effect, namely, to check our passions, and bring them under subjection.

But at once to meet Dr. Middleton, I beg to call the attention of his admirers to two eminent lights of the Catholic Church, to whose learning and sagacity the Doctor can make as little exception, as to their piety and probity—these are St. Ambrose and St. Augustin; the former recites the miracles operated by the relics of St. Gervasius and Protasius, of which he declares himself an eye witness. St. Amb. Ep. 5.

The other informs us of above seventy miracles, wrought by the relics of St. Stephen within his own diocess, and consequently within his own knowledge, inspection, and examination. St. Aug. 1. 22 de Civ. Dei. C. 1.

Now if these pious, learned, and great men were on these occasions so well circumstanced as to be enabled to become unexceptionable evidences to the truth of the facts they attest (as they certainly were); if their joint learning, sagacity, and probity, rendered them otherwise so well qualified for the task, that their veracity cannot reasonably be questioned, nor their testimony be refused, which is no more than what is due to the great repute they always possessed in the world, and what every one has allowed them, till Dr. Middleton's "Free Inquiry" appeared: then, I

say, from these just concessions the following consequences directly follow, and must be admitted. First, that out of the list of the Fathers whom the Doctor impeaches of a weak and unreasonable credulity, or of invention and forgery, these two great men, at least, have a right to be excepted. Secondly, if they merit any credit and their testimony is to be admitted, then the veneration of relics must from thence be allowed to have been practised in the early ages, and warranted even by miracles. Thirdly, that therefore in those ages miracles had not ceased in the Church ; which overturns the whole system of the Doctor's opposition to the miraculous powers.

In order to invalidate these consequences, he alleges several extraordinary opinions some of them are said to have sustained, and which we reject as well as he. The greatest men have fallen into mistaken opinions, but what then? Is it because a pious and holy man may be lost in some speculative point, he is not to be allowed common sense in the ordinary actions of life? Or, because his understanding being limited, is liable to mistake what is above its comprehension, does it follow that he is not able to distinguish or discern truth from falsehood? Or, finally, if he receives his information from another, may he not have the discretion to inquire into the truth of it? Therefore, if any one of the Fathers may have been mistaken in any controverted point, not appertaining to faith, or not decided ; or have been wholly ignorant of several modern discoveries (such was St. Austin's mistake about the Antipodes), still he must be allowed to have had the sense to distinguish truth from a cheat in the miracles he saw with his own eyes ; or the discretion to make use of the means he had in his power, of being certified about the relations he received from second or third hands : therefore, on summing up the whole, I

think this great exception the Doctor makes to the Fathers' judgment comes to nothing. Also his imputation of *weakness* in their believing, like the Magi of old, seems to be still more precipitate and groundless, because we gather from the Scriptures, such Ministers of Satan were from the beginning.

His next exception to their evidence, upon account of their want of veracity, is, I apprehend, not more successful than the former. This exception he grounds principally upon the pretended inventions and forgeries, which he very liberally charges upon them, but without the least proof; therefore it is quite arbitrary, and deserves no further answer. He, however, strengthens his weak presumptions by charging them with espousing some spurious legends for Apostolic writings, and equalling them with the authority of the Scriptures; from whence he concludes, that they were also capable of forging miracles themselves, or of propagating forgeries; but how ridiculous! Their espousing such writings (if ever they did) argues, indeed, an error of judgment, and a very pardonable one, till such time as the Church had declared which Scriptures were genuine—which apocryphal, which canonical, and which not; but it cannot be looked upon as a forfeiture of their veracity. In a word, because through imperfect information and the darkness of the times, they might unwarily have mistaken one book for another, and innocently led others into the same mistake, this can be no reason to conclude that they would designedly impose upon us a counterfeit miracle for a real one, or a known falsehood for truth.

Yet upon these weak grounds has the Doctor the confidence to lay his indictment against them. Those whom the body of Christianity of all ages constantly respected as pillars of the Church for their knowledge and wisdom,

and its greatest ornaments for their virtue and probity; those has the Doctor branded with the contemptuous characteristics of being weak men, or the infamous one of being cheats and impostors.

Certainly it was a bold effort to attempt to shake their *veracity* and *authority*, whose sagacity and integrity were always revered, and made them be looked upon as pillars of the Church of Christ. I trust what I have said in their vindication will not be less satisfactory than the Apologies for the Fathers by the brightest ornaments of the Anglican Church of this day — the strong body of Puseyites.

Fifth Objection.

Some ancient Schoolmen, such as St. Thomas of Aquin, urge that the respect shown to an image does not stop at the image itself, but proceeds to the original; hence the cross is adored with the same kind of worship as Christ himself, in the same manner as the purple of the king is honoured with the same honour as the king himself.

Answer.

Mind, kind reader, I am pledged to prove the Truths of the Catholic Church from Scripture alone, and not the opinions of Catholic divines: the faith of the whole body of Catholics, not the speculations of some. I have no concern whatever with the opinions of the schoolmen. These men were fond of subtle and metaphysical distinctions: they often endeavoured to explore the mysteries of religion till they were lost in an abyss of obscurity; but then they pretended no claims to infallibility, nor exacted from their brethren an unqualified assent to their opinions. We consider them as private, unauthorized individuals. If their doctrine be conformable to that of the Church, we admit it; if not, we reject it. We neither subscribe to their opi-

nions, nor have we to answer for their occasional errors. But it may be said "they were men celebrated in their generation." What then? Were not Luther and Calvin also equally celebrated? they were the fathers—the Saints of the Reformation. And are Protestants willing to be accused of favouring the impure doctrine that teaches the lawfulness of substituting on some occasions the bondmaid for the wife, because it was preached by the magnanimous Luther? Or of believing that the God of all goodness is the great author of sin, because that opinion was supported by Calvin? (de Praedes. p. 727.) Undoubtedly not. Allow me, then, in like manner to spurn these doctrines which are ascribed to Catholics, on the authority of the ancient schoolmen, and not the authority of the Church. But, to the point in question: the schoolmen of old, and St. Thomas, were accustomed to divide respect into two species, which were denominated, from their objects, *Latria* and *Dulia*. *Latria* was that respect which had God for its ultimate object; *Dulia*, that which was paid to any created being. Each of these, if considered according to their acceptation in common language, might be subdivided into different classes; but, considered strictly according to their ultimate object, they admitted of no division. Hence, every demonstration of respect to an angel or a man, to the king or to his throne, was denominated *Dulia*, because it was ultimately referred to a creature; and in like manner every demonstration of respect to Christ or to his cross, was denominated *Latria*, because it was ultimately referred to Christ. In support of this language, they urged, in the words of the angelical doctor, St. Thomas, "that the respect shewn to the image did not stop at the image, but proceeded to the original"—"motus autem qui est ima-

gine, prout est imago non sistit in ipsa, sed tendit in id, cujus est imago, et ideo ex hoc quod imaginibus Christi exhibetur religionis cultus, non diversificatur ratio latriæ.” (St. Thom. 2a. 2æ. quæ 81. Art. 3.) Thorndike’s language is similar to this:—“Indeed, and in truth, it is not the image, but the principal that is honoured by the honour that is said to be done to the image because it is done before the image.”—(Weights and Measures, p. 128.) Hence they inferred, that the cross of Christ was adored with the same kind of worship as God himself, in the same manner as the purple of the king is honoured with the same honour as the king himself. “Sicut purpura regis honoratur, eodem honore quo rex.”—(*Ibid.* 9, 103, Art. 4, et 3 parte, q. 25.) A comparison which is alone sufficient to vindicate them from all the charges which are brought against them. Against this, I am aware, it is said “that Bellarmine disapproves of the language adopted by the schoolmen, and that consequently they, even St. Thomas of Aquin, the Prince of theologians, merit censure.” However, it must be borne in mind, that Bellarmine does not disapprove of their language because its meaning was idolatrous, but because it might be misunderstood (Lib. 2, c. 22, De Imag., Ludgduni, 1587); a prediction which many Protestant teachers of this day have laboured with much industry to verify. Besides, Bellarmine, instead of attributing to the old schoolmen what, on his authority, Protestants pretend to affix to them, and, consequently, through them to the whole Catholic body, observes, it is evident from their works, that they speak not of a proper, but of an improper kind of Latria; and that they mean an imperfect worship, which analogically may be reduced to the species of worship due to the original; in other words, a worship which may be said to be of the same kind, because it is re-

ferred to the same object.—(*Ibid.* c. 23, 25.) In the mean time, though we do not, any more than Bellarmine, approve of this language, because it may be misunderstood by those who are not conversant with it, still, we contend, that had they maintained the present Protestant doctrine respecting the duty of bowing at the name of Jesus, they would have adopted the same reasoning as some Protestants now select from their works respecting the worship of the cross. They would have said, that the name of Jesus ought to receive the adoration of Latria, because the honour paid to the name does not stop at it but proceeds to him whom it represents. They would have argued, like St. Thomas, that the name of Jesus receives no reverence, inasmuch as it is a sound; that it is revered, therefore, as the denomination of Christ; and that, of course, the reverence paid to the name of Jesus must be the same as is paid to Christ himself; or, like St. Bonaventure, that we bow to the name of Jesus as to a rational being, therefore we bow to it as to Christ himself; but as we bow, we worship; therefore we ought to worship the name of Jesus as Jesus himself. To us, accustomed to a different language, such conclusions appear at first sight very extraordinary; but in themselves they are innocent, and shew that the schoolmen meant no more in giving Latria to the cross, than Protestants do by bowing to the name of Jesus.

Sixth Objection.

On the authority of some Protestants, several Catholic divines teach that, by a special privilege, the Virgin is present in her images, personally, physically, and really; in order that from the faithful she might, in those images, receive due adoration.

Answer.

All the theological works I have been able to come at,

in order to substantiate the language of this objection, merely say that the Blessed Virgin may be piously believed to be personally present in some of her images, to receive in them due veneration. “*Quod in aliquibus simulachris seu imaginibus insignibus ipsius, pie credatur assistere,..... ut in illis debitas adorationes accipiat.*” But, then, no Catholic is bound to believe this: therefore I am no more concerned with this than with a thousand more or less probable opinions; I am, I beg to repeat it, pledged to defend the faith of Catholics as scriptural, not the opinions of some Catholic divines; the faith of all, not the speculations of some. However, I see no reason to doubt that the Almighty God may grant such a privilege to the Blessed Virgin: but no one is obliged to believe that he has done so. Nor need we hold such a belief to account for the celebrity of some particular images of the Blessed Virgin. When the faithful have received more remarkable favours from God, after invoking the intercession of the Holy Mother of Jesus, before some particular image, it is natural to suppose, that they and others will more frequently visit the same place in hopes of similar favours, but without any necessity of their believing the Blessed Virgin to be then personally present. Besides, no Catholic is obliged to believe the personal presence of the prototype in any image; nor could any, I should think, be found who hold such an opinion; at least I never knew or heard of any such persons. But suppose a Catholic did hold such an opinion; his veneration of a privileged image would not thence be idolatrous, nor would it, as by many it is attempted to be asserted, resemble in any way the Pagan worship of idols. For the veneration paid to the image would be always relative and directed to the Blessed Virgin or saint whom it represented, whether present or absent; the image itself

remaining a bare memorial; whereas the Pagan was an idolater in every case, because his adoration was paid to false gods. I know it is said that the first Christians ridiculed the image work of the Pagans, even when the Pagans vindicated it on the ground of its being only relative: therefore speaking of the first Christians they could not have paid to images even so much as a relative worship. But then, though I admit that the primitive Christians ridiculed, and with good reason, the image work of Paganism as rank idolatry, still I deny that in so doing they exposed themselves to any rational retort. For the idolatry of the Pagans consisted in paying divine worship to images, which Christians do not and never have done; and also in paying divine worship to false gods, while the primitive and present body of Catholics worship with divine honour one only true and living God.

Treating of the Schoolmen, I deem it expedient to notice the modern charge against Catholics regarding Den, which has lately created such noise in the religious world. The first accusation made against Catholics on this point, is, that a certain private individual, by name Peter Den, in writing a book on "Theology," has put forth certain obnoxious opinions. The work itself consists of seven volumes, and out of them five or six propositions are selected which give offence, and justly so, to Christian ears. The gravamen of the offence, however, is (second point of accusation) that this work is encouraged by the Catholic Prelates in Ireland—that it is the standard work of authority with the Clergy confided to their spiritual charge: and, finally, to the opinions of Den, or rather to his principles—atrocious, murderous, and antisocial, they (the priests) mould the minds of their flocks. With respect to the first charge, I meet it at once by saying, "never perhaps was

there published so voluminous a work containing such little evil." It consists, as I have remarked, of seven volumes, contains nearly 3,300 pages, and in the entire of them we Catholics defy any man to point out one entire page which can be condemned. The really obnoxious part of the work is to be found in the beginning of the 89th page of the second volume, but let my kind reader bear in mind, that that page which treats of the punishment of heretics, is not Catholic doctrine, it has been repudiated by the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, and was in a particular manner scouted by the late Dr. Doyle, long before there was ever any noise made about the work. Opposite the odious passage in Den, Dr. Doyle, in his own study, and without any external motive to prompt him, wrote in the margin with his own hand, this remark, "Non sic docuerunt Apostoli." "Not *thus* did the Apostles teach." Surely these reasons sufficiently demonstrate the malignity of those who persist, for their vicious purposes, in foisting the opinions of Den upon the whole Catholic body. Those opinions were at all times repudiated by the Catholic Church—they were never held by it, much less entertained by the Catholic people. Mind, however, regarding persecution of heretics, I speak only of the Catholic Religion itself, I by no means deny that some Catholics were persecutors. It is, unhappily, too true that the members of the Catholic Religion have been guilty of persecution; nay, sometimes its very pastors. Yes, they (the pastors) have persecuted, because their anger, their interest, their ambition, their ignorance, &c., led them on to do so; or, because they had in reality the bad passions of human nature. But that, hence, the Catholic Religion itself has persecuted, this is a point which with equal confidence I deny. The Catholic Religion, I boldly say, has not persecuted. There is not any one of its prin-

ciples, nor any one solitary deduction from them, that either sanctions or approves persecution; I say too little—that does not positively condemn persecution. The principles of the Catholic Religion, if fairly and dispassionately discussed, will be found mild, gentle, and benevolent—its only arms, persuasion, charity, and the force of truth. Consequently, it is not the Catholic Religion but the Catholic only, violating his own maxims, that has been the persecutor. “But then,” it may be said, “the persecution was conducted in the name of the Religion.” I admit even this, because passion can disguise itself under any form that seems the best to suit its purposes—under the mantle of piety just as easy as under the ægis of ambition. It has often done this; often assumed that sacred but insulted veil, because experience has instructed it that this is the unhappy secret by which it is particularly easy to cheat simplicity, and to inflame fanaticism. Thus, in like manner, how often has the holy name of Christianity been employed to execute the most criminal designs? How often have not men abused the venerable names of humanity, justice, friendship, &c., putting on the appearance of these virtues, and pretending to revere them for the very worst purposes? Therefore, again, the consequence is that the circumstance of conducting persecution in the name of Religion, is by no means a proof that it is the Religion itself which persecutes. However, I will even put the case that the Catholic Religion has really persecuted. But has not, I ask, the Protestant Religion persecuted likewise? Is not the very basis of Protestantism the persecution of Catholics? Yes, they not only have persecuted Catholics, but they have even maintained, as a tenet of their religion, that “to persecute Catholics” is a “duty”—indeed, as the Edinburgh Reviewers have remarked, “one of the most

sacred of Christian duties." Their mode of reasoning was this: "Popery," they said, "is idolatry. Now idolatry is so great a crime that it ought to be punished with death." "Therefore," they concluded, "the Papists ought to die." "This," says Mr. McCrie, "was an opinion generally entertained among the Reformers; and it was one ground, though not the only one, upon which they vindicated penal statutes against the Mass, and image worship. They were led," he observes, "to adopt this opinion in consequence of their holding that Christian nations are bound to enact the same penalties against the breaches of the moral law which were enjoined by the Judaical laws." Thus is persecution an acknowledged tenet of the Protestant Religion. How well this hateful doctrine has been applied may be seen from the following. Not only did the first Reformers sanction, and the Protestant public applaud its application to us, but they even sanctioned and applauded the basest murders, if committed only upon a Papist.

Thus Beza and his followers approved, and exulted loudly in the murder of the Duke of Guize. Thus Knox and his associates extolled that of Cardinal Beaton. Is it not also a fact, that during the course of above two hundred years, the chief source of popularity to our princes was, "in this very benevolent nation," the persecution of their Catholic subjects? Is it not true that the horrible cry, "The Christians to the beasts," was not more common once, among the Pagans, than was, until lately, among the Protestants of this country, the yell "No Popery"? Is it not also true that, at our very tribunals, every shadow of justice (pity was out of the question), was in general denied the Catholic? The grossest violations of justice, says Godwin, were committed on the part of the judges, with whom it was, at all times, a sufficient reason for giving no

credit to a witness—that he was a Catholic. If, then, the Protestant hate persecution, I can only say,—it is when himself is the sufferer. This is the observation of D’Alambert. “*Les Réformés,*” he says, “*qui reprochent tant l’intolérance à l’église Romaine, ne haïssent la persecution, que quand elle les regarde, et nullement quand ils l’exercent.*” Add to all this, is there even in the darkest annals of cruelty, anywhere recorded, one code of persecution more inhuman and detestable than that which has disgraced so long the legislation of this country?—I mean the penal statutes, which, for the sake of Christian charity, I will pass by unnoticed.

I shall now proceed to the consideration of the second charge, “that Den’s Theology is the standard book of authority with the Catholic clergy, on Catholic doctrine, and is their text-book; and that, to his opinions, or rather principles, which, being atrocious, murderous, and anti-social, they (the Catholic clergy of Ireland) mould the minds of their flocks.” The first part of this charge is ably confuted by the following paragraph, which is read in Den’s dedication of his work to the Archbishop of Mecklin....“If any of the future professors of the University should wish to amend what he (Den) had written, and would send their emendations to him, he would gladly adopt them, for he was not so wedded to his own opinions, as not rather to approve and admire what was preferable.” Add to this, if Den’s Theology be so binding on Catholic priests, who comes it to pass, that the author of these Lectures has never heard or read a single page of it before its late production into light by the itinerant crusade?—I declare most solemnly this to be the truth. Now with respect to this work being the text-book of the Catholic clergy of Ireland, I beg to remark, that in that Country ecclesiastical conferences

are held between the Catholic bishops and their Clergy at appointed times in the year. For the convenience of the priests who attend, it was thought proper to select one theological writer, following whose plan would infuse order into the studies, preparatory to the conference. But this has always been considered a question of little moment, namely, who the author should be. As Den was published at the cheapest rate, it was judged proper by a few of the prelates to adopt his course of theology, but without being pledged to pay any deference to him in the adoption of any one of his opinions. So much for Den.

Seventh Objection.

The Almighty God has expressly declared his anger against those that pretended to make any likeness of Him ; therefore it is unlawful to have such in the temples of religion.

Catholic Version.

Deut. 4.

15 You saw not any similitude in the day that the Lord spoke to you in Horeb from the midst of the fire.

16 Lest perhaps being deceived, you might make you a graven similitude, or image of male or female.

Isaiah, 40.

1 To whom then have you likened God? Or what image have you made for him?

Protestant Version.

Deut. 4.

15 for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire.

16 Lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female.

Isaiah, 40.

18 To whom then will ye liken God? Or what likeness will ye compare him unto?

In answer, I beg to reply, that the chosen people of God, under the Old Dispensation, were severely prohibited to make the likeness of any thing in the Heavens, or the earth, and in the waters, as appears from many texts in Deuteronomy; and this prohibition originated from their great propensity to idolatry, and, as the Sacred Scriptures have it, lest they should corrupt themselves. The wisest of legislators, therefore, addressed the words of the fifteenth verse of the fourteenth chapter of Deuteronomy, to the people of Israel, lest, through error of any sort, they should make an image of the Deity, and transfer to any thing created the honour due to God alone. It was with a view to the utter extinction of all idolatry, the Holy Ghost prohibited by Isaiah the formation of any image representing God. However, we find that this prohibition was not designed to operate in all cases; for if it were to be generally and permanently carried into effect, how could the Almighty God himself have directed the brazen serpent, and the figure of the cherubim to be formed?

Eighth objection is taken from—

Catholic Version.

Romans, 1.

23 And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things.

Protestant Version.

Romans, 1.

23 And changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.

Answer.

This text is misapplied against our doctrine. We most

willingly grant what is said here, for we never represent God the Father by any image, directly or immediately; that is, that he may be likened to such image. We only represent, historically, the figures in which he appeared to the Prophets of old. As—

Catholic Version.

Daniel, 7.

9 I beheld till thrones were placed, and the ancient of days sat : his garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like clean wool, &c.

Protestant Version.

Daniel, 7.

9 I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the ancient of days did sit, whose garment *was* white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool : his throne *was like* the fiery flame, *and* his wheels *as* burning fire.

The figure here described by Daniel we represent, and if it be asked why we do so? We answer, because it is not forbidden in any part of the Holy Scriptures to represent God Almighty by the figures in which he appeared, or was pleased to represent himself. Our opponents should produce texts of the Holy Writings, forbidding to represent, historically, this vision of Daniel, as he describes it, or the vision of other Prophets, or of St. John. Besides, they should also bear in mind that, by such representations, we do not believe God the Father to be an old man, more than did Daniel. The Catholic Church stedfastly believes and commands her pastors to teach her children that God is a pure spirit, has no body or figure; and that pictures which are said to represent him, do not so *immediately*, but the figures in which he appeared. If our opponents should urge that some of the Divine attributes are represented by some

of our pictures, I answer, that it does not hence follow that we intend to represent the divinity or nature of God, or to signify that it is a thing visible and corporeal, like such pictures. We only express some of the Divine attributes, as we do when we represent virtues, or vices, in human shapes, to express better their nature, but by no means to signify that they are corporeal, like their human semblances. Thus the white hair mentioned by Daniel, signifies the eternity of God; the crown, sceptre, and world, his absolute dominion over all things; the light, his infinite glory; and so of the rest. To conclude, according to the doctrine of the Fathers of the Council of Trent, pictures representing the apparitions of God the Father, or of God the Holy Ghost, are not commanded to be had and retained *especially* in our Churches. The Council mentions only the images of our Saviour, and of the Saints; the other pictures are only tolerated or permitted to be made when it is found expedient to do so, and even then they must be depicted *historically*.

Ninth Objection—

Catholic Version.

Leviticus, 26.

I I am the Lord your God: you shall not make to yourselves any idol or graven thing, neither shall you erect pillars, nor set up a remarkable stone in your land, to adore it: for I am the Lord your God.

Protestant Version.

Leviticus, 26.

I Ye shall make you no idols nor graven image, neither rear you up a standing image, neither shall ye set up *any* image of stone in your land, to bow down unto it: for I *am* the Lord your God.

Answer. In this text mention is made three times of the word *image*, and it is contrary to the Septuagint and

the Vulgate versions. In the Hebrew is no word which necessarily means *image*, so that I regret to say this is a false translation, and for the same intention as I stated regarding the 2nd of Colossians (see page 365, vol. 1.) The first word *Elilim*, in the Hebrew, means an idol, as is translated by our opponents, and consequently all the words following should be thus explained to agree with it.

Tenth Objection.

The veneration of images is peremptorily forbidden in the second commandment, and under the severest penalties.

In several recent publications I have with pain observed that the Catholic priesthood stands charged with a wilful suppression of what Protestants call the second commandment, but which with us is the first. Offence is taken from the commandment being abridged in some few of our catechisms, where we have it thus worded: "I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other Gods but me:" instead of "I am the Lord thy God, who," &c., as is found at full length in the 20th chapter of Exodus. But, then, the truth is this, some Catholic divines have thought that on particular occasions it is proper to make abridgments of the Decalogue for the use of the dull and the ignorant. Of suppressing, however, any commandment, they have never had either the wish or the intention. Their conduct is the same as had been adopted by the Holy Spirit in different parts of the Scriptures. Of these I shall notice one. With the children of Israel the Lord made a covenant, and charged them, saying—

Catholic Version.

4 Kings, 17.

35.....You shall not fear strange gods, nor shall you adore them, nor worship them, nor sacrifice to them.

Protestant Version.

2 Kings, 17.

35.....Ye shall not fear other gods, nor bow yourselves to them, nor serve them, nor sacrifice to them.

That this was meant as an abstract of what Protestants call the first and second commandments appears from the last verses of the chapter, in which they are said to have broken this covenant, and to have disregarded this charge by “serving their idols,” as it is read 41st verse of the same chapter, Catholic version, and “serving their graven images,” as is read in the Protestant Bible. Consulting, however, books of religious institution, printed about the commencement of the Reformation, I find that John Huss, “famous in his generation,” and the father of the Bohemian religionists, (*Opera Huss. Norimbergiæ*, 1558, p. 30), and Martin Luther, the great Patriarch of the Reformation (*Luth. Ienæ*, 1589, p. 117) stand guilty of the same charge of expressing the commandment as we Catholics do. Yes, they—the most ardent enemies of the Catholic Doctrine, and whose whole study it was to detect and expose the abominations (as they were pleased to express themselves) of the Church of Rome, stand guilty of suppressing a portion of the Decalogue. I have before me “*Dr. Martin Luther’s Catechism for Parsons, Schoolmasters, Masters of Families, young Persons, and Children at School:*” in it I read “the ten commandments of God which a master of a family ought exactly to represent to his domestics; the first commandment — ‘Thou shalt have no other Gods besides me.’ Q. What is that? Ans. We must fear, love, and trust God, above all things. The second commandment, ‘Thou shalt not use the name of thy God unprofitably.’ The ninth commandment, ‘Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s house.’ The tenth commandment, ‘Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife, servant, maid, beast, or any thing that is his.’” Mind, kind reader, this catechism is found also in the Appendix to Luther’s German Bible, p. 23, Lunenburg, 1640. In the meantime I deem

it necessary to note in what an *idol* differs from an *image*. An *idol* is a representation of a thing that neither is, or can possibly be; hence, in Habacuc, 2, 18, it is called “*a thing of his (man’s) own forging;*” in Isaiah, 44, 10, “*a graven thing is profitable for nothing,*” and St. Paul, 1 Cor., 8, 4, “*nothing in the world;*” in Hebrew it is *Elilim*, that is, vanity or falsehood; in Greek, *Eidolon*, or *an empty and idle fiction of the brain*; in Latin, *Scuptile*, which in the ecclesiastical meaning is always taken in the Scriptures for a “*representation of a false God.*” An *image* is a representation of a *true* or *real* thing, which either is, or is possible to be in that same manner in which he who makes or uses it intends by it to represent. In Hebrew, it is called *Salem*; in Greek, *Ikon*.

Having premised thus far, I deem it expedient to inform my reader that the manner in which the ten commandments were originally numbered cannot be at present told either from Scripture, or from any other source. Those which refer to the honour due to God are supposed to have been inscribed on the first table of the law; those which regard our neighbour, beginning with “*Honour thy father and thy mother,*” on the second. Protestants, adopting the system of Josephus, Philo, and Origen, divide the first part of the Decalogue into four commandments, making two distinct precepts of what we call the first, and being obliged to confine the number of the second table of the law to six, so as not to exceed the total number ten, they compress what we call the ninth and tenth into one.

St. Augustine, on the other hand (7th question on Exodus, 9th, and 250th serm.), Clement of Alexandria (6th Stromata), St. Jerome (on the 32nd Psalm), and others, divide the matter inscribed on the first table of the law into three commandments, and of course, to make up the number ten, they must divide into seven commandments

the matter of the second table beginning with "honour thy father and thy mother:" this is the division which we Catholics follow. With those eminent Fathers, therefore, as with us, the second commandment is, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" and all the preceding part of the Decalogue, having the same object in view, is compressed under the first. On the same principle of distinguishing the precepts, according as the objects to which they refer, differs the concluding part of the Decalogue, which Protestants are pleased to call the tenth commandment; by following St. Augustine we divide it into two, because it prohibits the desire of committing two distinct kinds of sin, the actual commission of which had been previously prohibited by two distinct precepts. I shall submit the commandments as they are read in the Catholic and Protestant Bibles:—

Catholic Version.

Exodus, c. 20, v. 2.

1 I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage: thou shalt not have strange gods before me: thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth: thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them: I am the Lord thy God,

Protestant Version.

Exodus, c. 20, v. 2.

1 I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.

Catholic Version.

mighty, jealous, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me : and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

2 Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that shall take the name of the Lord his God in vain.

3 Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day. Six days shalt thou labour, and shalt do all thy works. But on the seventh day is

Protestant Version.

2 Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

3 Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.

Catholic Version.

the Sabbath of the Lord thy God : thou shalt do no work on it, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy beast, nor the stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made Heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them, and rested on the seventh day : therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.

4 Honour thy father and thy mother, that thou mayst be long-lived upon the land which the Lord thy God will give thee.

Protestant Version.

4 Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work ; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God ; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates ; for in six days the Lord made Heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day ; wherefore the

Catholic Version.

5 Thou shalt not kill.

6 Thou shalt not commit adultery.

7 Thou shalt not steal.

8 Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

9 & 10 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house: neither shalt thou desire his wife, nor his servant, nor his handmaid, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is his.

Protestant Version.

Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.

5 Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

6 Thou shalt not kill.

7 Thou shalt not commit adultery.

8 Thou shalt not steal.

9 Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

10 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's.

Of the relative merit of the two divisions of the Decalogue adopted by Catholics and Protestants, I beg attention to the following observations—

1. The Scripture itself informs us, that the Decalogue contains ten commandments, but nowhere exhibits them actually divided. The prohibitory and precipient clauses amount in all to fourteen. It is therefore necessary to class

some of them together, in order to reduce them to ten distinct precepts.

2. On this account it appears natural to unite together all such clauses as appertain to the same object: and therefore Catholics consider as one commandment whatever regards the worship of false gods. Protestants divide it into two: but with more reason they ought to divide it into three. First, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Second, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," &c. Third, "Thou shalt not bow thyself to them, nor serve them." However, this conclusion, with the reason which is afterwards assigned, that God is a jealous God, and which equally applies to every clause, is a proof, that in the eyes of the Jewish legislator, they formed but one commandment.

3. In scripture they are usually described as one commandment. This appears from the chapter of Exodus in question, 2 Kings, 17, v. 35, Protestant version, but 4 Kings, v. 17, Catholic version, and also from Lev. 19, v. 2, and all those texts in which to serve images and to serve other gods are considered as the same crime, and of course as a violation of the same commandment.

4. In our arrangement of the Decalogue, we divide the tenth precept of the Church of England into two, for this distinct and obvious reason, that as the acts themselves are forbidden by two different commandments, on account of their different natures, so the desires of these acts ought also to be forbidden by different precepts. Thou shalt not commit adultery—thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife. Thou shalt not steal—thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, &c. Against, however, this reason, some Protestant divines say, that to make up the number of commandments, we have removed one

clause of the prohibition of evil concupiscence from the place it invariably holds in the Bible, and have made of it a separate command. In answer to this objection, I admit that though it be true, that in Exodus the prohibition of coveting a neighbour's house precedes the prohibition of coveting his wife, yet in Deuteronomy it comes after—

Catholic Version.

Deut. 5.

21 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife: nor his house, nor his field, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is his.

Protestant Version.

Deut. 5.

21 Neither shalt thou desire thy neighbour's wife, neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's house, his field, or his man-servant, or his maid-servant, his ox, or his ass, or any thing that is thy neighbour's.

Now if the Protestant Divine ought to follow Exodus, the Catholic may claim a similar right to follow Deuteronomy. Indeed, in the old Greek translation, the order in Exodus is the same as in Deuteronomy; and the best writers are agreed that it is the true one.

The reader will also observe the essential difference that occurs in the second commandment, as read in the Protestant Bible, but which with us is first. In the Catholic division of the commandments, and precisely in the first, he reads these words, "Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing," but in the Protestant the words are, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image;" and when we read in the Catholic Bible "Thou shalt not adore them nor serve them," we read in the Protestant "Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them." Now it is a fact that there is hardly a single passage in the Scripture which

is connected with any controverted question, that the first Reformers did not, some way or other, alter or pervert: "making," as the learned Protestant Zanchius admits, "the Scriptures agree with their own fancies." Yes, it is painful to remark, that some of the Bibles sanctioned by the Reformed Church, particularly at the commencement of the Reformation, were translated by prejudiced minds and hands: these translators corrupted the original text, and falsified the very commandments of God, and this by adhering neither to the original Hebrew, nor Greek, nor Latin, but wresting the words to serve their inimicable purposes against the Catholic Church.* Thus with regard

* It cannot be denied that many unjustifiable liberties were taken by the first Reformers with the Sacred Scriptures. They moulded them into any shape that suited their interests, and persuaded their credulous disciples that they were reading the pure unadulterated word of God, while in reality they were studying the inventions of men. However, with regard to the corruption of the text in question, I have my doubts whether it has not received some improvement from their ingenuity in corrupting it. What claim, I ask, has the word image to a place in the text? It certainly does not occur in the original; and by its introduction it limits the meaning of the precept. In the English version, images and representations are indeed forbidden: but pillars of stone, the frequent objects of idolatrous worship to the ancient nations, are not included. It appears the first Reformers had a great devotion to the word Image: they inserted it in the sacred text whenever they pleased; and cared little whether it made sense or nonsense, provided it might furnish a quotation against the Papists. But the passage which of all others was found the most useful occurs 1 John, 5, v. 21.

The Vulgate Latin text is—

Filioli, custodite vos a simula-
cris.

The Protestant Bible of 1683 and
of this day is the same as the
Catholic.

The true English according to the
Rhemish translation—

My little children keep your-
selves from idols.

The Protestant Bible of 1562,
1577, and 1579—

Babes keep yourselves from
images. This

to the commandment under discussion, the word *pesel*, which in Greek is *eidolon*, and in Latin *sculptile*, they translate "graven image," instead of "graven thing." Again, they allude not to the stress and emphasis of the words "to thyself," as it is in the Catholic Bible and was in the Protestant Bibles of 1562, 1577, and 1579; or, "to thee," as read in the Protestant London Edition of 1683, and in the Bibles of this day. Now these words unquestionably mean, we are not to make, so as to imagine, to assume, and to estimate what we make, as our God, the Creator, and the Sovereign Lord of Heaven and earth.

I have remarked before, that such must be the meaning of these words, since God himself, shortly after having given the express commandment, not to make any graven thing or image, commanded Moses to make the images of blessed spirits, namely, of cherubim; which were to serve for sacred purposes; also the image of a serpent in brass, for a miraculous purpose, promising that those who had been bitten by the fiery serpent, in punishment of their murmuring, should be healed by looking up to it.

This version was made when the babes of the Reformation were weak in faith, and it was proper to nourish their credulity with the milk of deception. The labour of their evangelical nurses was not lost. There was babe Knox in Scotland, whose enmity to images may still be read in the ruins of churches and monasteries; there was babe Whittingham at Durham, whose iconoclastic piety pillaged the cathedral and filled his pockets; and there were your babes without number in all parts of the kingdom, whose religion, like the barbarism of the Goths and Vandals, displayed itself in demolishing or defacing every monument of ancient piety.

(With a few alterations, from a Letter to a Clergyman
of the Diocess of Durham).

Catholic Version.

Numbers, 21.

8 And the Lord said to him: Make a brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign: whosoever being struck shall look on it, shall live.

9 Moses therefore made a brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign: which, when they that were bitten looked upon, they were healed.

Protestant Version.

Numbers, 21.

8 And the Lord said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole; and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live.

9 And Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole, and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived.

But then, granting, for argument's sake only, that their translation is correct, we Catholics heartily join assent, as to the purpose or end of making the graven image, if to adore it; for then it would be realized an idol, and the veneration paid to it, idolatry. That such, however, is not the veneration the Catholic Church pays to images, has been, I trust, sufficiently elucidated; and if this be not the true meaning and sense of the commandment, I ask, do Protestants observe it to the letter? Do they not make the likeness of things in the Heavens above, or on the earth? They do, and pictures and representations calculated to sully the imagination and corrupt the heart are not unfrequently seen, without calling forth any censure. Now, if such pictures or representations are tolerated, will it be told, that it is wrong—aye, idolatrous, to have and respect the image of Him, who triumphed over sin, death and hell? I shall now briefly explain the reason of the division of the

17th verse of the Book of Exodus into two distinct commandments. These reasons are two—First, to explain the sixth and seventh commandments; and Secondly, because they distinctly, and in express terms, prohibit some things of which the sixth and seventh commandments contain but an imperfect prohibition. We must be aware, that although reason alone is competent to inform us, that to prohibit adultery is also to prohibit the desire of another man's wife, because, were the desire lawful, its indulgence must be so too; yet, blinded by sin, many of the Jews could not be induced to believe, that such desires were prohibited by God. Nay, even after the promulgation, and with a knowledge of this law, many, who professed themselves its interpreters, continued in the same error, as we learn from these words of our Lord, recorded in St. Matthew—

Catholic Version.

Matthew, 5.

27 You have heard that it was said to them of old: Thou shalt not commit adultery.

28 But I say to you, that whosoever shall look upon a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart.

Protestant Version.

Matthew, 5.

27 Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:

28 But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

Finally, the seventh commandment forbids all unjust taking away what belongs to another; but by the tenth commandment, we are strictly prohibited to covet it on any account. By this law, then, which forbids to covet, the Almighty God has opposed a resistance to the

keenness of desire, which excites to every evil, but which, blunted in some degree by virtue of this law, is felt less acutely.

Now, to sum up, I will briefly note the falsifications of the text of the Holy Scriptures. Exodus, 20, v. 2.—1st. Contrary to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, aye, and all antiquity, they translate *pesel*, *eidolon*, and *scuptile*, *graven* image. 2nd, They add the word “*any*”—“thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image,” which is not in the Hebrew—“but thou shalt not make to thyself an idol.” 3rd. They have added “nor any likeness,” &c., when, according to the Hebrew, it should be, “nor the likeness of anything which is in Heaven.” 4th. For *serve* they have put *worship*. Thus in one text are four corruptions!!! In this assuredly they are inexcusable. If any of my readers should doubt for a moment these awful truths, I beg to refer him or them to Rom. 11, v. 4, and 1 Kings, chap. 19, v. 18, in which he will find a clear and unquestionable proof of their deceit in translating the Holy Scriptures. In the Bibles of 1648, in these places he will see that the words “*the image of*” are added to the text, they being neither in the Greek, Latin, nor Hebrew, where we have “who have not bowed their knees to Baal,” and not as they have it, “to the image of Baal.”

Eleventh Objection.

It was only about four hundred years after Christ that the worship of relics was introduced into the Church. Therefore it is a mere novelty.*

Answer. If it be admitted that a practice which has

* What an objection! what an admission! what blindness is here displayed, in using a weapon which can be turned against the assailant with so much facility, and still do we not daily hear this argument from many well meaning Protestants?

existed in the Church for more than one thousand four hundred years, is a mere novelty, what then becomes of the whole system of Protestantism, which was not heard in the world till more than fifteen hundred years after Christ, and which, at this day, can boast only, under any of its forms, the duration of three centuries? But then the assertion, that the veneration of relics was introduced into the Church four hundred years after Christ, is manifestly untrue. To the proof. The acts of St. Ignatius, the Holy Martyr of Antioch, who suffered about one hundred and seven,* expressly state, that "When the faithful had taken away his bones, with eagerly desirous hands, and had laid them together honourably and reverently, they deposited them in a distinguished place out of the city.....These were afterwards removed to the martyr's country, Antioch: and those towns which are between each city, received a double blessing; as well at first, when the martyr was led bound from Antioch to Rome, as now, when led with splendid trophies, he was brought back thither, and they gathered around him as bees about the honeycomb."† To this some Protestants may say, "That very probably the bones of the Saint might have been carried back to Antioch, decently wrapt up in a linen cloth, for the natural purpose of Christian burial, in the seat of his bishopric." To this I reply, that his genuine acts in Ruinart, written by Reus, Agathocles, and Philo, disciples of St. Ignatius, and eye witnesses of his martyrdom, prove that the holy relics were revered with that religious honour which unquestionably suffices to establish the concordance of our doctrine and practice with those of the primitive Church. Next we have the beautiful rela-

* This illustrious martyr was Bishop of Antioch, in Syria, and is the 4th of the Apostolic Fathers.

† Acta S. Ignatii § 24.

tion of the care of the faithful, for the bones of St. Polycarp,* given in the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, “When the envious and the wicked one,† the adversary of the race of the just, saw the greatness of Polycarp’s martyrdom ;..... he laboured industriously that his remains might not be taken away by us, though many were desiring to do this, and to hold communication with his sacred corpse. Hence, he suggested to Nicetas to intercede with the governor, that his body should not be delivered for sepulture : ‘lest,’ said he, ‘leaving him that was crucified, they should begin to worship this person.’ And these things they said at the suggestion and instigation of the Jews,‡ who also

* Is the last of the five Apostolic writers (St. Barnabas, St. Clement, Hermas, St. Ignatius, and Polycarp). From Irenæus (l. 3, c. 3, sect. 4, Ed. Massuet, we learn that this zealous bishop of Smyrna, “was taught by the Apostles, and had conversed with many who had seen Christ.” A distinct account of his martyrdom was published in a circular letter, addressed to the Churches established in various parts of the Christian world, and particularly to the Church of Philadelphia (Russel Patr. Apostol. tom. 2, p. 322-369). Scaliger (Animad. Euseb. No. 2, 183), speaking of this remarkable document, declares that he knows nothing more truly affecting in the whole compass of Christian antiquity.

† The devil; and this is a splendid proof that no idolatry was to be apprehended; for, had he foreseen this, would he not have “industriously laboured,” that the faithful might have the body, and worship it to their heart’s content, while he exalted in their base idolatry?

‡ It was well known to the Jews, that the Christians intended to pay a certain pious veneration to these holy relics, but, like modern revilers, they malignantly accused the faithful of intending idolatry. The very adduction of such a charge is proof, at least, of pious veneration being practised: for the Jews could never have been led to make it from the ordinary practice of decent interment. “This unfair policy of the adversaries of the Catholics...like almost every other point in the relative position of the two parties, may be traced

back

watched us when we were about to take him from the fire ; in as much as they were ignorant that neither can we forsake Christ, who suffered for the salvation of the saved throughout the whole world, the sinless for sinners, nor that we can never worship any other. For Him, being the Son of God, we adore ; but the martyrs, as disciples and imitators of the Lord, we worthily love, on account of their special affection to their own king and master, with whom may we be partakers and fellow-disciples. But the centurion, beholding the contention excited by the Jews, threw him into the midst of the fire, and burned him. And thus we, afterwards gathering up his bones, more honourable than precious stones, and more tried than gold, deposited them where it naturally followed that we should deposit them. To us assembling in this place, so far as lies in our power, with triumph and with joy, the Lord will grant to celebrate the birth-day of his martyrdom, both in memory of those who have completed their wrestling, and for the exercise and preparation of those who are about to wrestle." Surely this very early record of the veneration of the relics of an illustrious martyr, attests all that we require for the support of our doctrine on this head. It proves that the first Christians regarded such remains with feelings of the deepest respect and affection, and collected them with equally anxious care, as more honourable than precious stones ; and that they buried them in a distinguished place,

back as far as the Apostolic age. Even then was the same spirit of misrepresentation alive ; even then was the same homage offered to the enshrined relics of an Ignatius, or a Polycarp, denounced by scoffers at the Faith, as being an idolatrous transfer of that worship to the creature which belongs only to the Creator." T. MOORE, *Travels of an Irish Gentleman, in Search of a Religion*. Vol. 1, p. 297.

where they were accustomed, from a principle of religion, to assemble with a pious veneration, or in the words of the record, "to hold communication with his sacred corpse."

Finally, the acts of SS. Tarachus, Probus, and Andronicus, who suffered under Diocletian in the year 304, inform us, that the pro-consul, Maximus, commanded the tongue and teeth of St. Andronicus to be plucked out and burnt, and the ashes cast to the winds, "lest any pitiful woman of the Christians," he said, "should keep them as a treasure, honourable and holy." (Ruinart, p. 487.) Now these are, unquestionably, valuable primitive evidences of religious veneration, paid to the relics of the Saints. Then this veneration is not a mere novelty.

Last Objection.

Finally, say many distinguished Protestants, in the first ages of the Church images of Christ were not substantiated in the place of Pagan idols, nor proposed to the veneration of the faithful.

Answer.

The use of holy images is by no means a practice of precept; it follows, indeed, from a firm and sure principle, but for just reasons in certain circumstances it may be suspended or omitted. That the use and veneration of holy images is lawful is an article of Catholic Faith, but the actual practice of this veneration is a mere matter of discipline not essential to Christian worship. The Church made little use of pious pictures and images in the very first ages, for good and evident reasons. Till Pagan idolatry had in great measure ceased, there would have been manifest danger of the converts from Paganism not properly understanding the only lawful use of such sacred memorials. Moreover, the first Christians assembled for divine worship, in the days of persecution, in caves and catacombs, and

their confined oratories were not adapted for much ornament of painting or sculpture. They were not, however, entirely without them; for various pious devices, monograms, crosses, and even paintings, have been discovered in the recesses of the Roman catacombs, still in partial preservation. "We observe that the chapels in the sepulchres of the martyrs at Rome, where the Christian mysteries were celebrated in times of persecution, are adorned with paintings of roses, birds, crosses, and images of Saints. Some of these I copied in the catacombs of St. Cyriaque, the descent to which is from the garden of the church of St. Lorenzo.....Over the stone altar which was discovered in the baths of Titus, is a fresco painting of St. Felicita and her sons; and on the side walls are images of the Apostles. In the lowest subterraneous chapel in the church of St. Martin, you see the Mosaic of our Lady, which existed at least at the time of St. Sylvester." (*Mores Catholici*; or *Ages of Faith*, by R. H. Digby, Esq. Book, 3, p. 180.— See also many of these early images engraved and described in Dr. Rock's *Hierurgia*.) The peculiar circumstances of those early times afford, therefore, sufficient explanation and justification of the fact, that the use of holy images was very rare, but by no means because it was considered unlawful in itself, but because it was judged imprudent in peculiar circumstances, or rather owing to the circumstances of those days. For the full information of the reader, I beg to add, that the primitive Christians had no churches for the first 300 years on the walls of which they could exhibit the decorations of painting and statuary. Besides, it is well known that the Christian Religion during that lengthened period was persecuted by the Majesty of Rome; that its observance was assailed by almost a continual and relentless persecution, and that it was not till the begin-

ning of the fourth century that the public exercise of the religion of Christ was established in the Roman empire. That the first Christians, however, did not consider the veneration of images unlawful (independently of what is said in the text in answer to the question), appears from a fact recorded by Tertullian (*Tertull. de Pudicitia*), that in his time, that is in the second and third centuries, it was usual to have the image of the good shepherd engraven on their chalices. I shall use Tertullian's own words: "You may begin from parables: where there is the lost sheep sought for by the Lord and carried back upon his shoulder. Let the very pictures of your cups be produced: if even in them the interpretation of that animal will clearly shine forth." In his work (*De Corona*), speaking of the cross, the same writer says, "In all our movements, whether we come in or whether we go out; whether we put on our raiment, or whether we bind on our sandals, in the bath, at the table, while using either lights or couches, in whatever fashion we may be employed, we mark our forehead with the sign of the cross. If for these and the like points of discipline, you will find none. Tradition will be alleged to you as their voucher; custom as their confirmer; faith as their observer." Certainly the last quotation proves the pious and habitual custom of the primitive Christians in making frequent signs of the cross, and why so often? but because they held it in religious honour and veneration, and because they hoped by frequently arming themselves with this Holy Sign, to be delivered from evils and favoured with blessings by Him whose death they thus piously commemorated. Eusebius, the parent of Ecclesiastical history, relates, (*Euseb. Pamph. Eccles. Hist. lib. 7, c. 18*) that he had seen a brazen statue of the woman cured by touching the hem of our Saviour's garment, and various paintings of

the Blessed Jesus and of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and alluding to the statue of our Saviour, he tells us that an unknown plant grew at the base of it, which, when it had grown up so as to touch the hem of his garment, was a remedy for all kinds of diseases. Indeed, he premises by saying, that it was a fact "worthy to be handed down to the memory of posterity." After the description of this wonderful circumstance come the following words, "Nor is it wonderful that those among the Gentiles who formerly received benefits from our Saviour should have made these (statues). For we know of images also of the Apostles Paul and Peter, and even of Christ himself, preserved in coloured pictures. As it is likely that those in the early times were accustomed indiscriminately after the custom of the Gentiles to honour them in this way as their benefactors." St. Gregory of Nyssa, fourth century, (*De Deit. Fili et Sp. Sancti.*) mentions how often he had been moved to tears by beholding an affecting picture of Abraham about to sacrifice his son Isaac. The same holy Father describes in glowing terms the glory and beauty of the church, in which the moving picture of the Holy Martyr, St. Theodore, seemed to speak from the wall, and was highly useful for edification. (*De S. Theodoro Mart.*) S. Arterius mentions a famous picture hung up at the tomb of St. Euphemia, in the great church at Chalcedon, representing her and the history of her martyrdom. (*Panegy. de S. Euphemia.*) St. Ambrose, St. Athanasius, St. Basil, Prudentius, St. Paulinus, St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Sulpicius Severus, and St. Jerom, who all lived in the early ages of Christianity, afford similar testimonies to the use of pious pictures and images. (See also the numerous testimonies of holy Fathers brought forward in the second Council of Nice, Session 4.) St. Augustin, who flou-

rished also at the close of the fourth century, actually commemorates a veil or curtain exhibited by Evodius, Bishop of Uzala, on which were represented St. Stephen and the Holy Cross. (St. Aug. Serm. de Diversis, 32. 33. et De Civit, cap. 8. Evod. de Miracul, 8. Steph. lib. 2, cap. 4, ap. Aug. tom. 10.)

I presume I may now conclude this Lecture in the words of St. Ambrose: "If you say to me, what is it that you honour in a body now dissolved or consumed, of which God has no longer any care? I ask you, What is it that the Prophet means when he says: 'Precious in the sight of God is the death of his Saints?' And when he again says: 'To me, O God, thy friends are exceedingly honourable?' It is our duty to honour the servants of God and much more his friends, of whom it is elsewhere written: 'The Lord keepeth all their bones; not one of them shall be broken.' I honour, therefore, in the body of the Martyr, the wounds that he received in the name of Christ; I honour the memory of that virtue which shall never die; I honour those ashes which the confession of Faith has consecrated; I honour in them the seeds of eternity; I honour that body which has taught me to love the Lord, and not to fear death for his sake. And why should not the faithful honour the body which even the devils venerate: which they tormented indeed in death, but to which they shew respect in the sepulchre? I honour, then, the body which Christ himself honoured in the sword, and which with him will reign in heaven."—(Serm. lv. in natali SS. Martyr. Nazarii et Celsi. T. ii. in append, p. 467.)

And St. John Chrysostom—"God has divided the Martyrs amongst us, taking to himself their souls and leaving to us their bodies, that in their holy bones we may continually have a monument of this virtue. For if a coward

when he beholds the bloody arms of a warrior, his shield, his spear, his helmet, is roused to action, and burns to emulate his prowess; shall not we, though of all the most dastardly, when we look on not the weapons but the body itself of the Saint, which was deemed worthy to bleed in the cause of Christ, shall not we feel a promptitude of mind to engage in the same warfare?—For this reason it is that God until the day of the resurrection, has entrusted to us the bodies of his Saints.”—(Homil. xlvii. de S. Juliano. *Ibid.* p. 676.)

A D D E N D A

TO THE LECTURES ON THE VENERATION PAID BY THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH TO RELICS, IMAGES, ETC.

THE learned, though at the same time most inveterate, among Protestants, never attempted to dispute the veneration paid in the early ages of the Church to the Relics of the Saints. Daillé, Blondel, Chemnitius, Whitaker, &c., attest the prevalence of this veneration frequently. Martin Luther, with all his hatred of the Catholic Church, found no idolatry in her doctrine respecting crosses and images; on the contrary, he warmly defended it against Carlostadius and his associates, who had destroyed them in the churches of Wittenburg. (Epist. ad Garb. Guttal.) In the Wittenburg edition of Luther's works, the great Reformer is represented on his knees before a crucifix. Queen Elizabeth persisted for many years in retaining a crucifix on the altar of her chapel till some of her Puritan courtiers engaged Patch, the fool, to break it: "no wiser man," says Dr. Heylin (Hist. of Reform, p. 124), "daring to undertake such a service." James I. thus reproached the Scotch Bishops, when they objected to his placing pictures and statues in his chapel at Edinburgh, "You can endure lions and dragons (the supporters of the Royal Arms), and devils (Queen Elizabeth's griffins) to be figured in your churches, but will not allow the like place to Patriarchs and Apostles." (Spotwood's History, p. 530.) The Centuriators also allow that images were common even in the third and fourth

ages of the Church. "Eusebius," they say, "writes that he saw in Asia Christians who preserved the images of St. Peter, Paul, and of Christ himself." (Cent. 3.) Tertullian, the same writers add, seems to declare that the Christians kept the image of the cross both in their public assemblies and in their private houses. And it was hence that the Pagans called them "Worshippers of the Cross," (Cent. 3). Also Cent. 4, passim. Our own English writers,—nearly all who have treated on this subject,—make the same concession. Many other celebrated Protestants approve of the use and veneration of images. "As to the use of images in the worship of God," says Dr. Parker (Reasons for Abrogating the Test, p. 130), "I cannot but wonder at the confidence of these men to make so bold a charge against them (Catholics), when the images of the Cherubim were commanded by God himself (Exodus, 25, v. 18), which instance is so plain and obvious to every reader, there being nothing more remarkable in the Old Testament than the honour done to the Cherubim, that it is a much greater wonder to me that these men would advance the objection of idolatry so groundlessly, and can so slightly rid themselves of so pregnant a proof against it." "The pictures of Christ," says Montague, (Gagger gagged, p. 300), "of the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints, may be had in houses, set up in churches; respect and honour may be given to them, the Protestants give it; you say that they must not have latria, so say we; you give them dulia; I quarrel not with the word, though I could. There is a respect due to the pictures of Christ and his Saints. If you call this dulia, we give it too; let doctrine and practice go together, we agree." Again, the same learned writer in another work says, "There is a reverence due to the king's picture..... So there is to the image of Christ.....And parte 2, da

Orig. He calls it immediately after "Convenientem cultum; a suitable worship." Same work, p. 91, he also says, "If any innovator be in that error, that it be unlawful to make pictures, statues, or images.....to expose them for the ornament of churches, and the instruction of the ignorant, he is a man of no sense."

"There might be," says the learned and ingenious Dr. Thorndike (*Just Weights and Measures*, p. 127), "jealousy of offence in having images in churches before idolatry was quite rooted out, of which afterwards there might be no appearance." Junius, a Protestant Divine, writing against Bellarmine, says "no Protestant denies, *Colendas esse Imagines*, that images should be respected."

The following words of the great Leibnitz, which ought, surely, to convey a useful lesson to the Protestant reader: "Having, therefore, established that no other veneration of images is admitted than the veneration of the prototype before the image, there will be no more idolatry in that than in the veneration which is paid to God and Christ when his most holy name is pronounced. For names are also signs, and indeed far inferior to images, for they represent a thing much more faintly. Therefore, when it is said that an image is honoured, this is to be understood no otherwise than as we speak of bending our knees at the name of Jesus, blessing the name of the Lord, or giving glory to his name; and to adore before an outward image is no more reprehensible than to adore before an inward image represented in our imagination; for the external image is of no other use than to render the internal more expressive."

Posito igitur nullam admitti venerationem imaginum quam quæ sit veneratio prototypi coram imagine, non magis in ea erit idolatria quam in veneratione quæ Deo et Christo exhibetur, sanctissimo ejus nomine pronunciato.

Nam et nomina sunt notæ et quidem imaginibus longe inferiores, rem enim multo minus repræsentant. Itaque cum dicitur imaginem honorari, non id aliter intelligi debet quam quo modo dicitur, in nomine Jesu genua flecti, nomen Domini benedici, nomini ejus gloriam dari: et coram imagine externa adorare, non magis reprehendendum est, quam adorare coram imagine interna quæ in phantasia nostra depicta est; nullus enim alius usus est externæ imaginis, quam ut interna expressior fiat. (Leibnitz. Systema Theologiae, p. 144.)

Finally, referring to what Bellarmine says respecting St. Thomas, of Aquin (see page 49 of this Lecture), I must add, in justice to this great Doctor of the Church, that he himself has on other occasions *fully* explained his own meaning, and proved it to be Orthodox and Catholic. For, in several parts of his excellent and incontrovertible writings, he declares this veneration to be widely distinct from divine worship: "properly speaking," says St. Thomas, "we do not adore the cross, but only Christ who is crucified." (Lect. v, on Heb. xi.) Again: "It is idolatry," he adds, "when the honour due to God is given to images." (Ad. Col. 3, Lect. 1.) But because the respect given to the cross is referred to Christ himself, to whom the worship of *Latria* in the strictest sense is due, he understood it to come within the same denomination—namely, by paying supreme and absolute worship to Christ, and inferior and relative to the cross, which he explains from an example taken from the love of our neighbour, which is done by us without in the least committing ourselves with the commandment of loving God. For, although we love God in himself, still we must and ought to love him in his image—man, our fellow creature.

LECTURE III.

 THE SINGULAR DEVOTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH TO
 THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY JUSTIFIED.

ALTHOUGH what has been urged in the penultimate and last Lectures in justification of the Catholic Doctrine, of the Veneration of Angels and Saints, may be regarded as an implicit vindication of the respect and veneration due to the VIRGIN MARY, still, for weighty reasons, I am induced to inscribe a separate Lecture on this subject—so dear to every Catholic. To proceed with order and perspicuity, I consider it necessary to premise. 1st. That although the Catholic Church regards the VIRGIN MARY in a more pre-eminent degree than she does the Angels and the Saints, still she looks upon her as a pure creature, and consequently at an infinite distance from GOD, and also from the WORD INCARNATE. 2nd. As all acts of Religion are qualified to the objects in which they terminate, and also by the intention that directs them, so the Catholic Church declares, that all those acts which are referred to the VIRGIN, whether by way of honour or supplication are specifically distinct from those that she directs to the BLESSED TRINITY, or to Jesus Christ. Hence, she expects, that as words, and even actions, are *signa ad placitum*, as divines teach, or mere arbitrary signs, the meaning of which is determined by will, pleasure, or general usage, so, any word that is made use of in approved devotions to the VIRGIN, and which may be liable to an equivocal

sense, is to be understood and interpreted according to these restrictions. 3rd. All addresses made to the Blessed Virgin Mary are *in genere*, that is, *in their own nature*, the same as those made to the Angels and other Saints; namely, as to an intercessor for us with God, and not as to the author or bestower of any gift spiritual or temporal. Under these premises, I will now proceed, aided, I humbly hope, from above, to prove: 1st. That the superior and pre-eminent prerogatives and privileges of the Blessed Virgin Mary, being clearly and distinctly expressed in the Holy Scriptures, entitle her to a superior, and pre-eminent degree of honour, distinct from what is given to any other creature; but still, as I have said *in eodem genere*, that is, to a pure creature. 2nd. That these prerogatives justify the distinguished devotion and extraordinary veneration which the Catholic Church, under the limitations and restrictions just laid down, pays to her, and also renders the trust she reposes in her intercession reasonable, prudent, and conscientious.

First. The superior and pre-eminent prerogatives and privileges of the Blessed Virgin Mary being clearly and distinctly expressed in the Holy Scriptures, entitle her to a superior and pre-eminent degree of honour, distinct from what is given to any other creature.

The seeming reserve and silence of the inspired penmen regarding the Virgin Mary—her name seldom occurring in their writings, have afforded to many of our opponents a motive to depreciate her memory. Lesley in the "*case stated*" displays the whole strength of his eloquence on this groundless exception. But the most he or others make of it amounts to no more than a mere negative argument, how very little to the purpose will be evidently seen if we impartially consider the object each one of the inspired writers had in view. It must be admitted, that each

one had his respective theme allotted him by the Holy Spirit of truth, in which the Blessed Virgin had no direct personal concern; for instance, the purpose of the Evangelists was to vindicate the Divinity of their Blessed Lord and Master, to prove him to be the Messiah, so often promised to and expected by the Jews; and hence to furnish us with the leading circumstances of his life, doctrine, miracles, death, and resurrection, which place his divine prerogatives beyond the reach of doubt or contradiction. The end of the Epistles was to recapitulate and confirm, *in a certain manner*, the Gospel truths, and give us a system of Christian morality. The Acts of the Apostles were transcribed for two principal reasons. 1st. To declare the confirmation in grace of the Apostles by the miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost; and their installation and entrance on the ministry, with other analogous circumstances. 2nd. To give us a brief history of St. Paul—his miraculous conversion and extraordinary call to the Apostleship, together with the faithful discharge of his trust by which he became so instrumental in establishing and propagating the infant Church of the Blessed Jesus. Now the Blessed Virgin Mary, as it is obvious to every impartial reader, was entirely unconnected with these great designs, consequently a digression from them to her would have been foreign to the purpose of the inspired writers. But, then, in that part of the Gospel in which the Incarnation is described, in which, by the will and decree of Heaven, she was so materially instrumental; the Virgin Mary is mentioned in so ample and honourable a manner as unquestionably to give us the most exalted ideas of her sublime privileges and prerogatives, and make us regard them as the basis of that extraordinary honour, respect, and regard paid to her by the Catholic Church. These privileges and prerogatives are of two kinds—the first inherent, the second accessory. The first

are clearly and positively expressed in the Sacred Scriptures, the others partly expressed, and from reason and sense must be regarded as absolutely inseparable from the former. Her chief prerogative of the first sort is what must immediately occur to every Christian, who is capable and willing to form a just estimate of the inestimable benefits of his redemption, namely, her election by Heaven to be the Mother of a God made man. This extraordinary grace or favour excited so great and elevated a notion of her dignity in the mind of St. Augustin, that this great light and Doctor of the Church declared he wanted words to express it. "By what praises," says he "Oh! Sacred Virgin, I may extol you, I know not, since you have been deemed worthy to bear in your womb, Him, whom the Heavens are unable to contain." (S. Augus, Serm. de Annunciat). For, to form a just notion of the dignity of the MOTHER, it is necessary, if possible, to comprehend the attributes and intrinsic worth of the SON. But who can accomplish this great object? The great St. Thomas of Aquin, in this respect, does not hesitate to say, that the Blessed Virgin could not be raised even by Heaven to a more exalted degree, since the Son she brought forth was God from all eternity, and equal to His Heavenly Father. If in worldly estimation the purely *relative* advantages of birth, fortune, and antiquity of family attract respect; if the humblest of the daughters of Eve raised to be a partner of Royalty, becomes mother to the heir apparent to the Throne, is thereby ennobled and respected with the highest veneration, esteem, and regard, what opinion must we entertain for the spotless Virgin, who became the spouse of the Holy Ghost, the mother of a God made man? A cursory view of her sacred biography, in particular her elevation to be the mother of God, will give us a correct idea or notion of her intrinsic merit and excel-

lence. This is faithfully described in the plain and simple detail which the Evangelist gives us of her annunciation, which may be properly entitled an embassy to her from the Court of Heaven, certainly the most singular and surprising that was ever heard of, and the most mysterious in all its circumstances. An archangel is despatched from the Creator to the creature, from the Blessed Trinity to a poor maid dwelling in Nazareth. Thus the Evangelist relates this admirable event :—

Catholic Version.

Luke, 1.

26 And in the sixth month, the Angel Gabriel was sent from God, unto a city of Galilee, called Nazareth.

Protestant Version.

Luke, 1.

26 And in the sixth month, the Angel Gabriel was sent from God, unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth.

The subject of the embassy was still more unprecedented than the embassy itself, namely, to demand her concurrence in the accomplishment of the great mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God, by the ineffable operation upon her of the Holy Ghost—

35 And the Angel answering, said to her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the most High shall overshadow thee. And therefore also the Holy which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.

35 And the Angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.

Now could the Deity descend lower, or could a creature

be possibly raised to a higher degree of honour? Does not the dignity of the creature rise by the unspeakable humiliation of the Creator? But, the manner in which the heavenly messenger opens the embassy is still more astonishing, and reflects still more honour on the Virgin Mary—

Catholic Version.

28 “ Hail full of grace, the Lord is with thee: Blessed art thou among women.”

Protestant Version.

28 “ Hail, *thou that art* highly favoured, the Lord *is* with thee: blessed *art* thou among women.”

Full of Grace indeed, whether we consider the extraordinary gifts infused into her soul by Heaven, to qualify her for this exalted station, or the eminent virtues she exercised in the accomplishment of the Sacred Decree; indeed, considering both, we may well say that she had a plenitude of Divine Graces. To this fulness of Grace her unsullied and unparalleled purity must be referred, which by a special privilege she kept inviolate; for although she became a mother, still she did not cease to be a virgin; hence St. Bernard said, she never had her precedent before or since; “ *nec primam similem visa est, nec habere sequentem.*” To this fulness of Grace is also to be referred her unreserved *obedience* to the Divine Decree, for, at the same time that she declared it to be beyond her comprehension, still she concurs in its accomplishment, without the least hesitation or demur—

Luke, 1.

38 Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done according to thy word.

Luke, 1.

38.....Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy word.

From the same source was derived her unprecedented and inimitable *humility*, for even after she was elevated to the dignity of Mother of God, she styles herself the *handmaid of the Lord*. Assuredly, if the Evangelist had furnished us no other accounts of her distinguished merits, these testimonies are more than sufficient to give us the highest ideas of them, to entitle her to our distinguished respect and veneration; and, on the other hand, effectually to stop the mouths of her opponents, those especially who depreciate her memory, and affect to justify their conduct on the pretended reserve and silence of the Sacred penmen. For, to be endowed with such a plenitude of grace, as to become wholly and entirely acceptable with God, and such the Archangel declared her to be, when encouraging her to acquiesce, without demur, with the Divine Will, he said—

Catholic Version.

Luke, 1.

30 Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found grace with God.

Protestant Version.

Luke, 1.

30.....Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favour with God.

—and to be wholly absorbed in God; and to have God reciprocally united to her, collected from the words “*the Lord is with thee* ;” these inestimable advantages convey to us the idea of a creature the most pure—the most perfect—the most excellent that can be imagined, and unquestionably were the cause of the Angels pronouncing her “*blessed among women*.” Nevertheless these extraordinary ornaments of her soul which I have spoken of were only preparatory dispositions to her espousal with the Holy Ghost; the means to render her a fit receptacle for the

Eternal Word to become incarnate in her chaste womb ; to be brief, a prelude to her future sanctity. But who can tell how great this sanctity was, after she had been overshadowed by the power of the Most High ; after she had carried in her chaste womb for nine months the Source of all Sanctity, and had lived with the Blessed Jesus more than thirty years in heavenly conversation and intimacy ? The Evangelist has not explicitly declared it, he has left to us to form a notion of it from such auspicious beginnings, as well as from the nature of the circumstances in which she had share. For, if the integrity of our lives, and the rectitude of our morals may be gathered from our conversation and company, according to the rule adopted also on other points by St. Paul, how much do the virtues and merits of the Blessed Virgin rise in our estimate, when we call to mind that she was so intimate, and for so long a period, with the Holy of Holies ? The Heavenly Messenger did not hesitate to call her *blessed among women* : her cousin, St. Elizabeth, divinely inspired, salutes her with the same title ; and still the Virgin styles herself the *handmaid of the Lord* ; yet this humblest of all pure creatures, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, at the same time foretells her prerogative to be the means of perpetuating her name in benediction to all succeeding generations—

Catholic Version.

Luke, 1.

48 Because he hath regarded the humility of his handmaid ; for behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.

Protestant Version.

Luke, 1.

48 For he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaid : for behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.

—a prophecy which the Catholic Church literally fulfils so often as she invokes her assistance, in mentioning her holy name, which she always precedes by the word *blessed*. I am aware that our opponents, or, I regret to say it, *the abettors of the Reformed Doctrines*, urge usually against this, not only the silence of the Sacred penmen, but also the incidental and apparently harsh reply of the Blessed Jesus to her at the Marriage Feast of Cana—

Catholic Version.

John, 2.

4 And Jesus saith to her ;
woman what is it to me and
to thee ? My hour is not yet
come.

Protestant Version.

John, 2.

4 Jesus saith unto her
Woman, what have I to do
with thee ? mine hour is not
yet come.

To understand this answer of the Blessed Jesus, we must observe that our divine Lord and Master is to be considered in a two-fold capacity, *public* and *private*. In the former he *appeared* and *acted as the Son of God*, and as the *promised Messiah* ; in this character he was paving the way for the establishment of his Church and was wholly taken up with the discharge of the several functions of His Divine Ministry, which was the principal motive or end of his becoming man ; hence, as we read in the Sacred Scripture, he became *all to all*, without respect to persons, his Blessed Mother not being even excepted. We have an early proof of this, when at the age of twelve years, being found by Mary and Joseph, after a search of three days, in the Temple, and on their tenderly expressing their uneasiness for his absence, and asking of him why he had done so, his answer was—

Catholic Version.

Luke, 2.

49 How is it that you sought me? did you not know, that I must be about my Father's business?

Protestant Version.

Luke, 2.

49.....How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?

—thus giving them to understand, that to *this*, his *public* duty, every other concern was to give way; as his reply on another occasion to them that brought him word that his mother and brethren were in attendance on him without doors was an insinuation of the same truth; namely, that the discharge of his ministerial functions in obedience to the will of His Heavenly Father, was his chief and present employment, and the sole and immediate object of his attention. Therefore, at the marriage feast, his saying, “Woman, what is to me and to thee,” cannot be looked upon in any other light than as a bare admonition and remembrance of this great truth; namely, that he was acting in his *public* capacity, under the immediate influence and direction of His Father, and that consequently it behoved him to delay the manifestation of his miraculous powers till the time appointed by Heaven, “*My hour is not yet come.*” (John, 2, 4.) Besides, if this reply be considered in any point to affect the blessed Virgin, it must be admitted by the supporters of such an opinion that it reflects the highest honour on Mary, since she had such great and powerful interest with her adorable Son as to induce him to perform his first miracle at her prayer. As, then, the pretended neglect of the blessed Jesus for Mary in his public capacity is justly accounted for, so his superlative respect and regard for her in his *private* life, which was from his infancy till he was thirty years old, is equally certain, and must be

acknowledged by all. The Holy Ghost declares it by the Sacred penman in a few words, but most fully—

Catholic Version.

Luke, 2.

51 And was subject to them.

Protestant Version.

Luke, 2.

51And was subject unto them.

—that is, *obedient* to them, which succinctly, but perfectly comprises the whole sum of filial duty. I will close this testimony of the respect of the blessed Jesus with a profession he made of his love and tender regard for her on a public occasion, when every word he uttered demands our most particular attention, ought to be carefully treasured up in our hearts, and never effaced from them. It must be obvious to the reader, that the instant I allude to is the endearing remembrance the dying—meek Lamb of God made of his distressed mother in his last moments, when, knowing fully how much her heart was pierced through with the *sword of grief*, and seeing the inundation of affliction that overwhelmed her blessed soul, he seems to forget his own sorrows, to relieve her by committing her to the trust, care, and protection of St. John, saying to her, “Woman, behold thy Son!” and to the Disciple, “Behold thy Mother!” (John, 19, 26, 27.)

Assuredly, this instance is an irrefragable proof of the singular regard and concern the blessed Jesus had for Mary. Independently, that another consideration must very much enhance her merit with all impartial Protestants. It is this; they and we firmly believe that we have been redeemed by the immolation of his body and blood, which the blessed Jesus made on the altar of the cross. Now, I ask, did not the Virgin Mary furnish him that same body, and that same

precious blood in her chaste womb? Under this consideration, is she not entitled to the highest respect that we can pay to her? But, I trust, that the prerogatives I have just mentioned are all sufficient to overpoise every negative objection, at the same time that they become the foundation of our inviolable attachment to her memory, and are unquestionable proofs that the steadfast confidence the Catholic Church reposes in her powerful intercession, and the extraordinary devotion she has instituted in her honour, particularly that of the Rosary, and the daily addresses she makes to this greatest, holiest, and purest of creatures, are prudent and just. I shall now proceed to the second point, that these prerogatives of the blessed Virgin Mary being clearly expressed in the sacred Scriptures, ought to excite in us a singular veneration and attachment, since they render any confidence we should repose in her intercession both discreet, and in unison with the spirit of the same word of God.

That we ought to respect every creature whom the Almighty God himself deigns to distinguish with particular tokens of his divine honour and favour, is a truth, I apprehend, evident from the light of reason, which no one will, I presume, contest. "*Honour,*" says the Apostle, "*to whom honour is due.*" (Rom. 13, 7.) Upon this principle we pay respect not only to princes, magistrates, teachers, &c., but to every one whom God has placed over us in any superiority of life, either with respect to birth, fortune, or power. The great of this world regulate their conduct in their political concerns according to this principle, and hence require that homage be paid to their favourite ministers and servants. In this manner Pharoah honoured Joseph, and Assuerus rewarded the fidelity of Mardocai. Indeed, experience teaches, that the most

effectual way of gaining access to a person in authority is through a servant in favour and power; on the other hand, a contempt of such persons is frequently punished in an exemplary manner both by God and man. Now, if any one has the boldness to deny that the blessed Virgin Mary was the distinguished favourite of Heaven, singled out by the Almighty from the other daughters of Eve to be the object of extraordinary honour, favour, and friendship, and that Heaven imparted to her holy soul an unspeakable fund of divine graces to render it a fit abode for the Son of the Most High God; if any one, I say, has the boldness to contest these prerogatives, I humbly apprehend that the proofs I have adduced in their regard are sufficient to convince him, provided he duly reflect on them, and weigh them well and impartially. If afterwards to these proofs he annex the principle of paying honour to whom honour is due, it will follow, that it is incumbent on us to venerate in a distinguished manner the spotless Virgin Mary,—nay, that this is an indispensable duty, since as we have seen, God Almighty was pleased to distinguish her with extraordinary and singular marks of his favour, goodness, and grace. Not to respect Mary, is to censure the conduct of a supreme Providence in her regard, and find fault with the distinctions shown her; hence, even a Protestant prelate, Dr. Pearson, in his “Exposition of the Creed,” p. 178, could not refrain from saying, “We cannot bear too reverend a regard to the mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself.”

The first time the Church of God had occasion to exert herself in support of the honour of the Virgin Mary was in the fifth century, when the impious Nestorius contested the prerogative of her maternity. No sooner

did the impious and blasphemous doctrine become public, than the whole Catholic world was alarmed, and expressed its abhorrence of it—an evident sign and token that it was a novelty until then unheard of. A Council was convened at Ephesus, and the heretical opinion anathematized in the most solemn manner. On this occasion the word *theotocos*, that is, Mother of God, was adopted as the most fit to explain the doctrine of the Church on this point—to place beyond the reach of doubt, and to settle forever the distinguished prerogative of Mary's maternity. Indeed Heaven seemed visibly to interest itself in the blessed Virgin's cause, and to ratify the sentence the Church had pronounced against this impious heretic, by inflicting a judgment upon him corresponding to the nature of his guilt; for, as we are credibly informed from ecclesiastical history, his tongue, which had vomited out his injurious blasphemies against the mother of God, rotted in his head while he was yet alive; God testifying by the temporal execution of his justice how jealous he was of his blessed mother's honour, as Baronius, Fleury, &c. (Hist. Eccles.) testify.

My object in introducing this instance from Ecclesiastical history is merely to shew, by the vigorous resistance made against this declared enemy of the name of Mary, at that early period, how constant the attachment of the Church to the Virgin has been at all times; how uniform her sentiments in her regard, and how firm her zeal in defending and vindicating her honour on the least appearance of an attempt against it. Nor was this zeal confined to a bare confession and defence of her prerogatives, nor to a speculative and strict admiration of her virtues; she has also extended it to a dutiful homage of gratitude, which she has never failed to pay to her memory; and to a pious confidence which she has always had in her interest and intercession. Of the

first sort are those repeated comparisons with which the writings of the Holy Fathers abound, between Eve and Mary; the former as to the cause of our ruin, and Mary, the happy instrument of our reparation, with acts of sincere acknowledgment and thanksgiving for this ineffable blessing — St. Epiphanius (Adv. Hæres, lib. 3, tom. 2, § 18) says — “Truly life itself was introduced into the world by the Virgin Mary.....Eve brought to the human race the cause of death.....Mary gave the cause of life.”

St. Augustin (Serm. 18, de Sanctis.)—“Eve was the authoress of sin, Mary the authoress of merit.....the one wounded, the other healed.”

I am aware that the expressions which the Holy Fathers make would be received in *these* days with loud outcries of abhorrence; indeed, being taken rigorously to the letter, they are not correct; still these holy doctors never meant them but *in the sense* always understood by the Catholic Church,—hence, if Tertullian, or Augustin, or Epiphanius, call Mary the cause of our redemption, they mean only the *instrumental* cause, she being the Mother of Christ—a God Incarnate, who *alone* was the immediate cause of our redemption, and who alone effectually cancelled the whole guilt and debt of sin. Hence, St. Jerome says, “We respect Mary as the author of our Salvation, because, in receiving from Heaven the author of her being and ours in her womb, she has given us a Redeemer upon earth,” (De Assump.) To this explanation of the expressions that appear exaggerated in the writings of the Fathers, I think it advisable to add, that *they* also professed their unlimited confidence in her powerful intercession for us with the Blessed Jesus. “To you we have recourse, O blessed among women,” exclaimed the great Origen, who lived in the early ages of the Church. If he had been guilty of any ex-

cess in this point he would certainly have been noted for it by some of the contemporary Fathers of the Church, as he was for other errors and opinions. "Intercede for us, O Mistress, Lady, Queen, and Mother of God," was the affectionate address of St. Athanasius. "I throw myself at your feet," was the ejaculation of St. Ephrem. "Supplicate Almighty God to save our souls!" sighed out, in earnest prayer, the great light of the Oriental Church, St. Chrysostom. St. Austin, with a heart inflamed with an entire reliance in the interest of this great Advocate in Heaven, addresses her in terms that might be liable to censure, had he not explained himself on other occasions, as he has in what I have quoted from him. "You, O Mary," says he, "are the only hope of sinners (that is, through Jesus Christ); on your powerful interest (with God and your blessed Son) rest our expectations of an Eternal Crown." (St. Austin, Serm. 2, de Annunc.)

St. Justina, as St. Gregory Nazienzen informs us, being assaulted by magical enchantments, had recourse to God, through the intercession of the blessed Virgin, beseeching the Virgin to assist her—a distressed virgin. (St. Greg. Naz. Orat. 18, T. 1, p, 279.)

To these holy aspirations of these orthodox Fathers I must add the testimony of the learned Photius—

Photius, the schismatic patriarch of Constantinople, about the ninth century, delivered, upon the Feast of the Nativity of the blessed Virgin, as follows:—"But you, O Blessed Virgin, and also Mother of the eternal Word, our propitiation and refuge, interceding for us with your Son, and our God, and approaching him as our mediatrix, vouchsafe to render us your panegyrist, after you have purged us from all filth and blemish, fit to be admitted to the celestial nuptials."

But there can be no stronger testimony to the universal sentiments of the whole body of the Fathers, or rather of the whole Church on this head, than the prayer annexed to the angelical salutation—"Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now, and at the hour of our death"—which, if it was not framed by the Fathers assembled in the Council of Ephesus, in order to assert the blessed Virgin's prerogative, as from tradition has been constantly supposed, was, at least, adopted by the Church, and in general use among the whole body of the faithful, time immemorial.

The undoubted trust the Church constantly reposed in the interest of the blessed Virgin, and the rest of the Saints of the Court of Heaven, was declared in a most solemn manner, and at a most solemn time, by her representatives in the second Council of Nice, Act 6, in the following short emphatic speech:—"Let us, therefore," says she, "have the fear of God before our eyes in all we do: (for this effect) soliciting also the intercession of the ever unspotted Virgin Mary, our Lady, and Mother of God, and of all the Angels and Saints." Though it may, perhaps, be objected to this said Council, that the national Gallican Council of Frankfort soon after, through a mistaken information, or a misapprehension of another act of this 2nd. Nicene Council, concerning the veneration of images, demurred for a while to that article, which, however, upon a stricter recognizance of the matter, she afterwards came into. But be that as it may, it can be of no prejudice to her decree for invoking the Virgin and other Saints; on the contrary, her demurring expressly at the one, till it was explained, and her utter silence with regard to the other, is a tacit intimation of her approval; nay, that she looked upon it as an indisputable practice of the whole Catholic Church. To the testi-

mony of the second Council of Nice, I also beg to add that of St. Athanasius, who, in the first, thus expressed himself. “Whereas Christ, born of a Virgin, being our King, is also our Lord and God; for this reason, his Mother, who gave him birth, is truly and properly deemed Queen, Lady, and Mother of God. She, moreover, is styled the Mother of Life, therefore we pronounce her, again and again, and every way, most blessed. To this effect we cry out, be mindful of us, O Blessed Virgin, who, even bringing forth, didst still remain a virgin. *Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee.* Thee, the angelical and terrestrial hierarchies proclaim blessed. *Blessed art thou amongst women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb.* Oh, Mistress, Lady, intercede for us. Queen and Mother of God pray for us.” (Athanasius, in Serm. Sup. Evang. de Sancta Deipara.) If Athanasius thus spoke in the first Council of Nice, unquestionably such must have been the doctrine of the same Council regarding the Virgin Mary. The following beautiful prayer is attributed to St. Augustin and St. Fulgentius, but to which of the two is of little consequence: since the two things are established, which I have undertaken to prove: 1st. Her transcendent privileges, and 2ndly, that these are the foundations of the unbounded trust both Saints had of her powerful patronage.

“O blessed among women! who, knowing no man, yet conceived man in your womb—Mary conceived man by giving credit to the Angel; Eve was the ruin of man, by listening to the illusions of the serpent. Oh! happy obedience—Oh! surprising operation of Divine grace. Blessed Mary! what sufficient thanks can we return to you, who by your single consent became a reasonable succour to the world that had perished—what praises shall our frail nature give you? since by your communica-

tion with the Eternal word you have opened the way to our recovery from our shipwrecked state. Accept, therefore, our acts of thanksgiving, though mean and unequal to your merits; and when you receive our vows, excuse, through your intercession, our failings. Vouchsafe to listen to our prayers, and to procure in return for them our happy reconciliation. What we importunately intrude through you on the Throne of Mercy, may it through your interest be excused. What we confidently request by you, may it by your intercession be obtained. Receive our offerings—graciously give what we ask; because you are the only hope of sinners. Through you we trust in the forgiveness of our sins: on you, oh, most blessed among women! are our dependence and expectation of our reward. Holy Mary! vouchsafe to succour the miserable, support the faint hearted, cheer up those that are in tears (and affliction), pray for the people (the Laity in general), interpose in behalf of the clergy (in particular), intercede for the devout female sex, let all who celebrate your sacred Festival feel the effects of your seasonable aid.” (St. Aust. Serm. 18, de Sanct. in Med.)

But whilst our opponents refuse to participate in the benefit of her patronage, let us Catholics declare, on the contrary, with the holy Fathers just cited, that we have a steadfast belief of her great power and interest in Heaven, and consequently repose in her an entire confidence, as an intercessor for us with Almighty God. Her personal extraordinary prerogatives, so often commemorated, plead her power: reason and self-love prompt us to place our dependence on it. For if the Saints and Angels, who are only the servants or bare friends of God, have access to the Throne of Mercy in our behalf, as I have already shewn, who will be so injurious to the Mother of God as to think

that she is kept at a distance from it? On the contrary, what interest they may have by indulgence seems to be as it were the Blessed Virgin's, in right of her maternity. What will not the Blessed Trinity grant at *her* request towards the perfecting our reconciliation with his offended justice who made the first overture to it himself, through her concurrence, by demanding her consent to the accomplishment of the incarnation of the Eternal Word within her chaste bowels?

St. Austin, or be he as some are pleased to suppose, St. Fulgentius, was so much affected with this weighty consideration, as not to doubt to say that "by means of this, the Blessed Virgin's sole consent, the world, being fettered in the bondage of sin, received the first glimmering hopes of relief from its slavery. *Quæ singulari tuo assensu mundo succurristi perdit.*" (St. Aust. Serm. 18, de Sanctis.)

In these sentiments the holy Doctor only speaks after St. Elizabeth, who, divinely inspired, said to the Blessed Virgin, "Blessed art thou who hast believed, because the things shall be accomplished which were spoken to thee by the Lord." (Luke, 1, 45.)

It therefore being so, we cannot imagine that God can deny this creature any thing at her request, whom from the beginning he distinguished by such remarkable tokens of his favour. Again, she who was made worthy to have the word incarnate obsequious to her upon earth: what interest may not she be supposed to have with him, now that he is seated on the right hand of his Eternal Father, in his throne of Glory and Majesty, holding the sceptre of power and universal command over Heaven and Earth? "To me is given all power in Heaven and Earth." (Matt. v. 18.)

If her will and inclination to serve us be the points in

question, her eminent charity, transcending that of the cherubim and seraphim, and the whole choir of celestial Spirits, places them beyond dispute, and proves these benevolent dispositions to be inherent in her in a superior degree. Therefore, the Church, after St. Austin and other holy Fathers, does not think she exceeds in calling her “the refuge of sinners and mother of grace and mercy;” not by supposing her the author of these gifts (as I observed above) but by having, through her unbounded charity, a prompt will and inclination to request them for us; and as Mother of Christ, who is the source of grace and mercy, having an undoubted interest with him to obtain what she requests. In this single title of Mother of God, as has been shewn, all other titles are included and centred, and therefore the confidence we place in her resting on this foundation, becomes rational and prudent. In short, every proof urged in vindication of the invocation of Saints and Angels, enforces in the strongest manner the seasonableness and lawfulness of our addresses to the blessed Virgin; because as her prerogatives are so far superior to those of every other Saint and Angel, her interest and charity rise in proportion: and, therefore, the position then settled (that the Saints can serve us—that they have a will to serve us; and that, therefore, it is lawful to request their service) is still more conclusive in the blessed Virgin’s regard.

Our opponents, unable to withstand these unquestionable consequences, attempt to elude the force of them by charging us with excesses and abuses in the devotions of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Indeed, what they mean is hard to say; but if any thing, it must amount to this, that these devotions are either faulty in their nature and intent, or in their frequency and repetition. But the premises to this Lecture effectually obviate and refute the first objections,

whilst the difficulties for the second consideration are equally groundless. For, what is in itself lawful, cannot by repetition, become unlawful; hence, if addressing the Blessed Virgin Mary—say by the devotion of the Rosary—should we repeat the “*Hail Mary*” ten times, as this salutation is lawful, and may be recited, so addressing her ten times in the same manner we only so often repeat the same lawful act. Again, so often as we approach the Throne of Mercy by this devotion, and commence by saying the Lord’s Prayer, we exercise an act of adoration, humiliation, and dependency on God, as the source and bestower of all blessings, spiritual and temporal; and when we address God afterwards by the Hail Mary, we do not thereby pay him less these tributes of praise, but we glorify God in the Blessed Virgin, at the same time conscious of our own unworthiness we invoke Mary’s power and intercession. The objection that we encroach on the honour and prerogative of the blessed Jesus by invoking the Virgin is met by reflecting that the wholesum of our duty to Christ, I apprehend to consist in these three substantial points; namely, in believing in him, in trusting in his merits, and obeying his precepts. Now, first, that our attachment to the blessed Virgin is no ways destructive of, or prejudicial to our firm belief in Christ, but rather an encouragement to it, is most evident; because it is grounded on her prerogatives, which derive all their lustre from Christ, and are only, as it were, a reflection of the glory of the Son on the Mother; for it is through our steadfast belief of his Divinity, that we respect and honour the blessed Virgin, subministering to him her flesh in the accomplishment of the mystery of the incarnation, as Mother of God; and that we suppose her to have been favoured with the additional accumulation of graces, already recited, in order to fit her for the sublime station to

which she had been elected. The Son is, therefore, the fundamental cause of all her privileges, and the immediate object of our veneration ; and we do not pretend to honour the Mother but with reference to the Son, and in Him. “ There is no question,” says St. Jerome, “ but whatsoever praise is given to the Mother, it all redounds to the Son.” (St. Jer. Ep, ad Eustochiam.) Our devotion, then, to the blessed Virgin, rather contributes to strengthen our faith in CHRIST, because on this the other has an essential dependence. Hence, it has been observed, at all times, that the greatest lights of the Church have been professed advocates of the blessed Virgin. On the other hand, the enemies of Christ, and of his Church, have been the avowed enemies of Mary.

Our confidence also in the powerful intercession of the Virgin is much less a diminution of our hopes in Christ : our trust in the one and the other is specifically distinct ; namely, as of Intercessor and Mediator. We apply to Mary only as a means to attain an easier access to Jesus, and to secure a participation of his infinite merits and sufferings through her powerful interest. Finally, a devoted attachment to the service of the Virgin is, so far from being an obstruction or hindrance to the observance of the Divine precepts, and the practice of the evangelical virtues so strongly recommended by Jesus Christ, that it is evidently a help to these desirable purposes, and an incitement to the execution of all substantial duties. The principal festivals and most solemn devotions in her honour have a relation to some one of the great mysteries of religion ; of the first, are the feasts of her Annunciation, Purification, &c. Among the latter is the devotion of the Rosary, which is a commemoration of all the joyful, dolorous, and glorious incidents in the life of the Blessed Jesus, the confraternity of which is approved and

confirmed by the Church, and is regarded as a nursery of virtues, where a true and solid piety is inculcated; the practice of a stricter discipline, and the advancement of the cause of God and religion are solely attended to. Indeed it is remarkable, that among all the sons of the Catholic Church, there are none who are tied down to stricter regulations, and are bound to act more conformably to the precepts of Christ, and the rules of the Gospel, than the members of this association and institute erected and dedicated in the blessed Virgin's name. But to conclude—these observations, I apprehend, clear up the singular attachment the Catholic Church professes to the blessed Virgin's memory, beyond cavil or reply, and vindicate it fully from all the aspersions and impeachments of our opponents.

Now, in order to give the reader the sum and substance of the present defence of this truly laudable cause, in one single view, I shall close it with a short recapitulation of the whole.

The rule, then, for our addresses, whether of honour or supplication to this favourite of Heaven, is Almighty God himself, who vouchsafed to honour the blessed Virgin; this we look upon as an intimation to us of its being his Divine will, that we should honour and respect her, and becomes itself alone, both a reason that justifies, and a law that inculcates, not only relatively to the blessed Virgin, but to every creature who is known to have been the peculiar object of the Divine regard, according to the Apostle, (Romans, 13, v. 7): "Honour to whom honour is due." Again, Almighty God has distinguished the Mother of the Word Incarnate with extraordinary and singular marks of his honour and favour above every creature

whatsoever, whether man or angel; from hence all the regard we can show her, within the condition of a creature, and so as not to intrench on the Divine worship, derives its sanction; must be deemed to be recommended to us from the Almighty himself, and therefore, as Dr. Pearson just cited, has avowed, becomes her indisputable right. From these solid considerations arises our elevated idea of her superior and unparalleled prerogatives; on this foundation we pay a profound regard to her memory; we become earnest supplicants for her prayers, and upon a well-grounded belief of her transcendant charity, which renders her willing to assist us; and in her great power in Heaven, which enables her to serve us, we repose an assured confidence in her interest at the throne of Mercy, yet barely as a mediatrix of intercession for us, which, therefore, we think entirely regular—no ways derogatory to the Supreme homage that is due to God alone, nor injurious to Christ as our mediator of redemption.

Let, then, our opponents advance against Mary what they please; their objections can be no prejudice to her cause; they must only tend or contribute to stir up our zeal, if we have it at heart, to be regarded, like the greatest lights of the Church, her faithful clients. Therefore, we will incessantly say, “To thy help (that is, to your patronage and intercession) we have recourse, O Mother of God.”

With the Church of the Living God will we request that she would intercede for us, that we may copy in ourselves the virtues she practiced, and which endeared her to Heaven. Yes, we will exclaim: “Permit me to praise thee, O Sacred Virgin! give me strength against thy enemies! Hail, Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy, our life, our sweetness, and our hope! To thee do we cry, banished sons of Eve!

Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us now, and at the hour of our death ! Thus, shall we have her intercession at the Throne of Mercy, and she herself shall be as the Holy Ghost has foretold—' blessed among all generations.' ”

ADDENDA

TO THE LECTURE ON THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

1st. THE Almighty God in denouncing the serpent that had tempted Eve thus alluded to the future Redeemer of the human race, and for the first time made honourable mention of the Virgin Mary.

Catholic Version.

Genesis, 3.

15 I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed : she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel.

Protestant Version.

Genesis, 3.

15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed : it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

The vulgate Latin text is *Ipsa** *conteret caput tuum, et tu insidiaberis calcaneo ejus.*

“How ready our New Controllers of Antiquity and the approved Ancient Latin Translation are to find fault with this text, Gen. 3, ‘She shall bruise thy head,’ &c., because it appertains to our blessed Lady’s honour, saying that all ancient fathers read *ipsum* ; when, on the contrary,

* *Ipsa*, the woman ; so divers of the fathers read this place, conformably to the Latin ; others read it *ipsum*, namely, the seed. The sense is the same ; for it is by her seed, Jesus Christ, that the woman crushes the serpent’s head.—(Note to Douay Bible.)

St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Gregory, St. Bede, St. Bernard, and many others, read *ipsa*, as the Latin text now does. And though some have read otherwise, yet whether we read 'she' shall bruise, or 'her seed,' that is, her Son, Jesus Christ, we attribute no more or no less to Christ, or to his Mother, by this reading or by that; as you may see, if you please to read the annotations upon this place in the Douay Bible."—(*Ward's Errata.*)

In the preface to the *Errata*, Ward observes, "Some books of the Vulgate translation have *ipsa*, and some others *ipse*; and though many Hebrew copies have *ipse*, yet there want not some which have *ipsa*; and the points being taken away, the Hebrew word may be translated *ipsa*; yea, the Holy Fathers, St. Augustine,* St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Gregory, St. Bede, &c., read it *ipsa*, and I think we have as great reason to follow their interpretation of it as Chemnitius's, or that of the Protestants of our days; and though the word *conteret* in the Hebrew be of the masculine gender, and so should relate to *semen*, which also in the Hebrew is of the masculine gender, yet it is not rare in the Scriptures to have pronouns and verbs of the masculine gender joined with nouns of the feminine, as in Ruth, 1, v. 8, Esther, 1, v. 20, Eccles., 12, v. 5. The rest of Chemnitius's Cavils you will find sufficiently answered by the learned Cardinal Bellarmine, Lib. 2, de verb. Dei, cap. 12, 13, 14.—(*Ward's Errata.*)

Finally,—

In the Catholic translation there is no perversion, for the original is susceptible of both meanings. When the Pen-

* St. August. lib. 2 de Gen. cont. Manich, c. 18, 1, 11, de Gen. ad. Literam, cap. 36. St. Ambr. lib. de Fuga Sæculi. cap. 7. St. Chrysost. in Hom. 17, in Gen. St. Greg. lib. 1, Mor. cap. 38. Beda, alii in hunc locum.

tateuch was written there was no feminine form for the third person singular of the personal pronoun: the masculine form was applied indifferently to both genders; it is used, for instance, where Abraham says of Sarah, “*She* is my sister.” It is true, that when the Masoretic punctuation was introduced, the Rabbis made a distinction by points, but the Masoretic decisions are not received as of paramount authority, since, according to them, the celebrated prophecy, “They shall look upon him whom they have pierced,” should be read, “They shall look upon him as a lion.” Neither reading affords the slightest countenance to the worship of the Virgin Mary, since the obvious grammatical construction refers *she* to Eve.

Catholic Version.

2nd. Hail full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women.

Protestant Version.

Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women.

“The vulgate Latin text is Ave, ‘*gratia plena*’ Dominus tecum. Greek, ‘*Kecharitomene*.’ The true English, according to the Rhemish Translation, ‘Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee.’ In the Protestant Bible of 1562, ‘Hail, thou that art freely beloved.’ In those of 1557 and 1579, ‘Hail, thou that art in high favour.’ In the Protestant Bible of 1637, ‘Hail, thou that art highly favoured.’ In the Bible of 1683, ‘Hail, thou that art highly favoured, our Lord is with thee.’ In our miserable land, the holy prayer which every child used to say is not only banished, but the very text of Scripture wherein our Blessed Lady was saluted by the Angel, ‘Hail, full of grace,’ they have changed into another manner of salutation, namely, ‘Hail.

thou that art freely beloved,' or 'in high favour.' I would gladly know from them, why this or that, or any other thing, rather than 'Hail, full of grace?' St. John the Baptist was full of the Holy Ghost, even from his birth; St. Stephen was full of grace (Acts, 7, v. 8), why may not then our Lady be called 'full of grace,' who, as St. Ambrose says, 'only obtained the grace which no other woman deserved, to be replenished with the Author of Grace?' If they say the Greek word does not signify so, I must ask them why they translate *elkomenos* (Luke, 16, v. 20), *ulcerosus*, 'full of sores,' and will not translate *kecharitomene*, *gratiosa*, 'full of grace?' Let them tell us what difference there is in the nature and significancy of these two words. If *ulcerosus*, as Beza translates it, be 'full of sores,' why is not *gratiosa*, as Erasmus translates it, 'full of grace?' Seeing that all such adjectives in *osus* signify fulness, as *Periculosus*, *Ærumnosus*, &c., as every school-boy knows. What syllable is there in this word that seems to make it signify 'freely beloved?' St. Chrysostom and the Greek Doctors, who should best know the nature of this Greek word, say that it signifies to make gracious and acceptable. (St. Chrys. Comment. in Ep. 1.) St. Athanasius, a Greek Doctor, says 'that our blessed Lady had this title *Kecharitomene*, because the Holy Ghost descended into her, filling her with all graces and virtues.' (St. Athan. de S. Deip.) And St. Hierom reads *Gratia Plena*, and says plainly she was so saluted 'full of grace,' because she conceived him in whom all fulness of the Deity dwelt corporally." (St. Hierom. in Ep. 140, in Expos. Psal. 44.)—*Ward's Errata.*

To the above mentioned authorities, I beg to add that of Origen, whom all Protestants will unquestionably acknowledge to be a perfect master of the Greek. Now this learned writer understood the salutation of the Angel to

signify a privilege exclusively reserved to Mary, of course without excluding her adorable Son. "But because the Angel saluted Mary with a new word, which I have not been able to find in the whole Scripture, I must say a little on the subject; for I do not remember to have read any where else in the Scriptures what he said, 'Hail, full of grace,' which in Greek is expressed by *Kecharitomene*; nor is any such word addressed to any man. 'Hail, full of grace.' This salutation is reserved to Mary alone.'" (Origen. Hom. in Lucam. § iii.) 3rd. I consider it necessary, speaking of the blessed Virgin Mary, to say a few words regarding her immaculate conception. It is the belief of all Catholic Divines that the blessed Virgin was born free from original sin; and it is the most general belief that she was immaculate in her very conception. But the Church has never made any decree of faith on this subject. The Fathers of the Council of Trent merely declared that their decree did not comprehend the blessed Virgin, but left the question of her exemption from original sin exactly in the state in which it was left by the constitution of Sixtus IV., which the Council renewed and adopted. That decree simply forbid any one to assert in any public discourse that the blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin. But we are not allowed to censure those who privately hold the opinion. So early as the fourth century St. Amphilocheus (Orat. 4, in S. Deip. et Simeon), said "that God formed the blessed Virgin without a spot, and without sin." The ancient liturgy, which bears the name of St. Chrysostom, but is older than his time, speaks of Mary as in every respect without sin; "ex omni parte inculcata." (Lebrun, Tom. 4, p. 408.) St. Ambrose testifies the same in his Homily on the Psalm 118—"Beati immaculati." When to this I add that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is

founded upon very strong Scriptural evidence, my kind Protestant reader will see that it was not contrary to the written word, or the Fathers, but in strict accordance with them, that the Council of Trent did not include the blessed Virgin Mary in original sin.

4th. Against the heresy of Nestorius the Catholic Church believes and teaches the blessed Mary ever Virgin to be truly and properly the Mother of God made man, because the Son of God, from the human nature he assumed to himself or to his divine nature in her womb, and from her flesh, is truly God. As the appellative God implies every distinct divine person of the blessed Trinity, and as Mary the blessed Virgin is truly the mother of this divine person made man, the Son of God; "for He shall be called," said the Angel, "the Son of the Most High." She is therefore the Mother of God.

END OF THE LECTURE ON THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

LECTURE IV.

 ON THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL, AND ON THE SACRAMENT
 OF PENANCE IN PARTICULAR.

“It will not be amiss, in giving the exposition of the Sacrament of Penance, to present the reader previously with a general notion of the Sacraments as they are understood and taught by the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church has always uniformly taught, that, besides the graces which Jesus Christ diffuses immediately by himself, without the ministry of the Church, there are others which he has put as it were into the hands of his first pastors and their lawful successors, the bishops and priests of his Church, by the institution of certain ceremonies which produce those graces when they find in us the requisite dispositions. We call these ceremonies Sacraments, and reckon seven in number; namely, Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Order, Matrimony. This number is suited to all states and degrees, and serves to all the necessities of our souls, correspondent to those of our bodies: 1st. As to our corporal necessities, we must first be born into the world; to this Baptism answers, whereby we are regenerated, or born anew to God. 2. We must gain strength and growth, thereby to become perfect men; to this answers Confirmation, whereby we are made strong and perfect Christians. 3. We must have a daily com-

petent sustenance for life; to this the blessed Eucharist corresponds, whereby our souls are fed and preserved to everlasting life. 4. When sick, we must have medicine and remedies to cure our wounds and diseases; to this the sacrament of Penance answers, whereby all the diseases and wounds made in our souls by sin are healed. 5. We must have cordials and restoratives against the agonizing fits and pangs of death; to this corresponds Extreme Unction, whereby our souls are strengthened in their agony against despair and the last assaults of the devil. 6. We must be governed by laws and magistrates, to avoid injustice and confusion; to this answers Holy Order, whereby we are provided with pastors and spiritual superiors, to guide, govern, and direct our souls. 7. We must increase and multiply, in a lawful and natural way, by marriage; to this corresponds the sacrament of Matrimony, whereby the married state is blessed and sanctified, not only to the having of children, but to the having and educating them to life everlasting.”—(See D. Thom. Sum. P. 3, q. 63, Art. 1.)

The seven Sacraments were instituted by Christ our Lord; because he only, who is the author of grace and nature, is able to give to natural things the virtue to produce supernatural effects of grace. They were ordained to sanctify our souls; that is, to render them holy and agreeable to God, while sin is blotted out, and sanctifying grace is given or increased in them.

Such is the doctrine of the Catholic Church touching the sacraments, their number, and the special graces they confer upon the worthy receiver; and the Catholic, in adhering to this doctrine, has the infinite satisfaction to know that his faith, in this as well as in every other particular, is grounded on the authority of the unerring word of God,

infallibly delivered and interpreted by the Catholic Church, which St. Paul declares to be “ the pillar and ground of the truth ” (1 Tim. 3, 15), which Jesus Christ has promised to be with “ all days, even to the consummation of the world ” (Matt. 28, 20); to which he promised to send another comforter to abide with “ for ever, even the spirit of truth ” (John, 14, 16); and against which the gates of hell were never to prevail (Matt. 16, 18); and, finally, that he believes no more than what the Fathers and Councils of the Church and all the saints of God have invariably professed and believed in every age.

Having laid down this general notion of the Sacraments, I beg attention to other particulars regarding them. Commencing from Baptism, by many it is asked, ought we believe that children who die without baptism are saved? In answer, I beg to reply, that it is not allowed to expect the salvation of any, except of those for whom God, who is free in the dispensations of his gifts, plainly informs us, in the sacred Scriptures, he hath prepared it—

Catholic Version.

Matthew, 20.

23 to sit on my right or left hand, is not mine to give to you, but to them for whom it is prepared by my Father.

Protestant Version.

Matthew, 20.

23 to sit on my right hand and on my left, is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my Father.

Now, the Holy Writings do not anywhere say that God will free infants that are not baptized from the malediction under which, they teach us, they fell through original sin:—

Catholic Version.

Job, 14.

4 Who can make him clean that is conceived of unclean seed?

Psalm, 50.

7 For behold I was conceived in iniquities; and in sins did my mother conceive me.

Ephes. 2.

3 we were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest.

Protestant Version.

Job, 14.

4 Who can bring a clean *thing* out of an unclean? not one.

Psalm, 51.

5 Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.

Ephes. 2.

3 and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.

I repeat it, there is not any passage of the Sacred Writings in which it appears that Almighty God will deliver Christians from this wrath and corruption, except by means of baptism. Besides, Jesus Christ has said—

John, 3.

5 Amen, Amen, I say to thee (Nicodemus), unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

John, 3.

5 Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and *of* the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

This passage, assuredly, relates to baptism; for, to be born of *water* signified among the Jews, whose language our Lord borrows in this place, to become a member of religion by complying with a duty necessary to salvation. So that *to be born of water and the Holy Ghost* evidently signify

to be washed with the water of baptism by the grace of the Holy Ghost, to enter by it into the Christian Church, and thus to receive a new spiritual birth. Is, then, the baptism of infants of precept, inquire others? Most certainly. Christ has said—

Catholic Version.

Matthew, 28.

19 Going therefore teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Protestant Version.

Matthew, 28.

19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Here a commission is given of baptizing all persons; and as there is no express direction or command what the Apostles were to do with the infants of those who were baptized, it is natural and obvious that they were also to be baptized; for we may assure ourselves, that had not the Apostles baptized infants or children when they received their parents into the Church, the Jews, who took such particular care that their children should not be deprived of the means of becoming members of the Mosaic Law, would certainly have urged this as a great objection against the Christian religion. But we do not read of any such objection ever made, and, therefore, we may depend upon it that the Apostles gave them no room for it. Against this, however, it is argued, that “the Scriptures make no express mention of the baptism of infants.” But what then? Does it follow that they are not to be baptized? Now, if this objection be true, then, as the Scriptures do not make express mention of the alteration of the Sabbath, does it follow that we are not to observe the Sunday? And still, do not

the very persons who differ from us on the point in question regard the observance of Sunday, as the Lord's day, as sufficiently authorized from the New Testament? Yet this is not more clearly implied than the other. In the meantime, we read in several places of whole households being baptized—

Catholic Version.

Acts, 16.

15 And when she (Lydia) was baptized, and her household

1 Cor. 1.

16 And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other.

Protestant Version.

Acts, 16.

15 And when she was baptized and her household

1 Cor. 1.

16 And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other.

Now, it is very unlikely that there should be so many households without children; and therefore, since none are excepted, we may conclude that they were baptized as well as the rest of the family: only, the baptism of adult persons being more for the honour of the Christian religion, the holy writers chose only to name the chief persons baptized, thinking it sufficient to include their children and servants under the general term of "all theirs," or "their households." What confirms this reasoning more is, that the Scriptures nowhere mention the deferring the baptism of any Christian child, or the putting it off till he came to the years of discretion: an argument that surely may as justly be urged against the adversaries to infant baptism, as the silence of the Scriptures is against us. But it seems this objection of the silence of the Scriptures is not true;

for, by directing attention to one text, we shall find that St. Paul alludes to the baptism of children in the most forcible manner :—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 7.

14 For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife : and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband : otherwise your children should be unclean ; but now they are holy.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 7.

14 For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband : else were your children unclean ; but now are they holy.

Here, according to several eminent Catholic and Protestant divines, it is clear that the Apostle directs that if any man or woman had a husband or a wife that did not believe, they should not separate or part, if the unbelieving person was still willing to cohabit ; the reason of which, he says, is, because “ the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife,” or “ the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband ;” that is, it has often come to pass that an unbelieving husband has been brought to the faith, and so to baptism, by his wife ; and an unbelieving wife, in the same sense, by a believing husband to the same baptism ; hence their children were baptized, for the word “ holy ” (now they are holy) signified baptism or washing, as well from several places of the Old Testament—

Exodus, 19.

10 And he (Lord) said to him (Moses), Go to the

Exodus, 19.

10 And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the

Catholic Version.

people, and *sanctify* them to day, and to morrow, and let them wash their garments.

Leviticus, 6.

27 Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof, shall be sanctified. If a garment be sprinkled with the blood thereof, it shall be washed in a holy place.

Protestant Version.

people, and sanctify them to day, and to morrow, and let them wash their clothes.

Leviticus, 6.

27 Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy: and when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof upon any garment, thou shalt wash that whereon it was sprinkled in the holy place.

—as from the original texts, and the interpretation given of them by the most learned among the Jews, Some Catholic Divines, however, give different explanations of this text of St. Paul. They say, that the Apostle speaks here not of an internal sanctity, that entitled them to heaven, but of a sanctity and state by which a Christian husband might lawfully dwell with a Pagan wife, and the birth of their children become legitimate. The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife. How? Relatively to the use of marriage, as the Apostle proves, by saying their children were holy, that is, lawfully begotten. For, in reality, if the use of marriage with an unbeliever had not become holy by the fidelity of the other party, the greater part of the children of Christian parents in those times would have been the fruits of uncleanness. For which reason the Corinthians, who saw that the Apostles and all the Church looked on them as legitimate, had no cause to doubt but that a believing husband might lawfully dwell with a party that continued in

infidelity. This, according to them, is St. Paul's meaning in this place. (I hope the reader will observe, that no allusion is made to the impious notion, that to be born of Christian parents is sufficient, without baptism, to impart sanctity to children; this notion has been at all times strongly repudiated, and cannot be entertained without openly violating the command of Jesus Christ—that all should be baptized.) Other Divines say by parity, when speaking of Protestant and Catholic marriages, and alluding to this text, that the Protestant wife is sanctified by the Catholic husband, and the Protestant husband is sanctified by the Catholic wife; that is, that a Catholic and Protestant, who are legally married, their marriages being sanctioned and registered, &c., in due form, as required, they are sanctified; that is, freed from every imputation of guilt, in the eye of the law, and of the public. For, to sanctify, or to be sanctified, implies that meaning besides that of rendering holy, or being holy. By being thus sanctified, or justified, in point of marriage by the law, their marriage is confirmed and ratified, and secured from nullity or invalidity, on the ground of disparity of religion and Church; and the children born of them, are reputed legitimate. But as to sanctification of the one or the other, namely, by matrimonial connexion, if understood of real and absolute sanctity (Christian sanctity), such as renders a person holy and justified in the sight of God, it is evident this cannot be the meaning of this passage of the Apostle. Such sanctity cannot be attained where there is not true and orthodox faith, the very foundation of Christian sanctity, and where the other means requisite to sanctity are not taken. This sanctification, therefore, of the one party by the other, is to be understood by analogy, that is, by the resemblance between things with regard to some circumstances and

effects. Thus, in the present case, the sanctity is only analogical—incipient as it were, and imperfect, only as in a near way to true sanctity. This by the opportunity the unbelieving party connected with the believing may have, and has actually, of attaining true faith and religion in the true Church of God, the Church of the believing; and thence of acquiring real sanctification, or being really sanctified, at least, having the opportunity to become so, yet not merely by the matrimonial connexion. While, then, the unbelieving party consents to live in peace and harmony with the believing, not reprobating, not ridiculing, not contemning the religion of the believing; not impeding the exercise and the observance of holidays, days of fasting and abstinence, the frequenting the chapel at the hours of divine service, not treating with irreverence or ridicule particular acts of devotion towards a crucifix, an image, &c., the sign of the cross, and such like; allowing the children to be baptized and educated in the Catholic Church and Religion; moreover, joining with the Catholic in the observance at least of some of these points; when the Protestant party is *thus* disposed, he or she accordingly may be said to be sanctified by the other in an inceptive degree. Thus, the unbelieving by the believing is in the near way to true and real sanctification, and may be reckoned a candidate to the true Church, faith, and religion of God; and by the means afforded in that Church, he or she may realize effectively sanctification.

Proceeding now to the Sacrament of Confirmation. I have to remark, that it is said, in several parts of the Epistles, that the faithful have received the unction and the seal of the Holy Ghost—

Catholic Version.

2 Cor. 1.

21 Now he that confirmeth us with you in Christ, and that hath anointed us, is God.

22 Who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts.

Ephes. 1.

13 In whom you also, after you had heard the word of truth (the gospel of your salvation): in whom also believing you were signed with the Holy Spirit of promise.

1 John, 2.

20 But you have the unction from the Holy One, and know all things.

27 And as for you, let the unction, which you have received from him, abide in you. And you have no need that any man teach you: but as his unction teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie. And as it hath taught you, abide in him.

Protestant Version.

2 Cor. 1.

21 Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God;

22 Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.

Ephes. 1.

13 In whom ye also *trusted*, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise.

1 John, 2.

20 But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.

27 But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.

There is likewise in the Epistle to the Hebrews, a reference or allusion to the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirma-

tion, and the Eucharist, which the first Churches usually received together. For there mention is made that the faithful, who had been enlightened, had tasted the heavenly gifts, and had been made partakers of the Holy Ghost.—

Catholic Version.

Hebrews, 6.

4 For it is impossible for those, who were once illuminated, have tasted also the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost.

Protestant Version.

Hebrews, 6.

4 For *it is* impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost.

Add to this, the same Apostle also teaches us, that this imposition of the hands, or the receiving the Holy Ghost in the Sacrament of Confirmation, was not to expire with the times of the Apostles, when he tells us, that this very imposition of hands belongs to the foundation of faith, and when he places it in the number of the essential articles which all Christians acknowledge are common to all ages of the Church, namely, Penance, Faith, Baptism, the Resurrection, and the Last Judgment—

Hebrews, 6.

1 Wherefore leaving the word of the beginning of Christ, let us go on to things more perfect, not laying again the foundation of penance from dead works, and of faith towards God.

2 Of the doctrine of bap-

Hebrews, 6.

1 Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God.

2 Of the doctrine of bap-

Catholic Version.

tisms, and imposition of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.

Protestant Version.

tism, and of laying on of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.

From these authorities, it is lawful to challenge confidently our religious opponents to point out a single passage in the Holy Writings which justifies the retrenching of what is expressly fundamental. Let them remember such is confirmation, or the imposition of hands; and the French Protestants say, in the notes of their Bible on this passage, that this "imposition of hands served to confirm the Churches, that had been baptized in their infancy when they came of age." If it be asked, was it customary in the times of the Apostles, as at present, to join the anointing with the imposition of hands in the administration of this Sacrament? I answer, that it is with reference very probably to confirmation, and the anointing used in it, that St. Paul says to the Corinthians—

2 Cor. 1.

21 Now he that confirmeth us with you in Christ, and that hath anointed us, is God:

22 Who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts.

2 Cor. 1.

21 Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God;

22 Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.

This passage is convincing on this subject; we here find the name of confirmation, "he that confirmeth us;" the anointing used, "and he that hath anointed us;" the grace

of the Sacrament, " who hath given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts ;" and the principal effect of this grace, which is to be a seal and pledge of eternal glory, " who also hath sealed us." Thus this passage alludes in every word to the whole doctrine of the Catholic Church regarding confirmation. I admit anointing is applied in the Holy Scriptures for many uses, in which it may properly represent the effects of the grace of the Holy Ghost ; for example, to heal wounds, to spread a sweet odour, to consecrate things or persons—as kings, priests, and prophets—

Catholic Version.

Luke, 10.

34 And going up to him, bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine.

Genesis, 28.

18 And Jacob, arising in the morning, took the stone which he had laid under his head, and set it up for a title, pouring oil upon the top of it.

Exodus, 29.

7 And thou shalt pour the oil of unction upon his head : and by this rite shall he be consecrated.

21 And when thou hast taken of the blood that is upon the altar, and of the oil of unction, thou shalt

Protestant Version.

Luke, 10.

34 And went to *him*, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine.

Genesis, 28.

18 And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone that he had put *for* his pillow, and set it up *for* a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it.

Exodus, 29.

7 Then shalt thou take the anointing oil, and pour *it* upon his head, and anoint him.

21 And thou shalt take of the blood that *is* upon the altar, and of the anointing oil, and sprinkle *it* upon

Catholic Version.

sprinkle Aaron and his vesture, his sons and their vestments. And after they and their vestments are consecrated.

1 Kings, 16.

1 And the Lord said to Samuel : How long wilt thou mourn for Saul, whom I have rejected from reigning over Israel ? fill thy horn with oil, and come, that I may send thee to Isai the Bethlehemite : for I have provided me a king among his sons.

3 Kings, 19.

16 And thou shalt anoint Jehu the son of Namsi to be king over Israel : and Elishus the son of Saphat, of Abelmeula, thou shalt anoint to be prophet in thy room.

Psalm, 44.

8 Thou hast loved justice and hatedst iniquity : therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

Protestant Version.

Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon the garments of his sons with him : and he shall be hallowed, and his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him.

1 Sam., 16.

1 And the Lord said unto Samuel, How long wilt thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from reigning over Israel ? fill thine horn with oil, and go, I will send thee to Jesse the Bethlehemite : for I have provided me a king among his sons.

1 Kings, 19.

16 And Jehu the son of Nimshi shalt thou anoint *to be* king over Israel : and Elisha the son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah shalt thou anoint *to be* prophet in thy room.

Psalm, 45.

7 Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness : therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

Finally, in the early ages of Christianity it was customary with the Apostles, in passing through towns, if there were any who had not received confirmation, to confirm them.

It is unnecessary to speak of Penance, it forms the subject of the present Lecture.

The Holy Eucharist was treated of in the first five Lectures.

Proceeding, therefore, to Extreme Unction, we find that this Sacrament was promulgated by St. James, in the following forcible manner—

Catholic Version.

James, 5.

14 Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.

15 And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man: and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.

Protestant Version.

James, 5.

14 Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord:

15 And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.

We have, then, in this single passage a sacred sign, which is the anointing joined with prayer; the grace peculiar to the Sacrament, which is the health of the body when it is for the glory of God; and, above all, the remission of sins. I am aware many Protestants say, that since the gift of curing the sick has long since in a great measure ceased in the Church, so Extreme Unction ought to be laid aside.

In answer, I beg to state that though Almighty God does not so frequently think proper to heal the sick who receive this Sacrament as he did in the primitive Church, he still continues mercifully to hear the prayers that are offered to him for the health of the infirm, when this favour conduces to the honour of God and their salvation, a case which occasionally takes place. Many other Protestants ask for authority of Jesus Christ, independently of the authority of St. James, to shew forth the necessity of receiving this Sacrament. Well, then, Our Lord himself seems to have indicated it when he sent his disciples two and two before him, for the Evangelist informs us that—

Catholic Version.

Mark, 6.

12 And going forth they preached that *men* should do penance.

13 And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.

Protestant Version.

Mark, 6.

12 And they went out and preached that men should repent.

13 And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed *them*.

Now, this anointing cannot be supposed to have been invented by the Apostles : it was commanded by our Lord. Nor did its efficacy arise from any natural virtue peculiar to oil ; its efficacy was mystical, having been instituted to heal the maladies of the soul rather than to cure the diseases of the body.

Proceeding now to Order, we find that this Sacrament is fully established in the word of God. We see it there a sacred sign, which is in the imposition of hands, and grace joined with this sign—

Catholic Version.

1 Timothy, 4.

14 Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with imposition of the hands of the priesthood.

Again he says to him—

2 Timothy, 1.

6 I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the imposition of hands.

Protestant Version.

1 Timothy, 4.

14 Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.

2 Timothy, 1.

6 Whereof I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.

“With regard to the number of orders, to use the words of the Council of Trent:—‘As the ministry of so exalted a priesthood is a divine thing, it was meet, in order to surround it with the greater dignity and veneration, that, in the admirable economy of the Church, there should be several distinct orders of ministers, included by their office to serve the priesthood, and so disposed as that, beginning with the clerical tonsure, they may ascend gradually through the lesser to the greater order.’ Their number, according to the uniform and universal doctrine of the Catholic Church, is seven, porter, reader, exorcist, acolyth, sub-deacon, deacon, and priest. (See Dionys. lib. Eccles. Hier., cap. 3; Cornel. Papa in epist. ad Fab. episcop. Antioch. extat apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6, cap. 35. Conc. Carth., 4, Can. 4, et seq, et Ignati, epist. ad Antioch.) Of these orders some are greater, which are called Holy Orders, and they are sub-deaconship, deaconship, and priesthood; the others are called the lesser or minor

orders, and are Porter, Reader, Exorcist, and Acolyth. As persons are prepared for baptism by exorcisms, and for marriage by espousals, so those who are consecrated to God by orders are prepared by tonsure, which precedes the reception of the first minor order. Tonsure declares what manner of person he should be who desires to receive orders, and the name 'Clerk,' which he receives then for the first time, implies that thenceforward he has taken the Lord for his inheritance. In tonsure the hair of the head is cut in form of a crown, and should be worn in that form, enlarging the crown according as the ecclesiastic advances in orders. This form of the tonsure the Church teaches to be of Apostolic origin: it is mentioned by the most ancient and venerable Fathers; by St. Denis, the Areopagite (Dionys. de Eccles. Heir. c. 6, part 2); by St. Augustine (Aug. serm. 17, ad Frat. in Erem.); by St. Jerome (Hier. in cap. 44, Ezek. vid. Rhaban Maur. lib. de Institut. Cleric. Bed. lit. Hist. 5, Angl. c. 22.) According to these venerable personages the tonsure was first introduced by the Apostles, in honour of the crown of thorns which was pressed upon the head of the Redeemer; that the instrument devised by the impiety of the Jews for the ignominy and torture of Christ might be worn by his Apostles as their ornament and glory. The order of porter follows tonsure: it duly consists in taking care of the key and door of the church, and in suffering none to enter to whom entrance is prohibited. The porter also assisted at the Holy Sacrifice, and took care that no one should approach too near the altar or interrupt the celebrant. To the order of porter also belonged other functions, as is clear from the forms used at his consecration; taking the keys from the altar, and handing them to him, the Bishop says, 'Conduct yourselves as having to render

This is the hair of the consecrated

an account to God for those things which are kept under those keys.' Reader follows porter; to him it belongs to read to the people in a clear and distinct voice the sacred Scriptures, particularly the Nocturnal Psalmody; and on him devolves the task of instructing the faithful in the rudiments of faith. Hence, the Bishop in presence of the the people, handing him a book which contains what belongs to the exercise of his functions, says, 'Receive (this book), and be you a rehearser of the word of God, destined, if you approve yourself faithful and useful in the discharge of your office, to have a part with those who from the beginning have acquitted themselves well in the ministry of the divine word.' The third order is that of exorcist: to him is given power to invoke the name of the Lord over persons possessed by unclean spirits. Hence, the Bishop, when initiating the exorcist, hands him a book containing the exorcisms, and says, 'Take this, and commit to memory, and have power to impose hands on persons possessed, be they baptized or catechumens.' The fourth and last minor order is that of acolyth, whose duty it is to attend and serve those in holy orders, deacons and subdeacons in the ministry of the altar. The acolyth also attends to the lights used at the celebration of the holy sacrifice, particularly whilst the Gospel is read. At his ordination, the bishop, having carefully admonished him of the nature of his office which he is about to assume, places in his hand a light, with these words, 'Receive this wax light, and know that henceforward you are devoted to light the Church in the name of the Lord.' He then hands him empty cruets, intended to supply wine and water for the sacrifice, saying, 'Receive these cruets which are to supply wine and water for the Eucharist of the blood of Christ, in the name of the Lord.'

“ Proceeding now to holy orders, the first is that of sub-deacon ; this office, as the name implies, is to serve the deacon in the ministry of the altar : to him it belongs to prepare the altar-linen, the sacred vessels, the bread and wine necessary for the sacrifice, to minister water to the priest or bishop at the washing of the hands at mass, to read the epistle, a function which was formerly discharged by the deacon, to assist at mass in the capacity of a witness, and see that the priest be not disturbed by any one during its celebration. These functions, which appertain to the ministry of sub-deacon, may be learned from the solemn ceremony used at his ordination. In the first place, the bishop admonishes him, that by his ordination he assumes the solemn obligation of perpetual continence or chastity, and proclaims aloud that he alone is eligible to this office who is prepared freely to embrace this law. In the next place, when the solemn prayer of the litanies has been recited, the bishop enumerates and explains the duties and functions of the sub-deacon. This done, each of the candidates for ordination receives from the bishop a chalice and consecrated paten, and from the arch-deacon cruets filled with wine and water, and a basin and towel for washing and drying the hands, to remind him that he is to serve the deacon. These ceremonies the bishop accompanies with the solemn admonition, ‘ See what sort of ministry is confided to you ; I admonish you therefore so to comport yourselves as to be pleasing in the sight of God.’ Additional prayers are then recited, and when, finally, the bishop has clothed the sub-deacon with the sacred vestments, on putting on each of which he makes use of appropriate words and ceremonies, he then hands him the book of the Epistles, saying, ‘ Receive the book of the Epistles, and have power to read them in the Church of God, both for the living and the dead.’

“ The second amongst the holy orders is that of deacon : his ministry is more comprehensive, and has been always deemed more holy ; to him it belongs constantly to accompany the bishop, to attend him when preaching, to assist him and the priest also during the celebration of the holy mysteries, and at the administration of the Sacraments, and to read the Gospel at the sacrifice of the mass. In the primitive ages of the Church he not unfrequently exhorted the faithful to attend to the divine worship, and administered the chalice in those churches in which the faithful received the Holy Eucharist under both kinds. In order to administer to the wants of the necessitous, to him was also committed the distribution of the goods of the church. That the greatest care should be taken that no unworthy person be advanced to the office of deacon is evinced by the emphasis with which the Apostle, writing to Timothy, dwells on the morals, the virtue, and the integrity which should mark the lives of those who are invested with this sacred character—

Catholic Version.

1 Timothy, 3.

8 Deacons in like manner chaste, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre :

9 Holding the mystery of faith in a pure conscience.

10 And let these also first be proved ; and so let them minister, having no crime.

Protestant Version.

1 Timothy, 3.

8 Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre ;

9 Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience.

10 And let these also first be proved ; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless.

“ The rites and ceremonies used at his ordination, also sufficiently convey the same lesson of instruction. The prayers used at the ordination of a deacon are more numerous and solemn than at that of a sub-deacon ; his person is also invested with the sacred stole ; of his ordination, as that of the first deacons, who were ordained by the Apostles (Acts, 6, v. 6), the imposition of hands also forms a part ; finally, the book of the Gospels is also handed to him by the bishop, with these words : “ Receive power to read the Gospel in the Church of God, as well for the living as the dead, in the name of the Lord.’

“ The third and highest degree of all Holy Orders, is the priesthood. Persons raised to the priesthood, the Holy Fathers distinguish by two names, ‘ Presbyters,’ which, in Greek, signifies *elders*, and which was given them, not only to express the mature years required by the priesthood, but still more, the gravity of their manners, their knowledge and prudence : ‘ venerable old age is not that of long time, nor counted by the number of years, but the understanding of a man is grey hairs,’ (Wisdom, 4, 18), and ‘ Priests,’ because they are consecrated to God, and to them it belongs to administer the Sacraments, and to handle sacred things. In the Holy Scriptures, the priesthood is described as two-fold, internal and external. The internal priesthood extends to all the faithful who have been baptized, particularly to the just, who are anointed by the Spirit of God, and by the Divine grace are made living members of the High Priest Christ Jesus. Through faith, inflamed by charity, they offer spiritual sacrifices to God on the altar of their hearts, and in the number of these sacrifices are to be reckoned good and virtuous actions, referred to the glory of God. Hence, we read, in the Apocalypse—

Catholic Version.

Apoc. 1.

5 Christ has washed us from our sins in his own blood.

6. And hath made us a kingdom and priests to God and his Father.

Protestant Version.

Apoc. 1.

5 Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.

6 And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father.

The doctrine of St. Peter, to the same effect, we find recorded in these words—

1 Peter, 2.

5 Be you also as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.

1 Peter, 2.

5 Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.

The Apostle also exhorts us—

Rom. 12.

1 to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing unto God, your reasonable service.

Rom. 12.

1 ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, *which* is your reasonable service.

David had said long before—

Psalm, 50.

19 A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit : a contrite and humble heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.

Psalm, 51.

17 The sacrifices of God *are* a broken spirit : a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.

“ That all these authorities regard the internal priesthood, it requires little discernment to discover. The external priesthood does not, however, extend indiscriminately to the great body of the faithful; it is appropriated to a certain class of persons, who, being invested with this august character, and consecrated to God by the lawful imposition of hands, and the solemn ceremonies of the Church, are devoted to some particular office in the sacred ministry. This distinction of priesthood is observable even in the Old Law. We have already seen that David spoke of the internal priesthood; and with regard to the external, the numerous commands, delivered by God to Moses and Aaron in reference to it, are too well known to require special mention. Moreover, the Almighty appointed the tribe of Levi to the ministry of the temple, and forbid, by an express law, that any member of a different tribe should assume that function; and Osias, stricken by God with leprosy, for having usurped the sacerdotal office, was visited with the heaviest chastisement for his arrogant and sacrilegious intrusion. As, then, we find this same distinction of internal and external priesthood in the New Law, the faithful are to be informed, that we here speak of the external only, for that alone belongs to the Sacrament of Holy Order.

“ The office of the priest is, then, as the rites used at his consecration declare, to offer sacrifice to God, and to administer the Sacraments of the Church: the bishop, and after him, the priests who may be present, impose hands on the candidate for priesthood; then, placing a stole on his shoulders, he adjusts it in form of a cross, to signify that the priest receives strength from above, to enable him to carry the Cross of Jesus Christ, to bear the sweet yoke of his divine law, and to enforce this law, not by word only,

but also by the eloquent example of a holy life. He next anoints his hands with sacred oil, reaches him a chalice containing wine, and a patena with bread, saying, 'Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass, as well for the living as the dead.' By these words and ceremonies he is constituted an interpreter and mediator between God and man, the principal function of the priesthood. Finally, placing his hand on the head of the person to be ordained, the bishop says; 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained;' thus investing him with that Divine power of forgiving and retaining sins, which was conferred by our Lord on his disciples. These are the principal and peculiar functions of the priesthood.

"The order of priesthood, although essentially one, has different degrees of dignity and power. The first is confined to those who are simply called priests, and whose functions we have now explained. The second is that of Bishops, who are placed over their respective Sees, to govern not only the other ministers of the Church, but also the faithful, and, with sleepless vigilance and unwearied care, to watch over and promote their salvation. Hence the Sacred Scriptures frequently call them 'the pastors of the sheep;' and their office, and the duties which it imposes, are developed by Paul, in his sermon to the Thessalonians, recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. Peter also has left for the guidance of Bishops, a divine rule; and, if their lives harmonize with its spirit, they will, no doubt, be esteemed, and will really be good pastors. But Bishops are also called 'Pontiffs,' a name borrowed from the ancient Romans, and used to designate their chief priests. The third degree is that of Archbishop: he presides over several

Bishops, and is also called 'Metropolitan,' because he is placed over the metropolis of the province; Archbishops, therefore (although their ordination is the same), enjoy more ample power, and a more exalted station than Bishops. Patriarchs hold the fourth place, and are, as the name implies, the first and Supreme Fathers in the episcopal order. Formerly, besides the Sovereign Pontiff, there were but four Patriarchs in the Church; their dignity was not the same: the Patriarch of Constantinople, although last in the order of time, was first in rank,—an honour conceded to him as Bishop of Constantinople, the capital of the Imperial world. Next to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, is that of Alexandria, a see founded by the Evangelist St. Mark, by command of the Prince of the Apostles. The third is the Patriarchate of Antioch, founded by St. Peter, and the first seat of the apostolic see. The fourth and last, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, founded by St. James, the brother of our Lord.

“ Superior to all these is the Sovereign Pontiff, whom Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, denominated in the Council of Ephesus, ‘ the Father and Patriarch of the whole world.’ Sitting in that chair, in which Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, sat to the close of life, the Catholic Church recognizes in his person the most exalted degree of dignity, and the full amplitude of jurisdiction; a dignity and a jurisdiction not based on synodal, or other human constitutions, but emanating from no less an authority than God himself. As the successor of St. Peter, and the true and legitimate Vicar of Jesus Christ, he therefore presides over the Universal Church, the Father and Governor of all the faithful, of Bishops also, and of all other Prelates, be their station, rank, or power what they may.” (*Catechism of the Council of Trent.*)

Here I consider it necessary to call attention to the great question, regarding the celibacy of the clergy of the Catholic Church. Many Protestants are of opinion that Catholic priests are absolutely and unconditionally forbidden to marry; now the real truth is, that they are only restrained by severe penalties, from violating a solemn engagement, knowingly and deliberately formed. No one obliges them to enter into the ecclesiastical state, and thereby contract this obligation; it is a matter of their own free and unbiassed choice, and to carry it into effect they have every help which religion can supply. If they should fail in the observance of so sacred and solemn a duty, they fall under the censure denounced by St. Paul against the faithless widows—

Catholic Version.

1 Tim. 5.

11 When they have grown wanton in Christ, they will marry:

12 Having damnation, because they have made void their first faith.

Protestant Version.

1 Tim. 5.

11 When they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry.

12 Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith.

The Catholic Church, therefore, prohibits in her clergy, what the Apostle stigmatizes in the wanton widow, a violation of a sacred vow, solemnly and deliberately made. The real policy of the Church, in this concern, is to be sought for in the plain and undisguised statement of the same great Doctor of nations—

1 Cor. 7.

32 But I would have you to be without solicitude.

1 Cor. 7.

32 But I would have you without carefulness. He

Catholic Version.

He that is without a wife, is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God.

33 But he that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife: and he is divided.

Protestant Version.

that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord:

33 But he that is married, careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please *his wife*.

Here, then, St. Paul, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, teaches, that a state of celibacy leaves us free to pursue a holy vocation without care and without obstruction; but the state of marriage involves the person who engages in it, in worldly concerns and anxious solicitude. If, therefore, the work of God should be performed not with negligence and indifference, but with religious zeal and holy fervour; if the salvation of souls demands the undivided care of the Christian minister, is it not highly proper and decorous that the Church should persevere in the plan which she has hitherto pursued? Besides, if in the old law, where the priesthood, the sacrifices, &c., were no more than types and mere shadows of the priesthood and sacrifice of the New Covenant, God, notwithstanding, commanded—with respect to the priests (though allowed to marry)—

Leviticus, 21.

6 They shall be holy to their God, and shall not profane his name: for they offer the burnt offering of the

Leviticus, 21.

6 They shall be holy unto their God, and not profane the name of their God: for the offerings of the Lord

Catholic Version.

Lord, and the bread of their God, and therefore they shall be holy.

12 Neither shall he (the high priest) go out of the holy places, lest he defile the sanctuary of the Lord, because the oil of the holy unction of God is upon him. I am the Lord.

Protestant Version.

made by fire, *and* the bread of their God, they do offer : therefore they shall be holy.

12 Neither shall he go out of the sanctuary, nor profane the sanctuary of his God ; for the crown of the anointing oil of his God is upon him : I *am* the Lord.

—if, then, I say, during the course of the week, in which by lot he was to officiate within the sanctuary, he was wholly secluded from his wife, certainly the Church of the new law, the Church of Christ has greater reasons to require greater sanctity from her priests ; considering the excellency and eminence of the sacrifices they offer, the real substance of which the sacrifices of the old law were but mere shadows and types ; to this end has she laid on them the obligation of celibacy. Hence, this law is purely ecclesiastical, but founded, as I have remarked above, on the grave and solid reasons cited from St. Paul. It is also, unquestionably derived from a pious and sacred custom, which prevailed in the Apostolic ages. During the three first centuries it was enforced by the general fervour which animated every breast, and maintained by the spirit of zeal, which inflamed the ministers of religion. In the fourth century we find it established by positive injunctions. In the Council of Elvira, held in 305, we observe direct commands addressed to all bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons, to live in a state of continence, under pain of degradation from their rank. (Can. 33.) In the Council,

of Neocæsarea, held about the same time, a similar law was framed under the same penalty. (Can. 1.) In the great Council of Nice (Can. 3), it is strictly forbidden that any clergyman should live in the society of a woman, except a mother, sister, aunt, or such as cannot excite suspicion. A threat of degradation is pronounced against those who shall violate this injunction. (Vid. Carranz. fol. 33, 36, 45, 53.) So general was the observance of this law, that when about the close of the same century St. Jerom wrote against Vigilantius, who censured the celibacy of the clergy, that learned Father declared the conduct of his opponent to be an injury to the Apostles and Martyrs. He affirms it the general law of all the distinguished Churches in the Catholic world, to admit those only to Holy Orders who were unmarried, or lived in a state of continence; or who, if they had wives, should consent to a separation, "quæ (nempe Ecclesiæ) aut virgines clericos accipiunt aut continentes, aut si uxores habuerint, mariti esse desistunt." (S. Hier. contra Vigilant. libello 2do. versus init.) That this same salutary discipline was rigorously enforced by the Anglo-Saxon ancestors of the present race of Englishmen, we learn from the most authentic sources. In a canon framed in the eighth century, at the period when Archbishop Egbert governed the see of York, we read the following injunction: "Let priests by no means marry wives, but love the Church." (Wilks Conc. vol. 1, 112, Can. 160. Sacerdotes autem nequaquam uxores ducant, sed ecclesiam diligent.) Again occurs the following pre-emptory mandate: "If a priest or deacon should take a wife, let him lose his rank." (Item 133, Can. 1. Si presbyter vel diaconus uxorem ducat, perdat ordinem suum. Item 134, Can. 5, it. 136.) But more strange, this very law of celibacy is sanctioned even by a Protestant legislature.—

Cathol. Conc. of Nice

Statute An. 2 and 3. c. 21. Edward 6th. "Although it were not only better for the estimation of Priests, and other Ministers in the Church of God, to live chaste, sole and separate from the company of women, and the bond of marriage, but also thereby they might the better attend to the administration of the Gospel, and be less intricated and troubled with the charge of household, being free and unburdened from the care and cost of finding wife and children, and that it were most to be wished, that they would willingly and of themselves endeavour themselves to a perpetual chastity and abstinence from the use of women." In the 'Political and Literary Anecdotes of his own Times,' (by Dr. Wm. King, Principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxon, London, 1818, p. 185,) we read, "It was no small misfortune to the cause of Christianity in this kingdom, that when we reformed from Popery, our Clergy were permitted to marry; from that period their only care (which was natural, and must have been for ever,) was to provide for their wives and children; this the dignitaries, who had ample revenues, could easily effect, with the loss, however, of that respect and veneration which they formerly received on account of their hospitality (in the epistle which is read at the consecration of our Bishops, it is required of them, amongst other injunctions, that they should be given to hospitality, not given to filthy lucre, not covetous. They likewise sincerely promise to assist the indigent, and all strangers who are destitute of help) and numerous charities; but the greatest part of the inferior clergy were incapable of making a provision for sons and daughters, and soon left families of beggars in every part of the kingdom. I do not inquire, whether chastity ought to be a requisite in those who are ordained to serve at the altar (it certainly

Cyclopedia of Ecclesiastical History

Annet Catholic & Protestant

adds a grace and dignity to their function), but I cannot help observing, that our Government makes no difference between a Bishop's wife and his concubine; the wife has no place or precedence, she does not share in her husband's honours, although the creation of a simple knight, whose honours, like the Bishop, are for life only, gives a rank and title to his wife. Moreover, as an academician and friend to the republic of letters, I have often wished, that the canons which forbid priests to marry were still in force. To the celibacy of the Bishops we owe almost all those noble foundations which are established in both our Universities; but since the Reformation we can boast of few of the Episcopal order as benefactors to those seats of learning. The munificent donations of Laud and Sheldon, in the last century (the 17th) will, indeed, ever be remembered; but, let it likewise be remembered, that these two Prelates were unmarried. Since the commencement of the present (the 18th) century, I do not recollect one of our Right Reverends who ought to be recorded as an eminent patron of learning, or learned man; but this will not appear very wonderful, if we consider by what spirit they were dignified—*'haud equidem spiritu sanctu.'* And yet, in the consecration of these *conge d'élire* Bishops, they are said to be called to this work by the Holy Ghost, and in their answer to the Archbishop, they seem to affirm it of themselves." Away, then, with the flimsy assertion, that the law of clerical celibacy is a tyrannical injunction, introduced by the Popes during the middle ages for political purposes, and that it is condemned even by writers in our own communion. The first of these pleas has been amply refuted; of the second, it may be briefly observed, that the opinion of any individual, however respectable, can have no weight, till the Church shall

to wit: a

think proper to make an alteration in her discipline. Against this, however, it is argued, first, that the Apostle plainly permits a Bishop and other Clergymen to marry—

Catholic Version.

1 Timothy, 3.

2 It behoveth therefore a bishop to be blameless, the husband of one wife, sober, prudent, of good behaviour, chaste, given to hospitality, a teacher.

Protestant Version.

1 Timothy, 3.

2 A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour given to hospitality, apt to teach.

In reply to this, I beg to state, that it was indeed, customary in the Apostles' time, when sanctity pervaded every class of persons, to select often married persons to fill the highest dignities in the Church. Many of the brightest ornaments that have dignified Church History, have been married. But, notwithstanding this, the Church has at all times shewn extreme delicacy on this point, for she has always declined to choose those who had been twice married. Besides, it was never the discipline of either the Latin or Greek Church to suffer the Clergy to marry after ordination; and the ancient Greek Church was fully as rigorous in enforcing clerical celibacy as the Catholic Church is at this period. (Vid. S. Epiphan hæres. 59.) As to the present practice of the Greek Church, it certainly permits clergymen to cohabit with wives, but wives whom they have espoused before their entrance into Holy Orders. But when the wife becomes defunct, a second marriage is not permitted. For, though such a marriage be lawful, it has been at all times considered by both Churches an indication of a sensual attachment

to carnal pleasure. Well, then, the Apostle requires that a Bishop, or Priest, be the husband of one wife: “*mias gunaikos aner;*” that is, he must be one who has not engaged in a second marriage. Consulting ecclesiastical history, we also find, that whenever the choice was made among married men for candidates for Holy Orders, the persons they chose lived ever afterwards in a state of continency; and of this fact St. Jerom is an honourable and unexceptionable witness. His words are so clear on the subject, that language cannot supply information in a more perspicuous form. “The Apostles,” says he, “were either virgins, or lived in a state of continence after marriage. Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are either selected among virgins, or widowers; or, at least, they are to observe continence after their priesthood till death.” (Apostoli vel virgines, vel post nuptias continentes. Episcopi, presbyteri, diaconi, aut virgines eliguntur, aut vidui; aut certe post sacerdotium in æternum pudici. S. Hier. Epist. 50.) Vid. etiam Origen. Hom. 17. in Luc. et St. Epiphan loc. citato. The reader will observe, this answer meets the objection, couched in similar language, from Titus, 1, v. 6.

2nd. It is urged, that the same Apostle says to all men in general—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 7.

9 ... it is better to marry than to be burnt.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 7.

9 ... it is better to marry than to burn.

I admit, St. Paul, unquestionably, allows all men to marry, but, provided they have not contracted any previous obligation to remain single; or, in the absence of a sacred engagement, it is surely better to employ the remedy provided to allay human concupiscence, than to indulge passion in op-

position to the divine will. But where a solemn engagement to observe continence has been freely contracted, as is practised by the Catholic Clergy, surely the Apostle no more allows marriage than he does the wanton widow, whom he consigns (same verse) to damnation, for betraying her first faith; or, in other words, for violating an obligation precisely of the same nature and description as that which is contracted by the Clergy of the Catholic Church.

Finally, it is said, that St. Paul authorizes, by his own example, the marriage of the Clergy, for he says—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 9.

5 Have we not power to carry about a woman a sister, as well as the rest of the Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 9.

5 Have we not power to lead about a sister, *a wife*, as well as other Apostles, and *as* the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?

The vulgate Latin text is “ Numquid non habemus potestatem ‘ *Mulierem* ’ sororem (*adelfen gunaika*) circumducendi?” Now, this text was falsely corrupted, the word *wife* was first substituted for *woman*, in the Protestant Bibles of 1562, 1577, 1579. Besides, St. Jerom (lib. Contra Jovin. cap. 19, 1 Cor. 7, v. 5, 35, and lib. 1, Adversus Jovin. de. op. mon. cap. 4, lib. 2, cap. 24,) and St. Augustine interpret it as we do; And St. Paul had no wife, as we read in—

1 Cor. 7.

8 But I say to the unmarried, and to the widows: it is good for them if they so continue, even as I.

1 Cor. 7.

8 I say therefore to the unmarried and widows. It is good for them if they abide even as I.

That Cephas or Peter had left his wife, and all to follow his beloved Lord and Master, is clear from—

Catholic Version.

Matt. 19.

27 Then Peter answering, said to him (Jesus): Behold we have left all things, and have followed thee: what therefore shall we have?

Protestant Version.

Matt. 19.

27 Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee, what shall we have therefore?

The Apostle, then, in 1 Cor. 9, v. 5, speaks only of a woman or women, or sisters, as Christians, who, after the Jewish custom waited on the preachers of the Gospel, and supplied them with necessaries; of this kind of women, many followed Christ, and maintained Him and his Disciples out of their substance. Thus did all the ancient Fathers and Doctors of the Catholic Church understand and explain this passage, as besides St. Jerom and St. Augustine, the renowned Chrysostom and Theodoret. But what will the reader say when he hears that Dr. Hammond, an eminent Protestant Divine, in his notes on the New Testament, 1638 (as it were to correct the spurious translation of the first reformers), puts in the margin of chap. 9, v. 5, “a sister woman?” Dr. Thorndike also assures us, that “a single life is a safer way to perfection in Christianity, than marriage. So is the profession of the clergy.....And the grace which our Lord, and St. Paul after him, owns in them that do this, is not a peculiar temper of the body, obliging them that do so to live single, and them that have it not to marry; but a singular zeal to forego that which is lawful for us, that we may the better come to his kingdom. Which when it proceeds from a single eye, proposing to

itself the means of attaining to the world to come; well we may be assured of God's help to perform it." (Just Weights and Measures, chap. 11, p. 74.) Dr. Jeremy Taylor, first Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and afterwards appointed Bishop of Down and Connor in Ireland, after the Restoration, says, in his "Liberty of Prophesying," the ancient Faith (the Catholic Church) has "such rational inducements, or, in school language, such motives of credibility, as may verily easily persuade persons of much reason, and more piety, to retain that which they know to be the religion of their forefathers; and which had actual possession and seizure of men's minds, before the opposite profession had a name.....The world is witness to the piety and austerity of the religious orders of men and women; the single lives of their priests and bishops." Finally, I beg to refer my reader to the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, against the admission of women into Colleges, Cathedrals, &c., in 'Strype's Life of Parker.' There he will also read a remarkable instance of her rudeness to that Archbishop's wife, as also in 'Nichol's Progresses,' A.D. 1561.

Proceeding now to Matrimony. This we believe to be a Sacrament; the union of the husband and wife being the visible sign of the invisible grace, which is represented to us by marriage. St. Paul speaks of it as a sign of the union, that subsists between Jesus Christ and his Church:—

Catholic Version.

Ephes. 5.

23.....The husband is the head of the wife: as Christ is the head of the Church.

Protestant Version.

Ephes. 5.

23 For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church.

Grace is likewise conferred in matrimony, since they who receive it with the proper dispositions find therein the grace necessary to live with holiness in matrimony. Again, St. Paul calls Matrimony—

Catholic Version.

Ephesians, 5.

32 A great sacrament.

Protestant Version.

Ephesians, 5.

32 This is a great mystery ; but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.

In the Protestant Testament is *mystery*, which, properly speaking, is the name the Church has always given to the Sacraments. We should likewise observe, that this Holy Spirit, foreseeing the opposition of many on this subject, has given to matrimony the name of mystery, or Sacrament, which she does not even give to Baptism, or the Eucharist. With regard to intermarriages of Protestants and Catholics, it is asked by many Protestants, why is the Catholic Church so opposed to them ?

1st. Because there can be no participation between justice and injustice, light and darkness. The Catholic party is just by his orthodox faith, well grounded in his faith of God, of Christ, of his Church and religion. He lives spiritually by these means, with the hope of eternal salvation ; and the Protestant party makes himself with injustice the depositary of divine truths, and the arbiter of them, too frequently condemning the religion of the Catholic party, and more frequently ridiculing it as superstitious. How in this case can they serve the Lord with one mind and one heart ? How, I repeat it, is it possible such solemn duties can be fully and faithfully complied with,

when the religious practice of the one and the other is as widely different as their faith, religion, and Church, are different one from the other? How often does not this difference of religion in course of time alienate mutual affection, confidence, and concord?

2nd. A Protestant and a Catholic are married: up to the birth of the first child nothing has been said regarding the religion in which it is to be baptized and educated. Well, the child is born, the husband then, as head and master of his family, insists that the newly-born child be baptized in his own church, against the consent of his wife. Hence, arises a breach of concord; matrimonial affection and confidence are alienated; and the wife, from a sense of the veracity and truth of her religion, and frustrated in her dearest expectation, is thrown into the deepest affliction. But, perhaps a previous arrangement was made between the two parties regarding the religion in which the children are to be educated, but which can never be agreed upon by the Catholic, still, how often has it happened that the husband has annulled this agreement?

3rd. Suppose the Catholic mother should depart life while the children are under her tuition, by what means then will they be brought up as Catholics? Not, surely, by the father himself, ignorant of the religion: much less by the wife's friends, who may not, and dare not interfere. Thus, the child loses by degrees the slender notion of religion the mother had instilled and taught it, and embraces that of the surviving father.

4th. In the case of a rich Catholic gentleman marrying a Protestant lady, is it ever considered that the father may be otherwise occupied than to attend to the children, as to initiating them in their religious duties, and that the essential part of parental duty devolves on the Protestant

mother, with whom the children pass their days and hours for at least five or six years, and who cannot expect to be instructed by her, even though she may be ever so willing, in consequence of her ignorance of the principles of the Catholic religion? In this case, who will be responsible for the loss of the children at the judgment seat of God? Besides, is there not danger, on the part of the husband, for the wife's salvation, from his ill example in the practice of his religion, and indifference or carelessness with respect to the conversion of his wife? I am aware, it is often said, that the design of the Catholic party is always good, and that they have most at heart the conversion of the Protestant party. But let him ask his own heart and conscience, whether such be his real and primary motive—whether it be grounded more on flesh and blood, than on Christian faith and charity? Catholics, whether rich or poor, if you will marry, “marry in the Lord,” if otherwise,..... “how knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? Or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?” (1 Cor. 7, v. 16.)

Having submitted to the reader this general notion of the Sacraments, I will now proceed to explain the Catholic doctrine regarding the Sacrament of Penance. I deem it necessary to premise a few principles. 1st. The merits and sufferings of Christ alone *radically* cancel the guilt of sin, in whatsoever manner or degree of malice it is contracted: these are the condign satisfaction for it to the divine justice, and are no doubt self-sufficient to discharge the whole mass of sin that has been, will be, or can be committed. 2nd. In the present order of Providence, since the establishment of the law of grace, the merits of Christ have not *usually* their actual effect, but inasmuch as they are applied to us by such particular

means or instruments instituted by Christ for this desirable purpose. 3rd. The Sacraments, so called, are these means of grace, or the channels through which the benefit of Christ's merits and sufferings—his sanctifying grace, is conveyed to our souls for this end, for the effectual cancelling of sin, and our reconciliation to the divine justice, injured by it.

Before the mystery of the incarnation was accomplished, man's justification was annexed to the inward motions of the heart, a steadfast faith in the future Messiah, an intense love of God, and a sincere sorrow for sin, exclusive of those singular advantages and extraordinary means of grace we now possess; for, it is since that happy event that Christ, as I observed above, has graciously vouchsafed to institute the sacraments to be a continual commemoration, as well as an application to us of this great mystery of mercy, for the purpose and intent for which it was fulfilled—the cancelling of sin, and our happy reconciliation to the divine justice, irritated by it.

For the information of the reader, I shall transcribe the greater part of the 14th Session of the Council of Trent, which presents a full exposition of the doctrine of the Catholic Church regarding the Sacrament of Penance.

The Holy Synod teaches, in the first chapter of the same Session, regarding the necessity and institution of the Sacrament of Penance, "that if all who are regenerated by baptism were so to testify their gratitude to God, as to persevere constantly in the justice they received therein through his grace and bounty, it would not have been necessary to have instituted any other sacrament than baptism for the remission of sin. But, because God, who is rich in mercy (Eph. 2, v. 4), knew the frailty of our weak nature, he has been pleased also to provide a remedy,

whereby those who, after baptism, should be brought again under the bondage of sin and unto the power of Satan, may recover life; namely, the Sacrament of Penance, through which the merits of the death of Jesus Christ are applied to such as have fallen after baptism.”

The venerable Fathers then proceed:—“Penance has been in all times necessary to all men who had sullied their consciences by mortal sin, to obtain grace and justice, even to those who deserved to be cleansed by the Sacrament of Baptism, whereby, denouncing and correcting their evil ways, they detest the offence they had committed against God, joining thereto a hatred of sin and a grief of the heart. Whence the Prophet says (Ezek. 18, v. 30)—‘Be converted and do penance for all your iniquities: and iniquity shall not be your ruin.’ Our Lord says likewise (Luke, 13, v. 3)—‘Unless you do penance, you shall all likewise perish.’ St. Peter, the Prince of Apostles, recommending penance to the sinners who were to be baptized, said to them (Acts, 2, v. 38)—‘Do penance, and be baptized every one of you.’ But yet Penance was not a Sacrament before the coming of Jesus Christ; neither is it after his coming for any one who has not been baptized. Now, our Lord Jesus Christ principally instituted the Sacrament of Penance when, after his resurrection, he breathed upon his disciples, saying to them—‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.’ (John, 20, v. 22, 23.) By which remarkable action, and not less expressive words, the holy Fathers have always unanimously understood that the power of remitting and retaining sin had been imparted to the Apostles and to their lawful successors, for the reconciliation of the faithful fallen after baptism. Hence the Catholic Church, with very great

reason, formerly condemned and rejected as heretics the Novatians, who obstinately denied this power of remitting sin. Therefore, the holy Council approving and receiving the sense of these words of our Lord as the true one, condemns the imaginary interpretations of those who, in opposition to the institution of this Sacrament, wrest and falsely apply these words to the power of preaching the word of God, and announcing the gospel of Jesus Christ."

In the second chapter, it teaches the difference between the sacrament of Penance, and that of Baptism, saying, "that the former differs in many respects from the latter," For, besides, that penance is very dissimilar from baptism, both in the matter and form, which constitute the essence of a Sacrament, it is manifest also, that it is a species of judicial act on the part of the priest, which cannot be said with respect to baptism. For it does not appertain to the minister of baptism to act in the capacity of a judge, the Church exercising no jurisdiction over a person before his entry into her bosom through baptism. "For what have I to do (says the Apostle) to judge them that are without?" (1 Cor. 5, v. 12.) It is not so with the servants of faith, whom our Lord Jesus Christ has once made members of his body, by the laver of baptism; for, with regard to these, he has been pleased, should they be afterwards contaminated with any crime, not that they should be purified a second time by a repetition of baptism, as this is in no manner allowed in the Catholic Church, but that they should appear as criminals before this tribunal of penance, in order that, by the sentence of the priests, they may be delivered; not once only, but so often as repenting of their sins, they should have recourse to it. Besides, very different are the effects of baptism from those of penance, for having put on Jesus Christ in baptism—

*Catholic Version.**Protestant Version.*

Galatians, 3.

Galatians, 3.

27 For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ.

27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

we become entirely new creatures in Him, obtaining a full and complete remission of all our sins; but by the sacrament of penance we cannot arrive at this total and entire renewal but by many sighs and great labours, which the justice of God exacts from us; insomuch, that it is with great reason, that penance has been styled by the Holy Fathers, as a painful and laborious baptism. Now this sacrament of penance is as necessary for salvation, to those who have fallen after baptism, as baptism is to those who have not yet been regenerated.

In the third chapter it treats on the parts and effects of the Sacrament of Penance, declaring "that the form of this Sacrament, in which its virtue and efficacy principally consist, is contained in these words, which the minister pronounces: "Ego te absolvo," &c. I absolve thee, &c. to which, indeed, by a laudable custom of the Holy Church, are joined some other prayers; but they in no manner regard the essence of the form of the Sacrament, and are not necessary to its administration.

(And Sess. 14, Can. 9.) It teaches, "if any one shall say that the sacramental absolution of a priest is not an act of jurisdiction, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring, that the sins of the person are remitted.....or shall say, that the confession of the penitent is not required, in order that the priest may absolve him, let him be anathema."

The acts of the penitent himself, namely, contrition,

confession, and satisfaction, are, as it were, the matter of this Sacrament; and these same acts which, being of divine institution, are required in the penitent for the integrity of the Sacrament, and for a full and perfect remission of the sins, hence they are called in this sense the parts of penance. But as to the ground and effect of the Sacrament, in what regards its virtue and efficacy, it consists in the reconciliation with God, which is often, in pious persons, who devoutly receive this Sacrament, followed by a great peace and composure of conscience, and with great consolation of the spirit.

The Holy Council, explaining after this manner the parts and effects of this Sacrament, condemns, at the same time, the sentiments of those who maintain that faith and the terrors of an affrighted conscience are the parts of penance.

In the 4th chapter it treats of Contrition.—

Contrition, which holds the first rank among the acts of the penitent, of which mention has been just made, is an interior grief, and a detestation of the sin committed, with a resolution of never sinning more. This notion of contrition has been at all times necessary for the remission of sin, and to a man fallen after baptism, it serves as a preparation for the remission of it, when joined to a confidence in the mercy of God, and to a desire of doing whatever is requisite for the worthy receiving of this Sacrament.

The Holy Council declares, therefore, that this contrition comprises not only a cessation from sin, and a resolution and a commencement of a new life, but also a hatred of the past, according to that of Ezekiel, c. 18, "Cast away from you all your transgressions, by which you have transgressed; and make to yourselves a new heart, and a

new spirit." Certainly, whoever will consider these transports of the Saints—"To thee only have I sinned, and have done evil before thee." (Psalm, 50.) "I have laboured in my groanings; every night I will wash my bed." (Psalm 6.) "I will recount to thee all my years in the bitterness of my soul," (Isaias, 38.) and others of this nature, will easily perceive that they flowed from a vehement hatred of the past life, and a great detestation of sin.

The Holy Council declares, moreover, that although it may sometimes happen, that this contrition may be perfect from charity, and reconcile man with God before he actually receives this Sacrament, this reconciliation, however, must not be attributed to contrition alone, independently of the desire of receiving the Sacrament of Penance, which is included in it.

And with regard to that imperfect contrition which is called attrition, because it springs commonly either from a sense of the turpitude of sin, or from the fear of punishment and of hell, if, with the hope of pardon, it exclude the desire of sinning, the Holy Council declares, that not only it does not render a man a hypocrite and a great sinner, but it is even a gift of God, and an impulse of the Holy Ghost, who indeed is not yet abiding in the penitent man, but only excites and assists him in such a manner as to prepare him for justification. And although it cannot of itself, without the Sacrament of Penance, lead a sinner to justification, yet it disposes him to receive the grace of God in the Sacrament of Penance.

"For it was with a similar fear, a fear filled with terror, that the Ninivites were so usefully struck by the preaching of Jonas, when they did penance and obtained the mercy of God. Thus it is falsely and without foundation, that some

calumniate Catholic authors, as if they had written that the Sacrament of Penance confers grace without any good motion from the part of those receiving it, which the Church of God has never believed nor taught; and they advance also another falsity, when they teach that contrition is a constrained and violent act, and not a free and voluntary one."

In the fifth chapter it speaks of confession.

"From the institution of the Sacrament of Penance already explained, the Catholic Church has always understood that an entire confession of sins was also instituted by our Lord, and that according to the divine law, this confession is necessary for all those who fall into mortal sin after baptism: because our Lord Jesus Christ, before his ascension into heaven, left the priests as his vicegerents, and as presidents and judges, before whom all mortal crimes into which the faithful might fall, were to be laid open, in order that they by virtue of the power of the keys which was given to them to remit or to retain sins, might pronounce sentence. For it is manifest that priests could not exercise this jurisdiction without cognizance of the cause, nor observe that equity in imposing the penalties, if the penitent confessed his crimes in general only, and not in particular and in detail.

"Whence it follows that all mortal sins of which penitents find themselves guilty after a diligent examen of conscience, ought to be laid open in confession, however secret they may be; and although committed only against the two last commandments of the Decalogue, as these sorts of sins not unfrequently wound the soul more dangerously than those which are done in the face of the world.

"As to venial sins, which do not deprive us of the grace of God, and into which we fall more frequently, although it

be laudable and useful and in no manner presumptuous to confess them, as the custom of truly devout and pious persons sufficiently testifies, yet they may be omitted without sin, and expiated by various other remedies.

‘ But as all mortal sins, even those of thought, render us children of wrath and enemies of God, it is, therefore, necessary to seek forgiveness of all from God, by a sincere and humble confession. When, therefore, the faithful desire to confess all those sins which occur to their memory, they, no doubt, expose all to the divine mercy; but those who act otherwise and knowingly retain any, present nothing to the divine bounty which can be remitted by the priest; for if the patient be ashamed to discover his wound to his physician, his art will not heal what he is ignorant of.

“ It follows also that those circumstances which change the nature of the sin, are to be also explained in confession: because, without this, the sins themselves are not entirely exposed by the penitent, nor sufficiently known to his judge (confessor), to enable him to estimate justly their grievousness, and to impose an adequate penance upon the penitent. It is, therefore, wholly inconsonant to reason to teach that these circumstances have been invented by idle men, or that it is sufficient to confess one of them only; as for example to say, I have sinned against my brother. But it is, moreover, impious to assert that it is impossible to make one’s confession in the manner thus pointed out, or that it is a rack and a torture to the conscience; for it is evident that, in the Church nothing more is required of penitents, than after each one has diligently examined himself, and explored to the bottom all the hidden recesses of his conscience, to confess those sins by which he recollects to have offended mortally his Lord and his God.

“ But the other sins, which do not occur to the mind after a diligent examination, are understood to be included in general in the same confession ; and it is with regard to these that we confidently say with the prophet : ‘ from my secret sins cleanse me, O Lord.’ (Ps. 18.) It is true that confession, from the difficulty which it offers and the shame we undergo in laying open our sins, might appear indeed a heavy yoke, were it not rendered light by so many consolations and advantages, which are undoubtedly conferred by absolution on those who worthily approach this sacrament.

“ Moreover, as to the manner of confessing secretly to a priest ; although Christ our Saviour has forbidden no one to confess his sins publicly, by the way of punishment for his crimes and for his own humiliation, as well as for the edification of others and of the Church which he has dishonoured, yet this is not commanded by divine precept, nor would it be advisable to require by any human law that crimes, particularly such as are hidden, should be divulged by a public confession.

“ As, therefore, private sacramental profession, which has been from the beginning and is now in use in the Catholic Church, has always been commended by the general and unanimous voice of all the most ancient Fathers of the Church, the empty calumny of those who are not ashamed to assert that it is of human invention, foreign to the command of God, and took its rise from the Fathers assembled in the Council of Lateran, is manifestly refuted. For the Church in this Council did not at all establish the precept of confession for the faithful, because they well knew that it was by the law of God already established and necessary, but they enjoined that this precept should be observed at

least once a year, by all and each one of the faithful, as soon as they had arrived to the years of discretion."

In the sixth chapter, it speaks of the minister of this Sacrament, and of absolution.

With regard to the minister of this Sacrament, the Holy Synod declares "all doctrines false and repugnant to the truth of the Gospel which, by a pernicious error, extend the ministry of the keys to all men indiscriminately, bishops and priests alone excepted, explaining these words of our Saviour: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in Heaven: and whatsoever you shall loose upon Earth, it shall be loosed also in Heaven." (Matt. 16 and 19.) "And whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained," (John, 20,) as addressed to all Christians, indifferently and promiscuously, contrary to the institution of this Sacrament, so that each one has power to remit public sins, by reprehension, if the person reprehended submit himself to reproof; and private ones, by a voluntary confession to any person whatsoever.

It likewise teaches, "that even priests who are in mortal sin, exercise the power of remitting sin as ministers of Christ, through the virtue of the Holy Ghost received in ordination; and that the opinion of those is erroneous who contend that this power is forfeited by wicked priests.

"But, although the Absolution of the Priest be a dispensation of the benefit of another, it is not, however, a simple ministry, or a simple commission to announce the Gospel, or to declare that the sins are remitted, but a species of judicial act, by which the priest as judge pronounces sentence."

Finally, with respect to the third part of the Sacrament

of Penance, the Holy Synod declares that "It must be taught, that the penance of a Christian after his fall is widely different from that of baptism, and that there are included in it not only cessation from sins, and a detestation of them, or a contrite and humbled heart, but also sacramental confession at least in desire, and to be made in proper time, and sacerdotal absolution: as also satisfaction by fasts, alms, prayers, and other pious exercises of a spiritual life, not indeed for the eternal punishment, which either by the Sacrament (of Penance), or by the desire of the Sacrament, is remitted together with the guilt, but for the temporal punishment." (Concil. Trid. Sess. 6, cap. 14. *De lapsis et eorum justificatione.*) Again, it also declares, "But this our satisfaction which we make for our sins is not made in any other way than through Jesus Christ; for we, who of ourselves can do nothing, as of ourselves, by the co-operation of him who strengthens us, can do all things; and thus man hath nothing wherein to glory, but all our glorying is in Christ, in whom we live, in whom we merit, in whom we make satisfaction, bring forth fruits worthy of the name, which have their power from him, are by him offered to the Father, and through him are accepted by the Father." (Concil. Trid. Sess. 14, cap. 13.) Having now, for the information of my kind Protestant reader, fully shown what are the real tenets of the Catholic Church regarding the Sacrament of Penance as laid down in the above-mentioned sessions of the Council of Trent, and held throughout the whole Catholic world, I shall at once proceed to submit the passages of the Scriptures which prove confession to be of divine institution. To proceed with method, I shall condense the whole force of the divine testimonies in favour of sacramental confession into the following syllogistical form:—

1. Those who have committed mortal sin are commanded by the Law of God to do penance, in order to become reconciled to God.

2. But the necessary means to do penance, and thereby become reconciled to God, standing to the authority of the Holy Scriptures, is to feel contrite for the sins committed; confess them (where opportunity is for so doing, for where confession is impossible, as, for example, where a priest cannot be had, contrition with a desire of confession suffices to salvation, as the Council expressly says in the 4th chapter of the same session) to a priest duly authorized, and make satisfaction for them.

3. Therefore, confession, as one of the parts of the Sacrament of Penance, is of divine institution.

The first proposition, namely, "they who have committed mortal sin, are commanded by the Law of God to do penance to become reconciled to God," is clear from innumerable passages of the Holy Writings. I shall subjoin a few:—

Catholic Version.

Ezek. 18.

30 Be converted, and do penance for all your iniquities: and iniquity shall not be your ruin.

Matthew, 3.

2 Do penance:

Protestant Version.

Ezek. 18.

30 Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin.

Matthew, 3.

2 Repent ye.

(See also Mark, 1, v. 4, and Luke, 3, v. 3.)

Luke, 13.

3 No, I say to you; but

Luke, 13.

3 I tell you, nay: but ex-

*Catholic Version.**Protestant Version.*

unless you shall do penance, you shall all likewise perish.

cept ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.

This first proposition is, therefore, unquestionably clear, and cannot be denied by any one. I shall now proceed to the proof of the second part of the second proposition; for with regard to the first, I hope it will not be denied that contrition for the sin committed has always been regarded as the first step towards a perfect reconciliation with God. Proceeding, then, to the second part, I shall lay down the following syllogistical reasoning:—

1. Christ Jesus has appointed the Apostles, and their lawful successors, to be spiritual judges here on earth, invested to this purpose with a spiritual power, that without their sentence (where it can be had) no sinner fallen after baptism can be reconciled.

2. But the Apostles could not, and their lawful successors cannot, form a right judgment of the state of sinners fallen after baptism, unless they become acquainted with their sins, by means of confession.

3. Therefore, they who have fallen after baptism are bound to confess their sins to the lawful successors of the Apostles—Therefore, confession of sins is of divine institution.

The first proposition is alone to be proved, namely, that Christ has appointed the Apostles and their lawful successors to be spiritual judges here on earth, invested for this purpose with a spiritual power, that without their sentence (where it can be had) no sinner fallen after baptism can be reconciled; for the second is so clear that no one can pretend to deny it; for without a cognizance of the cause, it is

impossible for any judgment to be formed even in thought. The whole difficulty rests therefore with the first proposition, which, when proved, it unquestionably follows, that confession of sins is of divine institution.

Recurring to the Holy Scriptures, three are the principal passages from which the truth of the first proposition is most clearly demonstrated,

First, where Christ addresses Peter—

Catholic Version.

Matthew, 16.

18 And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

19 And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth it shall be bound also in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth it shall be loosed also in Heaven.

Protestant Version.

Matthew, 16.

18 And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

19 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.

Secondly, when he makes the same promise, and in the same terms afterwards to his other Apostles—

Matthew, 18.

18 Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound

Matthew, 18.

18 Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in

Catholic Version.

also in Heaven ; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in Heaven.

Protestant Version.

Heaven : and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven.

In the third place, when finally he accomplishes his promise, and explains to them in the clearest manner the sense of his former promise, and the nature of the power he had promised—

John, 20.

21 As the Father hath sent me, I also send you.

22 When he said this he breathed on them ; and he said to them, receive ye the Holy Ghost :

23 Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them ; and whose *sins* you shall retain, they are retained.

John, 20.

21 As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.

22 And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost ;

23 Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them ; *and* whose soever *sins* ye retain, they are retained.

The first text, namely, “ thou art Peter,” &c., contains a promise made to Peter alone ; but neither Catholic nor Protestant divines doubt that he received the keys, not only to use them himself, but also to communicate them to his lawful successors. Peter had made a solemn profession of his firm faith in the divinity of the man-God, and, in recompense of this faith and profession, our Lord gives here, first, the power of binding and loosing. The second passage, from Matthew, 18, v. 18, contains a promise made

to all the Apostles of that power, which they and their lawful successors were afterwards to receive. And as he who spoke the words is the way, the truth, and the life,—cannot deceive or utter a falsehood, even though we should never read of this power being realized, still we should never entertain the least doubt of their having received it. The third passage contains the final accomplishment of the promise, the very conferring of the power itself, and the complete establishment of the whole Sacrament. But let us examine these texts more minutely; it is manifest, then, that Peter, in the first place, was constituted a spiritual judge, with spiritual power, by our Divine Lord and Master; this is unquestionably manifest, from the very metaphor of the keys, of which mention is made in the text, “I will give to thee the keys,” &c. For, in the first place, it is not customary for keys to be given to signify merely that the door is shut or open; but they are given to open or shut it in reality. Again, do we not daily behold, even among men, keys given away to magistrates, as a mark of their power? As in the ordination of porter, the keys of the material church are given him not to declare that the doors are open or shut, but to open and shut them in reality. I am fully borne out in this, from the explanation given by Catholic and Protestant divines, to the two following texts—

Catholic Version.

Isaias, 22.

22 And I will lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder; and he shall open, and none shall shut: and he shall shut, and none shall open.

Protestant Version.

Isaiah, 22.

22 And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open.

Catholic Version.

Apocalypse, 3.

7 He that hath the key of David : he that openeth, and no man shutteth : shutteth, and no man openeth :

Protestant Version.

Revelation, 3.

7 He that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth ; and shutteth, and no man openeth ;

where they are all unanimous that the word *key* implies a true and real power, by which Christ can absolve and bind with judicial authority ; thus in our case the word *keys* do not merely intimate and declare who is bound and who is loosed, but imply *really* and *truly* so.

Therefore, when Christ said the ever memorable words to Peter, “ I will give thee the key,” &c., he constituted him as perpetual judge, and imparted to him a certain spiritual power. He compared entrance into his kingdom to the entrance into a material house, which, as it cannot be effectuated but with the keys which open the door, so, unless by the keys—the spiritual power confided to Peter, of absolving us from our sins, we cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Hence St. Augustin says (Hom. in Verb. Apost. Legat. fungimur, &c., p. 181, tom. 10, edit. Colon. Agripp. 1616.), “ Let no one say to himself, I secretly do penance ; I do penance before God : God who pardons me, knows that I do it in my heart. Therefore it has been said without effect : ‘ Whatsoever shall be loosed on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.’ Without effect, therefore, have the keys been given to the Church. Do we set at nought the Gospel of God ? Do we cancel the words of Christ ? Do we promise to you what He refuses ?” But it may be said, in baptism even they who have the keys can open to man a way into Heaven, as in the case of infants

baptized by laymen, in case of necessity, and who die shortly after. Let it be, however, remembered, that the power of the keys is a judicial one, and is, therefore, properly exercised over those only who are already members of the Church by baptism. "For what have I to do, to judge them that are without?" says St. Paul, in his first letter to the Corinthians, c. 5, v. 12. Therefore, by virtue of baptism, men are admitted into the Church, and are subject to the power and judgment of the priests; but if afterwards they fall into mortal sin, they can in no manner be reconciled (the case of impossibility being excepted), but by the benefit of the keys.

2. It is proved from the metaphor of binding and of loosing; for *to bind* and *to loose*, certainly do not signify to announce or to declare, but actually to confine with bonds, and to liberate from them, and especially in the above texts of St. Matthew, chap. 16, v. 8, otherwise our Saviour would not have said, "whatsoever thou shalt bind, shall be bound;" or "whatsoever you shall loose, shall be loosed;" but rather, "whatsoever thou shalt bind, was bound, and whatsoever you shall loose, was loosed."

But some may say this is true; priests have the power to bind and to loose, but it does not follow that it is necessary to appear before their tribunal: for Jesus Christ does not say, "and whosoever you shall not loose, shall not be loosed." Wherefore, they have indeed the power to loose, should any one be inclined to make use of their ministry; but a sinner can be also reconciled in another manner, independently of their ministry. As in the case where public judges are constituted with judicial authority, they are empowered, it is true, to judge all who shall recur to them, yet those who have cause are not compelled to appear before them; they may choose their own arbitrators, or may even settle their differences by themselves.

But this objection is easily answered. For although private individuals are able to adjust the differences they may have among themselves, without the decision and interference of public judges constituted for that purpose, it does not follow, however, that they are able to adjust those which they may have; for example, with a king, or the first magistrate of a country, as such, unless they present themselves before him whom the king, or the first magistrate, shall have delegated as judge in his place. Now, all sins are causes which we have with God himself, and consequently, as God has entrusted the judgment of sin to the priests of the Church, those who are members of the Church cannot, if they have such causes, obtain a reconciliation with God, without the judgment of the priests. Wherefore, although this negation, "whatsoever you shall not loose, shall not be loosed," be not expressed in this passage of the Gospel, yet it manifestly follows, as well from the above affirmation, "Whatsoever you shall loose, shall be loosed," by which priests are constituted the future judges in all causes against God, as also from that, "Whatsoever you shall bind, shall be bound;" for, to bind is not only to add a new bond, as, for instance, that of excommunication, but also, to confirm and retain the bonds of sin, as is explained in another passage of the Gospel, in short, if this be not the meaning, or, should the guilty be able to obtain the absolution of their sins, without the sentence of the priests, the promise of Christ, "whatsoever you shall bind, shall be bound," &c., would not be true.

3. The third and principal passage, upon which the belief of the Catholic Church respecting the divine institution and absolute necessity of Confession is grounded, is found in the 20th chapter of St. John, where Christ after his resurrection thus addresses his disciples,—

Catholic Version.

21As the Father hath sent me, I also send you.

22 When he had said this, he breathed on them; and he said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost.

23 Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose *sins* you shall retain, they are retained.

Protestant Version.

21As *my* Father hath sent me, even so send I you.

22 And when he had said this, he breathed on *them*, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost:

23 Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever *sins* ye retain, they are retained.

By which remarkable action and not less expressive words, says the Council of Trent, in the 1st chap. 14th session, the holy Fathers have always unanimously understood, that the power of remitting and of retaining sin was imparted to the Apostles and their lawful successors for the reconciliation of the faithful, fallen after baptism. And, indeed, either the words of Christ just quoted mean nothing at all (which, it would be impious even to think), or they manifestly mean, that Christ did grant thereby to his Apostles and their lawful successors, the power not only to forgive, but also to retain sins. This being once supposed, which cannot be denied, the Catholic divine, in support of the necessity and divine institution of confession, forms this unanswerable argument: Christ, in the above passage, has constituted the Apostles and their lawful successors judges between God and the sinner, and, accordingly, has invested them with the power not only to forgive, but also to retain sins: but, unless confession be of divine institution and of absolute necessity for the sinner's reconciliation, the use and exercise of this power would be alto-

gether nugatory and useless, nay, even utterly impossible which cannot be asserted without blasphemy; therefore, confession is of divine institution, and of absolute necessity for the sinner's reconciliation. The major proposition, being made up of the words of Christ, wants neither explanation nor proof. The minor is equally certain, for, it is not less clear than evident, that if confession be not of divine institution, and of absolute necessity for the reconciliation of the sinner, that is, if there be other ordinary means to obtain the remission of sins committed after baptism, different from confession, the use and exercise of the power of forgiving and retaining sins would be rendered thereby wholly useless and nugatory. For, who is there, if he knew of any easier mode of reconciliation than that of confession, that would not prefer it? Who is there that would be so fascinated by the charms of humiliation and self-denial, as to submit, in opposition to his most darling passions of pride and self-love, to the mortifying law of auricular confession? For the correctness of this reasoning, I appeal to the reader's own good sense. But, supposing even, that some sinners should be found penetrated with so vehement a sorrow and contrition as to recur to the Priests for their greater humiliation, even yet, the use and exercise of the power granted them would be impossible without confession. For, as they have received the power not only to forgive but also to retain sins, a power, which conformably to the intention of Christ, they are to exercise not at random, but prudently, and with discretion, it must be a part of their office as judges, to discern what sins they are to bind, and what to loose, what sins to retain, and what to forgive. Now, how are they to form a just judgment; how can they make a just discernment; how can they distinguish, amongst a crowd of supplicants, the penitents

to be absolved from the penitents to be excluded, if they know not the sins which have been committed? How are they to know the sins, if the penitents themselves do not declare them? How could a civil or criminal judge ever be able to decide and determine, agreeably to the invariable rules of justice and equity, the degree of punishment proportionable to the number, quality, and aggravating circumstances of the culprit's crimes, unless he be made acquainted with them? As little would it be possible for the Apostles and their successors to enjoin a penance proportionate to the guilt of the sinners, without knowing the degree of this guilt. The absolute and indispensable necessity of confession, therefore, follows naturally from the above words of Christ. It is essentially connected with the power granted thereby not only to forgive, but also to retain sins—a power, the exercise of which, without sacramental confession, would manifestly be vain and useless, nay even impossible.

But, it may be objected, that although Christ gave power to his Apostles to bind and to loose, to forgive and to retain sins, it does not follow, that their successors have that power.

This objection is so futile in itself, that I should have deemed it unworthy of notice, had I not been assured of its being frequently urged to support a bad *cause*. The power of binding and loosing was certainly given to be exercised till the end of the world, no less than the commission of preaching, baptizing, &c. which, though addressed to the Apostles, was certainly designed to continue with their Successors—the Pastors of the church, for ever, according to that of Christ, Matt. 28, 20: “Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.”

But, it will be farther objected, that from the doctrine

contended for above, this monstrous absurdity would follow, namely, that man can forgive sins, which is a prerogative belonging only to God.

To this I answer, that the Jewish scribes and Pharisees were formerly under a similar impression, but, they were severely reprehended for it, and put to confusion by our Saviour; for, when our Lord (as we read in St. Matthew and St. Mark,) had told a man who was sick of the palsy, that his sins were forgiven him, some of the scribes and Pharisees, who were there present, concluded immediately in their hearts that this was blasphemy, "this man," say they, "blasphemeth, for who can forgive sins except God alone?" But, our blessed Redeemer, who came on purpose into the world for the remission of our sins, was instantly sensible of this wrong notion of the Jews, and, therefore, before they could even express their thoughts, he said to them, "Why do you think evil in your hearts? For, that you may see that the son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins," he turns to the sick man, saying, "Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house."

The Jews were here under two mistakes. In the first place, they thought our Saviour was not God; and in the second place, they thought that, being man, he could not forgive sins. Therefore, the blessed Jesus, for our instruction concerning the remission of sin, was pleased on this occasion to pass by, in some degree, the first mistake, and more expressly to confute the second; on which account, it ought to be noticed, that he does not say that you may see that I am God, or that you may see that in quality of God I can forgive sins; but to let you see that in quality of *man* upon earth I have power to forgive sins.

It might be said, that our Saviour would have used (against the Scribes and Pharisees, to prove himself God

from their own principles) some such argument as this: You grant that he who forgives sins is God; now, by this miracle which I have wrought, I shew you that I can forgive sins; consequently, according to your own principles, it follows, that I am God. But our blessed Redeemer did not openly make use of this argument; for although tacitly and in fact, especially in discovering to the Jews their own thoughts, he gave them sufficiently to understand that he was God, the searcher of hearts; yet, in the curing of the man sick of the palsy, what he more expressly made appear was, that even in quality of man he had power to forgive sins: this being the intention of the miraculous cure, "that you may know," says he, that (not only the Son of God, but also) "the Son of man has power even upon earth to forgive sins, arise" sick man, "take up thy bed and go into thy house." Upon this, as it is related in the chapter above cited, all the people were astonished and seized with fear, and all "glorified God," not because God himself had such power, which they knew before, but because he had given such power even to men.

Now, as from the divinity of our Redeemer down to his humanity is derived and descends an unlimited power of remitting sin, so from the man-God, who is our head, down to the ministers of his Church, who are his members, is also derived and descends a power of remitting all sins, of what kind soever they be, not indeed in their name or by their own authority, but in the name and by the authority of God. "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you." (John, 20, v. 21.) He hath sent me to save the world; you shall also become in some sort its saviours. He has sent me to destroy sin, to sanctify sinners, to reconcile men with him—go, complete this great work; and to this effect, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins

you shall forgive, they are forgiven them : and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." (John, v. 22, 23.)

There is no absurdity, therefore, in saying, that man can forgive sins when empowered by God so to do. It would, indeed, be not only absurd, but blasphemous, to say that he can forgive sins by his own power ; as no man by his own power can raise the dead to life, because both the one and the other equally belong to the power of God. But, as God has sometimes made men his instruments in raising the dead to life, so the Catholic believes, that he has been pleased to appoint that his ministers should, in virtue of his commission, as his instruments and by his power absolve repenting sinners ; and as this is evident from the texts cited above, it cannot be but a false zeal, under pretext of maintaining the honour of God, to contradict this commission, which he has so evidently given to his Apostles, and their lawful successors.

The same is also proved by various reasons. In the first place, if priests be not indeed judges, and have no power truly to remit sins, but simply to declare them to be remitted, it is certain that no one would be lost from this cause alone, namely, that they could not procure a priest to reconcile them. But St. Austin, in his 108th Epist. to Honoratus, explicitly writes, that some desiring to be reconciled, and of course believing in Christ, were eternally lost, because (having neglected the opportunity when it presented itself) they died before they could be absolved by the priest. "Do we never reflect," says he, "when danger is extreme and when there is no possibility of escaping it, how great a concourse is usually in the church, of both sexes and of every age ; some demanding baptism, some to be reconciled, some, again, the very action of penance itself, and all the consolation and completion of the sacraments

and their distribution? When, should the ministers be absent, how great is the misfortune that attends those who depart this life, either without having been regenerated (baptized), or without having been loosed (without having their sins remitted them)? How great also is the lamentation of the faithful, their relatives, who will never have them with them in the enjoyment of eternal life?" Thus far St. Austin.* Nor does St. Leo write differently, in his 91st Epist. to Theodorus. From which places we may gather, that sacramental reconciliation has the virtue to justify, and that it is not a simple declaration only of justification either already received or about to be received.

In the second place, if priests do not remit sins in any other manner than by declaring the divine promises, it would be certainly equally vain and ridiculous to absolve the deaf and those deprived by sickness of the use of their senses. "Where there is no hearing," says the wise man in Ecclesiasticus, 32, v. 6, "pour not out words." But in the primitive Church, not only the deaf, but also those who by violence of sickness were bereft of reason were sometimes reconciled, as is manifest from St. Austin, Lib. 1, De Adulterinis Conjugiis Capit. ult.; from St. Leo, in his Epist., cited above, to Theodorus; from the 4th Council of Carthage, Can. 70, and the Arausican Council, Can. 12.

In the third place, if absolution were merely a declaration of the remission of sins, either it would be rash, or it would be superfluous. For, when the minister says, "thy sins are forgiven thee," he pronounces this either abso-

* Unquestionably, this decisive authority of St. Augustine holds up to view the practice of the Church at its brightest era, of which that great Father was a distinguished ornament; it clearly overturns all the wretched sophistry, subterfuges, evasions, and inconsistencies which are adopted by many Protestants on this momentous affair.

for absolution worth of a baptism

lutely or hypothetically; that is, provided he believe and repent as he ought. If absolutely, he pronounces it rashly, as he knows not whether he who solicits to be reconciled be truly penitent and have faith such as is requisite for justification; besides, although the minister may in some degree know this, yet the penitent knows it better, and consequently does not stand in need of that declaration of the minister, which can add nothing to his certitude. But if the absolution be conditional (as Calvin teaches), such an absolution can never render a penitent secure and certain, as it depends upon an uncertain condition; and yet our adversaries rarely admit any other end in the absolution, than to render the individual certain of his justification.

In the fourth place, if the absolution be not a judicial act, but a simple enunciation of the divine promise which stands recorded in the Gospel, any individual, a layman, nay even a woman, a child, or an infidel, will be able to absolve no less than the priest: and although our adversaries admit this, because it follows evidently from their principles, yet it is contrary to the consent of all the Fathers, contrary to the practice of every Church, of every age, and even of sound reason.

I now proceed to support the same Doctrine from another passage of the revealed written word. I read—

Catholic Version.

Acts, 19.

18 And many of them that believed, came confessing and declaring their deeds.

19 And many of them who had followed curious

Protestant Version.

Acts, 19.

18 And many that believed came and confessed, and shewed their deeds.

19 Many of them also which used curious arts,

Catholic's rule

Catholic Version.

arts, brought together their books and burnt them before all.*

Protestant Version.

brought their books together, and burned them before all men.

* Whenever the Scripture speaks of sin, in general it is, and must be, understood of all sins; and should it be understood of some only, and not of all, the most absurd and ridiculous sentences might be found in holy writ. Thus, for example, Daniel, 4, 24, "Redeem thou thy sins with alms;" Matt. 1, "He shall save his people from their sins;" Matt. 9, "Son be of good heart; thy sins are forgiven thee;" Luke, 11, "Forgive us our sins;" John, 1, "Behold who taketh away the sins;" Acts, 24, "That they may receive forgiveness of sins," &c. In these, and innumerable other places, the Scripture speaks of sins in general terms only, yet it is manifest that it intends and includes all sins; and although each one in particular be not expressed, they are nevertheless evidently understood; and no one will ever doubt but that "Redeem thy sins with alms," "He shall save his people from their sins," "Son, be of good heart, thy sins are forgiven thee," &c., &c., mean one and the same thing with "Redeem all thy sins with alms," "He shall save his people from all their sins," "Son, be of good heart, all thy sins, without exception, are forgiven thee:" and so of the rest. Wherefore, according to the manner of speaking of the Scriptures, to confess and to declare their deeds, or sins, can mean nothing else than to discover and to reveal all their sins.

Calvin has thought proper to propose a few antitheses in his commentary upon the Acts between this confession of the Ephesians and the confession, as it is now in use, of Catholics, in order to make it appear that the above cited text does not in the least favour us. "We read," says he, "that these confessed but once; but the Papal law commands us to confess at least once every year. These went forward of their own accord, but the Pope imposes it as a duty upon all. Luke says that many came, not all; but under the Papal law there is no exception. These humbled themselves before the assembly of the faithful; but the Pope has issued a very different command, namely, that by secret whisperings the sinner shall auricularly reveal his sins to his priest. See how dexterously they accommodate the Scriptures to prove their fallacies." Thus Calvin.

But

This text, in the first place, is to be understood of the confession of the faithful after baptism, for they only are properly called believers, as is evident from—

But such light and puerile calumnies scarcely deserve refutation ; for although we read but once of the Ephesians having confessed, it does not however follow that they did not do it oftener ; otherwise it might be concluded that these same Ephesians, because we read nowhere of their having received either baptism or the Eucharist, according to Calvin's logic, had never received either the one or the other.

As to their having gone of their own accord to make their confession, this ought not in the least to surprise us, as well because there was no law at that time compelling any one to confess within a given time, as because, even in our days, many go spontaneously to confession not only at Easter, when alone they are obliged by the Ecclesiastical law, but also repeatedly through the year. Wherefore, although there had not been, even at that time, a law compelling all to confess yearly, the Ephesians could still have gone freely and spontaneously to confession at other periods.

“ But many came to confession, not all.” What opposition has this to that law which obliges all to confess their sins at least once every year ? Neither does this law absolutely include all, but those only whose consciences are defiled by mortal sin ; nor does it even oblige these at all times, but only once every year. Wherefore, supposing this ecclesiastical law not to be in force, at the time of St. Paul, still some of the Ephesians could have made their confession when all did not make it.

Finally, as to what regards their having humbled themselves in the assembly of the faithful, I do not know whence Calvin has taken this, unless from his own brain ; for St. Luke makes no mention of it. “ Many,” says he, “ of those who believed came confessing and declaring their deeds.” But whether they came before the assembly of the faithful, or in a private manner to St. Paul, or to any one else, St. Luke does not say. Besides, do not Catholics even in our days humble themselves before the assembly of the faithful, when in our confessionals, ranged in the middle of our temples, the whole congregation looking on, they cast themselves at the feet of the priest, and secretly make their confession to him ? See how dexterously Calvin accommodates his antitheses to weave in his calumnies.

Catholic Version.

Acts, 2.

41 They therefore that received his word were baptized : and there were added in that day about three thousand souls.

44 And all they that believed were together, and had all things common,

Protestant Version.

Acts, 2.

41 Then they that gladly received his word were baptized : and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.

44 And all that believed were together, and had all things common.

See also 1 Thessalonians, c. 1, and many other places, but this is not denied by any one of our adversaries.

In the second place, the Scripture unquestionably speaks here of the confession of sins, according to their different species, as appears from the words “confessing and declaring their deeds,” for no one can be properly said to confess his deeds who simply avows himself in general terms to be a sinner. Besides, the word declare, or as the Greek has it *enagello*, which St. Luke here makes mention of, signifies to relate something distinctly, and in the Syriac edition we find a word which signifies the same as the Hebrew *Saphar*, and may be properly translated numbering their sins, which certainly imports a detailed confession. How true, such was the case, appears from St. Paul’s ordering their books to be burnt, which he could not do unless they who followed curious things confessed their sins in detail.

Finally, it was a confession made, not to men, but to God’s ministers, such as St. Paul ; and as, at that time, there was no law or constitution in the Church commanding the confession of sins, it indisputably follows from this passage of the Scriptures, that confession was ordained and instituted by Christ. I am aware that Luther explains

deeds as signifying miracles, but this exposition is not only rejected by the unanimous consent of all Catholics, and especially by the venerable Bede, but by far the greatest part of the Reformers themselves, as Melancthon, Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, Sarcer upon the Acts of the Apostles, Illyricus, and Kemnitius.

The third passage I shall adduce, in confirmation of Confession, is taken from the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, chap. 5, which is expressed in these words:—

Catholic Version.

18 and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation.

19and he hath placed in us the word of reconciliation.

20 For Christ, therefore, we are ambassadors, God as it were exhorting by us. For Christ, we beseech you, be reconciled to God.

Protestant Version.

18 and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation ;

19 and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

20 Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech *you* by us: we pray *you* in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.

Calvin, himself acknowledges, in the fourth book of his *Instit.* c. 1, sec. 22, that these words refer to the power of the keys, and frankly confesses that this power is to be exercised, as well publicly as privately, towards the faithful who have been baptized. Now, certainly those who are sent as ambassadors, invested with a power to reconcile the enemies of a king, with the monarch himself, cannot properly discharge their ministry unless they know from the guilty what they have done, what the nature of the offence is

which they have committed, what satisfaction they are disposed to make, &c. &c.

Wherefore this ministerial power necessarily carries with it the power of hearing the causes of the guilty, and consequently, of exacting and receiving their confessions: nor is it lawful for the ministers to reconcile, at pleasure, any, without having previously heard them.

The fourth passage is taken from the Epistle of St. James, c. 5, wherein this Apostle exhorts the faithful to confess their sins. His words are these:—

Catholic Version.

16 Confess therefore your sins one to another.....

Protestant Version.

16 Confess *your* faults one to another.....

which exhortation manifestly shows confession to have been already instituted, and that it was to be made not only to God, but also to man. This agrees manifestly with the above words, according to the explanation which the Fathers give of them. For, a little above, the Apostle St. James had admonished the sick to bring in the priests of the church, in order to pray over them, anointing them with oil, and likewise added: that the effect of that sacred unction, and of the prayers would be, “to save the sick and raise them up, and if they should be in sins,” to remit and deliver them from them. But in order that the reader might not conclude from these words that those deadly or mortal sins of which a person might be guilty, would be remitted by the sacred unction, he subjoined: “Confess, therefore, your sins one to another:” for the sacred unction does not remit those mortal sins of which a man may have a knowledge, since these are to be cleansed by the sacrament of confession; but such as are venial, or even mortal

which we have no knowledge of, and which are commonly called the remnants of sin.

But, our adversaries object, and particularly Melancthon, in his Apolog. Confess. art de confess. and satisfac. ; and John Calvin, lib. 3, Institut. c. 4, s. 12, regarding the words one to another, that these words indicate, that St. James does not speak of sacramental confession, which is made to the Priest only, but of the confession of an injury done to an offended brother, in order to be reconciled with him, and to obtain his pardon, or, of the confession of sins, which is made to a pious and holy man, in order that he, knowing our spiritual infirmity, may instruct us, and offer up prayers to God for us.

But this objection is easily removed. For Origen in his second homil. in Levit ; St. Chrysostom, book 3. de sacerdot ; St. Augustin, homil. 12. ex lib. 50 hom. ; and St. Bernard in his Book of Meditations, chap. 9 ; maintain, that the above words are simply to be understood of confession which is made to a priest ; and as venerable Bede in his commentary upon this passage, and Hugo de S. Victor, book 2, on the Sacraments, correctly expound, these words one to another are to be taken, as the agreement of the words of the Scripture requires ; consequently, confess your sins one to another, imply the same, as, you being men, confess to men ; you, who stand in need of absolution, to those who have the power to absolve, from these words : whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them. As in the first Epistle of Peter, c. 4, when the Apostle says :—

Catholic Version.

9 Using hospitality one towards another without murmuring.

Protestant Version.

9 Use hospitality one to another without grudging.

Catholic Version.

10 As every man hath received grace, ministering the same one to another: as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.

11 If any man speak *let him speak* as the words of God. If any man minister, *let him do it* as of the power which God administereth: that in all things God may be honoured through Jesus Christ: to whom is glory and empire for ever and ever. Amen.

Protestant Version.

10 As every man hath received the gift, *even so* minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.

11 If any man speak, *let him speak* as the oracles of God; if any minister, *let him do it* as of the ability which God giveth: that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

he certainly does not wish to give us to understand by the words "using hospitality towards one another," that all without discrimination are to receive the rights of hospitality from all, or that all are to be taught, or all to be cured, &c., but that those who have no house or are in need should be hospitably received by those who have, or who are in easy circumstances; that the ignorant should be instructed by the learned; the sick should be cured by physicians; the poor supported by the rich; and not, that the rich should be supported by the poor, or that physicians should be cured by the sick, or the learned instructed by the ignorant, or, finally, that those who abound in houses should receive the rights of hospitality from those who have none: so also ought those, therefore, who are bound by the chains of sin to recur to those to whom it has been said: Whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.

The succeeding words also of the same Epistle, namely, "Pray for one another that you may be saved," signify that the priests should pray for the sick, and not the sick for the priests: for St. James manifestly alludes to what he had said before: "Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord."

My last Scriptural argument in defence of Sacramental Confession is taken from—

Catholic Version.

1 John, 1.

9 If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just, to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity.

Protestant Version.

1 John, 1.

9 If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us *our* sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

Here, it is clear, that the Apostle evidently alludes to the distinct remedy instituted by Christ for forgiving sin after baptism; addressing himself to those who had been baptized, he first says—

1 John, 1.

7 and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

1 John, 1.

7 and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

confirming what St. Paul says to the Hebrews, chap. 9,—

14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who by the Holy Ghost offered himself unspotted unto God,

14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot

Catholic Version.

cleanse our conscience from dead works, to serve the living God ?

Protestant Version.

to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God ?

Meaning, no doubt, that by the sacrifice of his blood, once offered on the cross, Christ our Lord paid and exhibited, once for all, the general price and ransom of all mankind, which no other priest could do. St. John, then, same chapter, says :—

8 If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

8 If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

That is, as no man dare say to Almighty God, that he has no sin, for—

Eccles. 7.

21 there is no just man upon earth, that doth good, and sinneth not.

Eccles. 7,

21 *there* is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not.

so, if, acknowledging our sinful nature, we confess our sins—make use of that distinct remedy instituted by Christ for forgiving them : the Almighty God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, because his fidelity and justice were pledged when his only begotten Son pronounced the ever memorable words—

John, 20.

23 Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them : and whose *sins* you shall retain, they are retained.

John, 20.

23 Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever *sins* ye retain, they are retained.

Having thus shewn that Sacramental Confession is a precept of divine institution, clearly proved from the Holy Scriptures, I will now proceed to answer the objections usually made against the Sacrament of Penance in general. I shall commence with the objections against Sacramental Confession.

LECTURE V.

 OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE SEVERAL PARTS OF THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.

First Objection.

It is nowhere read in the Bible that we must confess our sins to a Priest, if we wish to have them pardoned.

Answer.

Well, then, if it is nowhere read in the Bible, that we must confess our sins to a Priest, where are we to look for the authority to justify the practice of confessing our sins to a Clergyman of the Church of England? In the Book of Common Prayer (Visitation of the Sick) I read, "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, &c., &c. After which confession the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort: Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." Now is it not fair to ask, how can it be said, that a Clergyman of the Church of England has this power, and at the same time deny it to a Catholic Priest? Or rather, why is the practice of confession to be enforced by the Minister, at the most

awful period of his fellow-creature's life, when we are told that confession is not spoken of in the Holy Writings? But then, I ask, did not Christ give his Apostles power to forgive sins, when he said the ever memorable words "whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them," &c.? How can this power be brought into action without confession? The moment we admit the power of forgiving sins to have been granted to the Apostles, that very instant we must admit the necessity of Confession, or say that the power was altogether nugatory, or as some Protestant divines have it, merely declaratory. But then, "can it be supposed, that when the Blessed Jesus bestowed on his Apostles, at his first appearance after his Resurrection, in words and manner so solemn, the power of forgiving and retaining sins, he gave them really no judicial power at all? He declared that he sent them, "as the Father had sent him:" surely, he was sent with something more than a conditionally declarative ministry: and therefore he sent his Apostles with more. "When he had said this he breathed on them;" evidently to signify that he infused into them the spirit and power, which he himself had received from his Father. "And he said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Was it necessary for them to receive the powerful grace of the Holy Ghost, to exercise a mere conditionally declarative ministry? After these awful preparations he conveyed to them in precise terms, a most extraordinary commission to forgive and retain. Yet, some find it "the more seemly doctrine," that these emphatic words convey no power of direct positive Absolution? It is not only unseemly, but bordering on impiety, thus to make our Divine Saviour introduce and express with the greatest solemnity, a mere commission to declare what any layman might declare with equal authority. The

notion therefore of conditionally declarative absolution, is false and injurious to the divine institution of Christ. The idea, consequently, of confession being only allowable, and not imperative, is equally erroneous. The power of direct positive Absolution was granted by our Divine Saviour to the Priests of his Church. In granting this power he must have intended to require all those conditions necessary for its due exercise. But entire confession is necessary for the due exercise of the power of absolution. Therefore entire Confession is of divine institution, and imperative upon all who have fallen into mortal sin.

Objection Second.

Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, in the fourth century, abolished the whole system of Confession, which he dared not do were it of divine institution; besides, from that period up to the present, it has never been restored in the Greek Church.

Answer.

Socrates and Zozomen report, that about the year 251, on account of the error of the Novations, who taught that the erroneous crime of Apostacy could not be remitted by the keys of the priesthood, the Church, aided and assisted from above, increased the severity of her holy and prudential discipline, lest, by seeming too indulgent, she might in any way contribute to the propagation of this dangerous error. Accordingly, a priest was appointed in each Church, for the office of Penitentiary, to whom all were to address themselves, to receive a proportionate public penance, after confessing their sins. In the time of Nectarius, who was the immediate predecessor of St. John Chrysostom, in the see of Constantinople, about the close of the fourth century, a certain distinguished female confessed to the penitentiary a most grievous sin committed by her with a deacon in the

Church; the circumstance, however, becoming publicly known, and causing great scandal, Nectarius by the advice of Endæmon, one of his priests, suppressed the office of penitentiary altogether, and left it to each one's conscience to approach to the Sacraments without the necessity of doing public penance, provided he considered himself not to stand in need of it.* From this circumstance, however, it cannot be concluded that Sacramental confession was altogether abolished. No such inference could be more unfounded. We do not deny that Nectarius abolished the office of penitentiary, which had been only instituted after the persecution of Decius, but he did not attempt to abolish the practice of private confession, which remained in full vigour, as it had been before the office of penitentiary was instituted. Nectarius only abolished that which could give occasion to public scandal; but private auricular confession could give no room for scandal; therefore there was no necessity for its abolition, and it was not, consequently, abolished. The faithful were no longer obliged to apply to one appointed penitentiary, but might choose any other priest, and follow their own discretion as to the public penance, which he might enjoin. Thus private confession became even more solidly confirmed and sanctioned. The penitentiary was not the only priest who heard confessions in a city so populous as Constantinople; but he was the only one appointed to prescribe and enforce public penance.

* Thus, Nectarius abolished an institution merely ecclesiastical; but not one divinely instituted, which he neither could nor would have attempted to abrogate. But auricular confession, as it has been proved, is of divine institution. Therefore, he neither could nor did attempt to abolish it. Finally, that confession is not in use in the Greek Church is false.

Third Objection.

There is another necessary condition of the Sacrament of Penance, to which, besides that of confession of sins to the priest, the reformed Church objects, namely, that of satisfaction, or atonement of sin, to be made by the sinner on his repentance. This they reject as injurious to God, and lessening the full atonement made to Him, by the merits of the life, passion, and death of Christ for the sins of mankind; as if sinful man was therefore exempt from offering any other atonement than Christ's, without any co-operation on his part.

Answer.

The congruity of man's atonement to God, for sins committed against his Divine Majesty, may be evinced, by analogy of the temporal court of judicature, when a criminal may be acquitted, as to the whole guilt laid to his charge, and punishment due to it; yet he is not freed from the penalty, more or less, adequate to his guilt, as imprisonment, pillory, correction, &c. However, to establish it on the firmest ground, namely, Divine Law—Old, and New, the old prefigurative of the new; I ask, did not God, on the transgression of our first parents, besides the immediate punishment of death, which He previously menaced to inflict on their transgressions; did He not require, and accordingly inflict, other means of atonement, or satisfaction? What other was that on Eve?—

Catholic Version.

Gen. 3.

16I will multiply thy sorrows, and thy conceptions, in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children, and thou shalt be under thy

Protestant Version.

Gen. 3.

16 I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conceptions; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire *shall be* to thy hus-

Catholic Version.

husband's power, and he shall have dominion over thee.

17 And to Adam he saidwith labour and toil shalt thou eat thereof all the days of thy life.

19 In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, &c.

Protestant Version.

band, and he shall rule over thee.

17 And unto Adam he said in sorrow shalt thou eat *of* it all the days of thy life.

19 In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, &c.

Besides, for the remission of sin, not only was restitution first required, if injury were done, but, moreover, satisfaction was required, for the offence, to God. When David had sinned by vanity in numbering his people, God sent his prophet Gad to him saying—

2 Kings, 24.

12I give thee thy choice of three things, choose one of them which thou wilt, that I may do it to thee.

2 Sam. 24.

12I offer thee three *things*; choose thee one of them, that I may *do it* unto thee.

To David also, on committing adultery with Bethsabee, and putting her husband to death, Nathan the prophet is sent, and on confessing his sins, the prophet announces the remission of them from God, yet, with reservation of temporal punishment, namely, the death of the child. (2 Kings, c. 12, v. 14.) The prophet says, *the Lord hath also put away thy sin*. What a powerful argument in support of the Catholic doctrine of the forgiveness of sins. The Holy man does not arrogate to himself the power of absolving him. This was a privilege, reserved for the new covenant of the law of Grace, first conferred by the Eternal

Father upon Christ in his sacred humanity, and by him transferred to his Apostles, as his ministers and deputies, and from them to descend to their successors; namely, that contrary to what had ever passed on earth before, where sins were wont first to be cancelled in Heaven, and the pardon then, if at all, declared upon earth; now the sentence of judicature should be first pronounced by man here on earth, and then ratified in Heaven—here the Priest, by the authority delegated to him from Christ, giving absolution from sin, and there sealed and confirmed by Christ himself. The wicked Achab, by hair cloth, fasting, and other humiliations, escaped part of his deserved punishment. (3 Kings, 21.) The Ninevites, at the preaching of Jonas, and on the threats denounced on them, did penance, and thereby escaped destruction. (Jonas, 3.) The blessed Jesus confirms the same, when he upbraids the cities that had not done penance—

Catholic Version.

Matt. 11.

21 Wo to thee, Corozian, wo to thee, Bethsaida: for if in Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the miracles that have been wrought in you, they had long ago done penance in sackcloth and ashes.

Protestant Version.

Matt. 11.

21 Woe unto thee, Chora-zin! woe unto thee, Beth-saida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sack-cloth and ashes.

Again, the Scriptures everywhere teach, that God requires of all men, that they should on their part, co-operate with Christ's sufferings, in order, thereby, to derive for themselves, the application of the merits of Christ.—

Catholic Version.

Rom. 8.

16we are the sons of God.

17 And if sons, heirs also; heirs indeed of God, and joint-heirs with Christ: yet so, if we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him.

Heb. 12.

7 Persevere under discipline...

8 But if you be without chastisement, whereof all are made partakers, then are you bastards, and not sons.

Col. 1.

24 Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh for his body, which is the Church:

1 Cor. 9.

27 But I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection...

1 Peter, 2.

21 For unto this are you called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving you an example that you should follow his steps.

Protestant Version.

Rom. 8.

16we are the children of God:

17 And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with *him*, that we may be also glorified together.

Heb. 12.

7 If ye endure chastening.....

8 But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.

Col. 1.

24 Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the Church:

1 Cor. 9.

27 But I keep under my body, and bring *it* into subjection...

1 Peter, 2.

21 For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps.

It must, however, be understood, that we do not believe our sufferings, or other satisfactions, to be in themselves meritorious, this we reject with horror, we firmly believe that our satisfactions, dead in themselves, acquire life, and merit through the all-atoning satisfaction of Christ.

Here it may be observed to the learned of the Reformed Church who object to the necessity of man's making atonement or satisfaction to God, offended by his sins, that they wrest the proper signification of the words of Christ, and of St. John the Baptist, "Do penance," as if they implied *only* repentance and sorrow, or a forsaking of former sins, and a future amendment of life; in a word, repentance without satisfaction. Thus they interpret the Greek word *metanoia*, repentance, contrary to the very usual signification of that word, by the most ancient ecclesiastical writers, who for *pœnitentes*, repenting sinners, as those who in the primitive times did public penance, express it *oi en metanoia ontes*; that is, men doing penance. The like as to confession of sins, which ecclesiastical writers express by the same Greek word, and the penitents coming to confession, *tous metanountas*. See Sozom, 1, iii., c. 19; Dionys. Eccles. Hier. c. iii. in initio. St. Cyprian, Ep. lii.; St. Aug. 1, xii. conf. c. 12: where it signifies perfect repentance, that consists not only in confession of sins and amendment of life, but moreover in sorrow for offences, and painful satisfaction—it is to this part they object. However, the Greek words *metanoein* and *metanoia* (Matt. xi., 21; Luke, x., 13; 1 Cor. vii., 9), must signify painful satisfaction; such as was that of the Ninevites with fasting, hair cloth, and ashes—*metanoian*.—(St. Basil).

Relative to this point, the judicious Mr. Bois, prebendary of Ely, in his book, entitled "Veteris Interpretis cum Beza, &c., collatio Londini, 1655," commended by Walton in his

Polyglot, declares he would not have the common translation of "*pœnitentiam agite,*" do penance, changed: and brings these words of Melancthon, "Let us not be ashamed of our mother tongue; the Church is our mother, and so speaks the Church." (Matt. iii.) Thus they let the private interpretation of individuals supersede the generally-received interpretation of the Catholic—Universal Church, "the ground and pillar of truth."

Fourth Objection.

Many Protestants assert, that the necessity of offering atonement for sin by penitential works is derogatory to the abundant atonement Christ made by his sufferings and death for the sins of the world; is also injurious to the infinite goodness and mercy of God; and therefore it is not necessary or requisite for man to offer any other atonement to God than that which Christ has made.

Answer.

The Catholic Church, firmly believes and teaches, respecting satisfaction, that Jesus Christ, at once both God and Man, was alone, in consequence of the infinite dignity of his person, capable of offering up to God a sufficient atonement for the sins of his guilty creatures. Having, however, done this, and done it even superabundantly, it was in his power to apply the benefit of such expiation in two different ways: either, in the first place, by an act of entire abolition, without the reservation of any punishment whatsoever, or else by the commutation of a greater punishment into a lighter; that is, by the exchange of eternal sufferings into temporal ones. The former of the two methods is the most complete, and at the same time the most conformable to the notions of infinite goodness. For these reasons it is that God applies it, in the first instance, in the Sacrament of Baptism. The latter is

that which we believe he makes use of in forgiveness of those sins which are committed after baptism ; being compelled, as it were, to this diminution of his tenderness by the ingratitude of those who have thus abused the first benefits of his mercy. They are, consequently, obliged to endure a certain process of temporal punishment, although that which is eternal has been kindly remitted to them.

It would, however, be wrong to infer from these principles, that Christ Jesus has not satisfied completely for us. He has done so, and the inference which the above principles present is, on the contrary, this, that having by the infinite price which he has paid for our salvation acquired an absolute dominion over us, he for this reason forgives us upon such conditions, under such laws, and with such restrictions, as to his wisdom appear becoming.

It would be even an act of injustice and ingratitude did we dare to contest with our beneficent Redeemer, the infinitude of his merits, under the illusive pretext that, forgiving the sin of Adam, he has not at the same time released us likewise from all its consequences, leaving us still subject to death, and to a variety of infirmities, both corporal and spiritual, which that offence had called down upon us. Enough it is that His goodness has paid once that ransom by which we shall one day be delivered from all those evils which distress us now. It is ours to receive with gratitude and humility every token of his beneficence, be they ever so small, which His goodness is pleased to bestow, considering in these the steps by which in His wisdom He accelerates the work of our reconciliation, and displays, by a more striking manifestation, both the tenderness of his mercy, and the severity of his justice.

For reasons similar to the preceding we ought not to be astonished, if He who has shown so much lenity in baptism

should also, after the violation of our sacred promises, show Himself more rigorous and severe. It is reasonable, and even salutary to us that God, whilst he remits both sin and the temporal punishment which sin had merited, should yet, by way of check to restrain us within the boundaries of duty, demand from us some kind of temporal chastisement ; lest, emancipated too soon from the bonds of justice, we nourish a presumptuous confidence, and abuse the facility of obtaining pardon.

It is, consequently, in order to fulfil this obligation that we are subjected to a certain series of painful duties,—duties, which also we are bound to comply with in a spirit of deep humility and contrition. It was the necessity of these labours of satisfaction that compelled the Church during the early ages to impose upon sinners those heavy mortifications which we call the canonical penances. When, therefore, now the Church imposes upon sinners any painful and laborious duties, the act of performing these is what we denominate satisfaction. When in consequence of the extraordinary fervour, or piety of the penitent, the Church thinks proper to mitigate the severity of her discipline, this act of relaxation is the thing which we term an Indulgence, by which the Catholic Church means nothing else than “ a release of the temporal punishment due to such sins as have been actually forgiven by the Sacrament of Penance.” Hence, it is not, as many Protestants imagine, an encouragement, or leave to commit sin, or a pardon by anticipation of future sins. No, it regards not immediately and directly the pardon of any sin whatever, but on the contrary, it requires and presupposes sin to be already forgiven by hearty and sincere contrition, and the other parts of the Sacrament of Penance. Besides, the power of dispensing indulgences is principally invested in the Head of

the Church; (for the power does not belong to a simple priest, nor even to an abbot, or a rector of a parish, unless they have received competent jurisdiction for the express power), it is, as I have just observed, principally inherent in the Supreme Pontiff; and in a limited manner in Bishops. Hence, far from being a blasphemous usurpation of the divine authority, it is the delegated power of Heaven, administered according to the will of God; far from being a novel institution, whose origin can be traced no higher than the eleventh century under Urban II., it has been practised in the earliest ages of Christianity; far from being repugnant, or contrary, to the Holy Scriptures, it is entirely consistent with the inspired writings, and claims its strongest authority from them; far from being destructive to religion, by relaxing the nerves of discipline, it is a strong incentive to piety, by a prudent application of mercy; and far from being an inducement to sin by the indulgence of crimes, or easy purchase of pardon, it is the restraint of guilt, which of necessity presupposes the most difficult, as well as the most noble efforts of the combined powers of grace and nature, namely, a sincere detestation of sin, and true repentance of heart.

Fifth Objection.

Many Anglican divines explain the words of John, 20, v. 21, &c., as of a mere declaratory power.

Answer.

To suppose the ministry of the Apostles and their lawful successors, with regard to the power of forgiving and retaining sins, to be merely declaratory, and not juridical, would be degrading and nullifying the emphatical words of our Lord's institution. He declared, that he sent them as the Father had sent him—

Catholic Version.

John, 20.

21 As the Father hath sent me, I also send you.

22 When he had said this, he breathed on them ;

Protestant Version.

John, 20.

21 Peace *be* unto you : as *my* Father hath sent me, even so send I you.

22 And when he had said this, he breathed on *them*,

—evidently to signify, that he infused into them the spirit and power, which he himself had received from his Father—

..... and saith unto them :
Receive ye the Holy Ghost.

..... and saith unto them,
Receive ye the Holy Ghost.

Surely it was not necessary for them to receive the powerful grace of the Holy Ghost to exercise a mere conditionally declaratory ministry ; still very many Protestants are of this opinion, and consequently say that the words that follow—

23 Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them ; and whose *sins* you shall retain, they are retained.

23 Whose soever sins ye shall remit, they are remitted unto them ; *and* whose soever *sins* ye retain, they are retained.

—conveyed to the Apostles no extraordinary power or commission to forgive and retain sins, no power of direct positive absolution. But certainly the reader, if candid, will surely regard this construction of the words of the Redeemer, not only as unseemly, but bordering on impiety ; whereas, it makes him introduce and express, with the greatest solemnity, a mere commission to declare what any layman might declare with good authority.

Sixth Objection.

Many persons, who do not understand the principles of Catholics, and undertake to preach and write against them, say that we Catholics maintain that the only means of being reconciled with God, when we have offended him, is by confession alone. This old exploded calumny, raked up for the edification of the ultra bigots, we have in a late number of the "Protestant Journal," where we read:—"It is held in the Catholic Church, that the priest has power to forgive sins; that whether the sin be mortal or venial, if only it be confessed and the enjoined penance performed, he has power to forgive it, and to confer judicially an absolution from sin."

Answer.

Miserable indeed must be the state of that Church, and unsecure her foundations, which has recourse in her writers to such gross calumnies as is the one in question. The Catholic Church teaches, that the reconciliation of the sinner must commence from contrition, which includes in itself what every other religious society means by repentance; and it maintains that, without this contrition or sorrow, without a deep and earnest grief, and firm purpose, with the assistance of God's grace, not to sin more, no confession on the part of the penitent, or absolution on the part of the priest avails before Almighty God; on the contrary, that he who seeks for reconciliation with God without this sorrow and without this determination, in place of obtaining pardon for his sin, commits a most grievous sacrilege, and thereby adds to the guilt of his former sins and transgressions, and departs from the sacred tribunal more heavily laden than when he approached it. In the mean time, directing the attention of the reader to the means proposed by the Church of England for the performance of the last act of repentance, by which we are

cleansed from sin, it must be confessed that its doctrine is laid down in the vaguest manner. We are told (Art. xi.) that we “are accounted righteous before God, only for the merits of Christ, by faith, and not for our own works; wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort,” and we are referred to the Homily on Justification for further explanation. We are told also (Art. xvi.), “that there is a place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.” Referring, however, to the Homily on Justification, we find it frequently repeated that men are to be justified by faith alone, without good works. Love is certainly spoken of as an ingredient in this faith; but we are not told how the sinner is conducted to it. We are never informed how his return, like that of the prodigal child, is to be accomplished, when he becomes sensible of his guilt; much less are we told in what way he is to be gradually conducted to that faith which justifies the sinner. The nature of this faith is not even explained to us. In vain, then, do we ask whether, for man’s justification—

1. We must be satisfied with the simple persuasion or conviction, that the merits of Christ are sufficient to purge us from all sin? or—

2. That his blood has been applied to us all, and that we are forgiven when we think on this same blood? or—

3. That there is a more individual application to each one, whenever sin is regretted? Besides—

4. What are the criterions, the tests whereby the true reconciliation may be discerned from the imaginary or false?

5. What is its process—is it one of simple conviction?

6. What is to authorize us to feel this conviction?

7. What are the previous steps which make us worthy

of it, and which can make us suppose that we have merited it?

Alas! on all these important points we are left in obscurity—in darkness. Each Church of England divine gives the opinion or sentiments of his own mind; hence we find so many different ideas as there are persons who have written upon it. In the first Reformers—the fathers and founders of the Reformation—passing their contradictions and inconsistencies by unnoticed, we have an attempt to shew the mode or manner how the justification of the sinner is attained. In the works of Luther, and the articles of faith of several Churches, we are told, that the first step to justification is the terror of conscience; that the soul, contemplating the dreadful abyss of misery whereby it is surrounded, seeing itself necessarily on the brink of eternal destruction, is excited to a deep sorrow for its sins, and returning through the merits of Christ, and faith in him, its sins are covered and taken away in the sight of God. The preliminary step, therefore, for the sinner's justification is simply terror, or dread of God's judgment; the next step is sorrow; the final one is an act of faith in the power of Christ to redeem and save by the efficacy of his blood. (See Mohler's *Symbolick*, chapter on this subject.) Now, the Catholic Church requires all these dispositions; but it considers them as mere inefficient acts—incipient, which must be farther matured before confession can be of avail. The Council of Trent represents, indeed, the soul as terrified and struck with horror at the awful state to which guilt has reduced it, as struck then by the sense of God's judgment, it is for a moment lost in fear and apprehension, till naturally looking on the other side for relief, it sees before it the immense mercy and goodness of God, then balancing that with the divine justice, the

soul is stirred up to hope for mercy and pardon, and craves to be admitted again to the divine embraces: then, with feelings of affection for God's goodness, in condescending to receive so great a sinner into the arms of divine mercy, its fear is banished; for as we read—

Catholic Version.

1 John, 4.

18 perfect charity
casteth out fear,

Protestant Version.

1 John, 4.

18 perfect love cast-
eth out fear:

—and the soul is inflamed with an ardent love of God, and brought into that state which is the immediate precursor and cause of forgiveness; as we find is described—

Luke, 7.

47 Many sins are
forgiven her, because she
hath loved much.

Luke, 7.

47 Her sins, which
are many, are forgiven; for
she loved much.

Thus, then, in Catholic principles, faith is the principal root of justification; but there are acts of other virtues, through which the soul must pass, before it is justified.

This is also the doctrine of the Apostle, who every where tells us that except through faith no man can be justified, and that no man can be justified through faith except through Christ, and through faith in him, so this progress of Justification begins in *that* faith and ends in the application of the blood of our Redeemer as the only means of salvation. But I have said there are acts of other virtues through which the soul must pass, before it is justified. Yes, the Catholic Church teaches, that the sin-

ner being sorry for having offended God, having, I say, a supernatural sorrow, that is, exclusively drawn from the attributes of God ; supreme, that is, a hatred of sin beyond every other evil on earth ; universal, that is, without excepting any one single fault or omission ; being also ready to make reparation for the evil done, he repairs to the lawful parties of Christ, in order that by manifesting his past offences by an humble and sincere confession, he may be sacramentally absolved from them. For it believes that Christ has established such a tribunal among men. That at this tribunal, when we lay open our offences and expose our sins to those, who are deputed and authorized by the Church for this purpose, the moment the minister of Christ says the words, “ I absolve thee from all thy sins,” the judicial sentence passed on earth is ratified in Heaven by Almighty God. This in virtue of the words, “ whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them.” But as it may often happen that we may not manifest sufficiently our contrite dispositions ; or it may appear that our sorrow is not either supernatural, or supreme, or universal ; or make firm resolutions of amendment, then it is prudent on the part of the Minister of Christ to defer the absolution, this Christ has provided for, when he said “ and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.”

Seventh Objection.

But is it not enough to declare sins in general, granting, for argument's sake, that priests have a power to forgive them ? What necessity is there to make a specific declaration of them ?

Answer.

“ Let it be supposed, for example, that a private individual should present himself before a civil court, requesting a decision of his case, and desiring to be informed of the

penalty, if any, attached to his transgression. What answer, think you, would the judge naturally make him? He would tell him: ‘My good friend, I should be glad to know, first what your case is; what law have you infringed? What have been your transgressions? How often, &c.? Otherwise how shall I be able to determine any thing about you?’

“I will suppose, which God forbid—that Mr. Faber is seized with some serious attack of illness. The physician is sent for, and attends. ‘What ails you, my good Sir? You seem greatly reduced; where do you feel pain?’ ‘O I am very ill; my suffering is excessive.’ ‘How did it begin? Where do you feel it particularly?’ ‘O, Sir, I have acted very wrong, I acknowledge; and I am truly sorry for it: if you did but know what I suffer!’ ‘But tell me then; is it in your head, or stomach, or side? Let me know where your pain lies.’ ‘My pain weighs heavily upon me; it is intolerable; I can tell no more.’ In vain does the physician persist in endeavouring to obtain some further information, some particular avowal of his real situation; he can elicit none. Not knowing, therefore, what remedies to prescribe, and fearful of bringing on his death, instead of promoting his recovery, *quod enim ignorat, medicina non curat*, he leaves the patient to himself, and to his friends, who are driven to despair by his obstinacy, which is so likely to cost him his life. But, be well assured, Sir, that Mr. Faber would never adopt for the cure of his body, the plan of proceeding which he recommends you to follow for that of your soul. He would conceal nothing from his physician; he would tell him at once the cause, the seat and the nature of his disorder; and he would scrupulously confess the smallest circumstances, however slightly they might appear to aggravate his distemper. Accurately

informed by his account, the physician would act directly upon the evil, and triumph over it by suitable remedies. Perhaps Mr. Faber might relapse from time to time, but he would be re-established by speedy recourse to the physician, whose excellent treatment would long preserve him to his family, his friends, and his dear parishioners. I shall not be surprised if, after reflecting on his own experience, he finds it not so objectionable a plan, to compare the confessor to the physician, the sinner to the patient, and the infirmities of the soul to those of the body: and perhaps even ends by making trial upon his own soul of that very process of cure which he at present so unreasonably condemns in the practice of Catholics." (Answer to the Rev. G. S. Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, by the Right Rev. J. F. M. Trevern, D.D., Bishop of Strasbourg.)

Last Objection.

"What! would you have me reveal to a man like myself all the irregularities of my life, and all my secret sins known to God alone! must I expose the shame of my conduct and most secret thoughts! give a full detail of the disorders which I have so carefully concealed from the world, and which I could wish, were it possible, to erase from the memory of my accomplices, and even from my own! must I lay open my secret intentions, my motives, and mad desires, the very remembrance of which still covers me with unutterable confusion: No, Sir, it is more than I can submit to: the humiliation is quite intolerable; and though you should demonstrate every other article of your religion, this alone, of Confession, would for ever withhold me from your Communion." This language is alarming, but it does not at all surprise me. Such expressions, and a similar aversion, are common to many. However, from this natural repugnance experienced in all ages, it appears

that a powerful consequence may be deduced ; namely, that the aversion we all feel against this most humiliating act of repentance, has so imperious an ascendancy over our minds, that no earthly power could ever succeed in compelling us to surmount it. Imagine to yourself the most absolute Monarch, the most ancient and Universal Council, and you have all that is most imposing belonging to earth and Heaven ; yet these would never succeed by their own authority, either in forcing this act of obedience, or in persuading us to submit to this odious yoke. The command must absolutely have come from Heaven ; from Him who reads the heart, and rules the conscience ; and the first Christians must have heard it from Jesus Christ himself, or his Apostles.

“ You may seek, as long as you please, for some other origin of a practice, the very idea of which alarms self-love ; to me it appears impossible to find any other than the express command of Jesus Christ.” (Amicable Discussion.)

I will close this answer with the remarkable words of Henry VIII. “ Put the case, that not one word was particularly or figuratively read of confession, nor any thing spoken of it by the Holy Fathers ; yet, when I consider that all people have discovered their sins to the Priests for so many ages, when I consider the good that continually follows the practice of it, and no evil at all, I cannot think or believe it to be established or upheld by any human invention, but by the Divine order of God. For the people could never, by any human authority, be induced to discover their secret sins, which they abhor in their consciences, and which they are so much concerned to conceal, with such shame and confusion, and so undoubtedly to a man that might, when he pleased, betray them. Neither could

it happen, that among such great numbers of priests, some good, and some bad, indifferently hearing confessions, they should all retain them; and that also, when some of them can keep nothing else secret, if God himself, the author of the Sacrament did not, by his special grace, defend this so wholesome a thing. For my part, let Luther say what he will, I will believe that Confession was instituted, and is preserved by God himself; not by any custom of the people, or Institution of the Fathers." (Defence of the Seven Sacraments.) To sum up—

If, therefore, any of our opponents should still persist asking by what authority do your priests take upon them to forgive sins? The answer and solution are obvious and evident: by the same authority, namely, of Christ; by whose authority, and through whose merits alone, our priests forgive sins by the Sacrament of Penance, as they do forgive sins by the Sacrament of Baptism; and also your own ministers by Baptism.

But whence the necessity of the sinner's accusation or confession of his sins to the priest? The answer is also obvious. Priests are appointed by Christ the spiritual judges and physicians of his spiritual kingdom—the Church, analogous to the temporal judges appointed by the temporal king; similar, also, to the several corporal physicians throughout the kingdom, by their profession. Vain and insignificant would be the appointment of judges, by the king's authority, to judge criminals, and, according to their own judgment, to acquit or condemn, unless the judge took cognizance of the supposed crimes. In the civil court, it is true, the criminal, by the law of nature and of nations, is not to be his own accuser, therefore he always sets off with "Not Guilty." His prosecutor and witnesses are cited to make the accusation, and, in consequence of such accusa-

tion, the judge proceeds, examines, and finally pronounces "Acquitted," or denounces "Guilty." The physician, in like manner, proceeds, not to prescribe remedies, nor to give his opinion of the sick person's disorder, whether mortal, dangerous, or slight, and if it may be easily cured by appropriate remedies, till the patient opens to him all his complaints, and the symptoms, and causes of his illness; and this the patient complies with, though the cause be ever so malignant and secret: the physician then, to come to a better knowledge, examines him more minutely as to circumstances, &c., to all which the patient readily and frankly answers and makes confession. Similar to these two parties, is that of the repenting sinner, as to the confession of sins. The priest, as judge, cannot otherwise know the secret sins, nor even the public ones, of the sinner coming to him to obtain the forgiveness which God has promised to the truly repenting sinner, unless the sinner open to him the sins of which he is guilty. On this occasion may be applied that of Proverbs (chap. 18, v. 17), "The just is first accuser of himself: his friend (the priest) cometh, and shall search him." Thus, similar is the case of the temporal judge and corporal physician, and that of the spiritual judge and physician, of the temporal criminal and the sick person. The temporal judge passes his sentence accordingly, on the supposed and accused criminal, either acquitting or condemning him to punishment more or less grievous, of long or limited duration, or he cites him to give bail for his future better conduct, or for his future appearance at his court of judicature; or he finally cuts him off from all communication with mankind, by death. All this the judge does as of himself, and by his own authority, yet, in fact, he acts only in the name of the king, and by the power and authority that the monarch conferred on

him, and as delegated by the king to that purpose. Thus, does the priest, throughout the whole of his spiritual function, act in the name, by the authority, and delegation of Christ.

But at this spiritual tribunal of the Church, the priest despises not the man that turneth himself from sin, himself being sinful, and needing the mercy of God, by the same means by which the sinner himself seeks to obtain it. "He that thinketh himself to stand, let him take heed lest he fall." (1 Cor. 10, v. 12.) The priest is, moreover, the spiritual physician; and if corporal diseases, the more violent, painful, and dangerous they are, attract, or draw, greater compassion from the corporal physician, and excite him to greater attention to his patient; so, undoubtedly, is it with the spiritual physician, by how much more the spiritual life of the soul is of greater importance than that of the body. "Blessed is he that findeth a true friend, and that declareth justice to an ear that heareth." (Eccles. c. 25). This consideration should suffice to remove every obstacle of shame, fear, &c., that may deter even the most heinous sinner from accepting the gracious offer of God to forgive him his sins, on his confession of them to a priest, however humiliating the requisite condition may be. Moreover, seeing that a corporal physician, with whom his patient acts, and to whom he discloses the most latent and malign causes of his distemper, with confidence of secrecy, would be the basest of men, were he to make known to others such confidential disclosure made to himself, and would be despised and abhorred by mankind, much more so would the priest be in a similar case: for, as Eccles. remarks, "He that discloseth the secret of a friend (much more so with respect to sins heard in confession), looseth credit, and shall never find a friend to his mind." (Chap. 27, v. 17.)

Besides, by the law of the Church, to the breach of the seal, or confessional secrecy, is annexed a most severe punishment on the infringer. Christ, also, by whose ordinance the confession of sins is appointed, in order to the forgiveness, has there manifested his special protection of secrecy, seeing that it hath never yet been known, that even an apostate and wicked priest revealed the secret sins confessed to him at the tribunal of penance, while he exercised that function in the Church, though, after his apostacy, he became inimical to it, even to that degree, as to decry it down with the pen. But as to the sufficiency of confessing sins to God alone, who knows the secrets of the hearts of men, St. Augustine observes, “Do penance such as is done in the Church; let no man say, I do it secretly; I do it to God. In vain then, did Christ say, ‘whatever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven,’ &c., ‘whose sins ye shall forgive,’ &c., ‘whose sins ye shall retain,’” &c. (Hom. 49.)

“If others, finally, should object the confession made with the intention of deceiving the priest, I answer that the circumstance of the possibility of a priest being deceived by hypocritical confessions, is of no weight against the utility and general certainty of the practice of confession. It is the exception, not the rule. The power of absolving was given in compassion to true penitents. Multitudes of these apply for it, and receive it with fruit and consolation: the hypocrite will rarely approach at all. Besides, Mr. Faber ought to know that the Catholic Church does not believe her priests empowered to absolve any who are not truly penitent: hence, a hypocritical applicant receives no benefit, but only loads his soul with the fresh guilt of sacrilege. The confessor may be deceived, but God cannot;

and thus, while the true penitent is forgiven, the absolution falls null upon the head of the hypocrite.

“Before we pass to the evidence from the Fathers, I must ask Mr. Faber what he considers the ‘more seemly doctrine’ as to the power of retaining sins equally bestowed by our blessed Redeemer. Like other Protestants, he keeps this entirely out of sight; but it is of great importance in determining the real nature of the commission with which the priests of the Church are invested. Our Saviour empowered them both to forgive and to retain sins, thus clearly investing them with a discretionary power of judging. How would Mr. Faber exercise the latter? Surely, in order to retain sin, a priest must know what he is to retain, and why he retains it. If a person makes to Mr. Faber a poor, lame confession, by acknowledging some weighty matter which lies heaviest upon his conscience, he will be sure to have it conditionally declared to him that he is absolved. It is impossible to conceive a case in which Mr. Faber would, or could, ever exercise the power of retaining sins. The sinner while he confessed some heavy sin, as a man might make a confession of murder before he mounted the fatal drop, might say nothing of a multitude of other crimes with which his past life had been defiled; nothing of innumerable restitutions which he owed, nothing of enmities which he had no intention of terminating by sincere reconciliation; and yet none of these would be retained. He would be sure of ‘conditionally declarative absolution,’ but of retention of sins never confessed, or repented of, he would be in no danger. The most that my opponent could say in reply would be, that the conditional declaration equally applied to retaining, and that conditional absolution implied also conditional retention. But,

if absolution be expressly declared, why not retention? I suspect for no better reason than the 'hopeless absurdity' of a priest gravely and formally saying, as he must do in such case, to a penitent, 'By the authority of Christ committed to me I absolve thee from all thy sins, and by the same authority I retain them all in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.' I may well add, in Mr. Faber's own phrase, that a 'mere statement of this is amply sufficient for its full exposure.'"—(*Husenbeth, &c.*)

Having replied to the leading objections against confession, I shall now proceed to offer, in proof of the divine institution of Confession, several arguments drawn from reason, which will place this Truth above all doubt, and beyond the possibility of contradiction.

I prove it, in the first place, from its antiquity. For all human institutions in the Church are found to derive their origin either from some General Council, or from the decrees of some Pope; but that Confession existed in the Church before the decree of any council or of any Pope, may be seen from the testimonies cited above; since St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and Origen lived not only before the convocation of the first general council, namely, the Nicene, but before every other council, provincial not excepted, and every Pope who has issued any bull touching sacramental Confession.

Again: That Confession is of divine institution, I prove from this well-known axiom of law, namely, *In dubio, melior est conditio possidentis*; that is to say, if a man has enjoyed the quiet and undisturbed possession of a certain property for a length of time, and it cannot be shown that he acquired, or holds the same unjustly, the law will always support and maintain him in his possession, because it pre-

sumes always in favour of him who is in possession ; and this very possession is considered by law a sufficient title : the justness of which decision is founded upon this other maxim, *Nemo presumitur malus donec probetur*, that is, no one is presumed guilty until he be proved. Now let this be applied to confession. The Catholic Church has been in possession of confession these eighteen hundred years. If not, let the contrary be proved. Let it be shown, 1st. Who the artful impostor was that first intruded it into the Christian world ; 2ndly, in what century or age of the Church this innovation took place ; 3dly, in what country it was first introduced ; 4thly, who were the chief abettors of this strange dogma ; and 5thly, who were they that opposed it. He who denies the divine institution of Confession must be able to point out each of these five points ; for it is a fact well known to all who have the slightest knowledge in Church history that at the most trifling and insignificant innovations or changes that have taken place in the Christian world every one of the above points can always be ascertained. Now, as this is impossible in regard to Confession, we must conclude that the author of confession is our Divine Saviour, Jesus Christ himself, according to the celebrated rule laid down by St. Austin, lib. 4, de Bapt., c. 6, where he says, “ *Quod Universa tenet Ecclesia, nec a Conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, Auctoritate Apostolicâ traditum rectissime creditur,*” that when any doctrine is found generally received in the Church, in any age whatsoever, whereof there is no certain author, or beginning to be found, then it is sure that such a doctrine comes down from Christ and his Apostles.

2. I prove it, in the second place, from the difficulty of establishing such a law ; for if there be anything in the

Catholic Church which may be considered hard and difficult, it is most assuredly confession. What is there in effect more irksome and disagreeable than for an emperor, a king, or persons of the highest distinction to be compelled to reveal to the priests, who are but sinful men like themselves, all their most hidden and shameful abominations of whatever nature or species, or however painful the discovery may be to the feelings of the penitent, to submit to the judgment of these same priests, and to undergo the penalty enjoined by them? So great is the difficulty attending such a matter that it may be safely pronounced incredible that any prelate would ever dare to make or introduce such a law, or that he would ever be able to persuade the people to receive and submit to it for so many ages; unless it were indeed established, supported, and encouraged by a divine command, institution, and promise. Divine, therefore, must be the authority which has brought the minds of men to submit to confession, and divine the promise that has brought them to submit to it willingly.

3. The third argument is drawn from its great utility; for an humble confession brings always with it so many real benefits and advantages, that if there were no other proofs of its divine institution, these alone would suffice. For whether we consider God, or whether the priest who governs his Church by his authority; whether we take the whole Church in general, or only each of the faithful individually, the signal utility of confession everywhere appears. First, we discover in this scheme the wonderful mercy of God, who does not here extort the confession of the guilty after the manner of terrestrial judges, in order to condemn them after having confessed; but like a charitable physician, in order to heal their wounds so soon as they shall discover them; also his justice, which checks the

pride of the sinner, by the humility of confession, and which exacts that those who did not blush to do what was shameful, should undergo the confusion of confession. Secondly, great advantage is derived therefrom to the pastors of souls, who by the confession of the sheep, become acquainted with their diseases, and thus are better enabled to apply to each one the most convenient remedies, as well in private by their counsels, as in public by their discourses. Thirdly, the utility of confession, both to the Church and State is no less apparent; for many evils which can never be remedied by public courts of justice are without difficulty corrected by the tribunal of penance. Witness the number of restitutions daily made, which would never be made without it;—witness the many families divided by mortal dissensions from time immemorial that are reconciled, and meet together again in the kiss of peace and friendship;—witness the many baneful effects of slander and calumny which are arrested and destroyed by the retractions and reparations of penitents, who are obliged to discharge this duty at the risk of their characters under the penalty (in case of refusal) of being deprived of absolution, and consequently of the benefit of the Sacrament;—witness the many unjust contracts that are dissolved by it,—the many thousands of vices and disorders most injurious to the community which are eradicated, and which the civil authority would in vain attempt to suppress;—witness, in short, the many dangerous conspiracies, and other foul compacts which have been from time to time, and are still detected and eluded by the confessor's wise and prudent counsel to the penitent, and caution to the State. Lastly, the principal utility that accrues from confession is received by those who discharge as they ought this duty with integrity and fidelity. For, to say nothing of the inestima-

ble benefit of having their sins remitted them, and of being reinstated into favour with God, which Jesus Christ has solemnly promised (Matt. 18, v. 18, and John 20, v. 22-23), they will receive also many other advantages; such as present comfort and ease of conscience, a remedy against future sins, directions and prescriptions from the minister of God for curing the spiritual maladies of the soul, &c. 2dly, by this passing confusion, which will last but a moment, they will escape the dreadful shame of having their sins written on their foreheads at the last day, to their eternal confusion, when the Lord, according to the Apostle St. Paul, 1 Cor. 4, will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts. These and many other advantages, of which frequent mention is made in the works of the Holy Fathers, are obtained by every sincere penitent upon making a faithful and exact confession of his sins.

4. The fourth and last argument I shall offer in favour of the divine institution of Confession, is drawn from the infallibility of the Church, which has repeatedly and solemnly declared this truth in her general councils, and emphatically taught the same in every age. This declaration alone of the Catholic Church, the oldest and only Church that has descended in a direct line from the Apostles down to us, and which St. Paul styles "the pillar and ground of the truth," ought, indeed, to suffice to resolve every difficulty on this subject, and banish for ever all doubt.

I beg to submit in confirmation of the above Truth one more proof, drawn from the figures which have preceded Sacramental confession, from which a two-fold argument may be formed. In the first place, if the confession which God exacted in the old law was a mere figure, as indeed it

was, "all these things happened to them in figure;" St. Paul tells us in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, c.10, v.11, it is certainly necessary, that in the new law there should be a confession of sins commanded by God, and a confession as much more perfect and exact as the thing figured is above the figure. In the second place, if confession made before a minister of God was deemed necessary at that time, when no power was given to the priests to remit sin, who is there that will not infer that it was far more necessary that confession should be enjoined in the new law, when we can confess with so much benefit, as to obtain a certain and speedy absolution of our sins, by a worthy confession?

The first figure, therefore, is found in the 3rd and 4th chapters of Genesis, where God first exacted from Adam and Eve, and afterwards from Cain, the confession of their sins. In these places confession is exacted, not of the heart only, but also of the mouth; not in general only, but also in particular; not to God only, but also to his minister: for the interrogation was made by an Angel appearing in human shape, as appears from his walking in Paradise at the afternoon air (Genesis, 3, v. 8). From which there appears so great a similarity between that confession and the confession which is now made to a priest who is also an angel of the Lord according to Malachy, chap. 2, v. 7. that the one may be said with reason to be the figure of the other. Wherefore, this figure is beautifully treated by Tertullian in his second book against Marcion; also by St. Ambrose, in lib. de paradiso, cap. 14. and lib. 2 de Cain et Abel, cap. 9; also by St. Greg. lib. 22, *Moralium*, cap. 13; and by St. John Chrysostom, homil. 18. in Gen.; who all expound these places as having a bearing upon confession, and say that God wished

to extort a confession from them, that they might wipe away by it what they had committed by transgressing.

The second figure may be found in the 13th and 14th chap. of Leviticus, where the judgment of the leprosy is committed solely to the priests. The lepers were obliged to shew and present themselves to the priests, and according to their determination either to remain out of the camp or after their cure to return to the same : which law our Lord also approved in Matt. chap. 8, when he said to the leper who had been healed by him : " Go shew thyself to the priest, " &c. That this was a figure of Sacramental confession, St. Chrysostom, lib. 3, de Sacerdotio, and St. Jerom. in cap. 16 Matthæi, equally testify. For, from this St. Jerom infers, that the priests ought to know the different species of the sins ; and St. Chrysostom shews, that the office of Christian priests is far more excellent than was formerly that of the Jews, as they had the power not to heal the leprosy, but to declare it healed ; whereas ours have power not to declare the sins healed (that is remitted), but to heal (to remit) them in effect.

The third figure is the confession which God instituted in the old law, in addition to which he exacted as a satisfaction the oblation of a sacrifice ; of which we have a proof in Numbers, chapter 5, and also in Leviticus, chapter 5. For, unquestionably, if figurative confession was instituted by God and necessary by the divine law, how much more ought the confession prefigured to be esteemed instituted by God, and necessary by the divine law ? The words of the Scripture in the Book of Numbers, chap. 5, are these, " And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying : say to the children of Israel, when a man or woman shall have committed any of the sins that men are wont to commit, and by negligence shall have transgressed the command-

ment of the Lord and offended, they shall confess their sin." Here two things are to be observed : first, that the Hebrew word corresponding to the term confess, is in the conjugation of hitpaél, which augments its signification ; so that it may correctly be interpreted, they shall expressly and distinctly confess. Secondly, these words : "they shall confess their sin," are more clear and explicit in the Hebrew : for thus we read, they shall confess their sin which they have done ; from which we infer that, in this place, an open confession of every sin according to its different species was commanded ; for if it was sufficient to confess them in general only, the Scripture would not say, they shall openly confess their sin which they have done, but simply they shall confess their sins.

In Leviticus, chap. 5, where our version has : Let him do penance for his sin ; in the Hebrew we find the same expression as in the Book of Numbers, for thus we there read : And it shall be, when he shall sin in any one of these things, that he shall openly confess the sin which he hath sinned.

Moreover, the testimonies of the Rabbis, and the practice of their nation sufficiently shew, that this precept is to be understood of distinct confession, and, according to the species of the sin, for the expiation of which sacrifice was to be offered. Respecting the practice of the Hebrews, Thomas Walden, in his second tome on the Sacraments, chap. 137, writes, that he was informed in Austria of this their custom by the Jews themselves : and St. Antoninus in the third part of his Sum. Theologic. tit. 14, chap. 6, § 1, says, that the more learned among the Jews were always careful before their death, to confess all their sins to some Levite, if, perchance, one could be had. For the testimonies of the Rabbis, see Peter Galatinus, lib. 10, chap. 3,

who proves from many testimonies of them, that they conceived it to be necessary, in confession, to make a full declaration of their sins, according to their different species and circumstances.

Add to this, that it is more than probable that the Book of Ecclesiasticus in the 4th chap. exhorts to the observance of this legal precept when it says: "Be not ashamed to confess thy sins;" for there is, generally speaking, very little shame attending a confession made to God alone, or which is made in general terms only to men; but the reverse is but too often the case in a confession made to men, according to the different species of the sin, as experience sufficiently proves.

The fourth figure is found in St. Matthew, chap. 3, and St. Mark, chap. 1, where we read that many went out to John (the Baptist), and were baptised by him, confessing their sins: for as the baptism of John was a figure of the baptism of Christ, so also was the confession which was made to John a figure of the confession which was to be made to the ministers of Christ. It must also be remarked, that those who went out to John did not declare themselves in general terms to be sinners, for this would not, in any manner, be conformable to the words of the Evangelists; but they most evidently made an open and thorough confession of all their sins, according to their different species; for both Evangelists expressly say that they went out confessing their sins.

ADDENDA

TO THE LECTURES ON PENANCE.

It forms no part of my present undertaking to discover what is the real Doctrine of the Established Church regarding Confession, but then I consider it necessary to adduce authorities of this Church on this important point—

1st. Bishop Montague (Gagger Gagged, pp. 78, 83, 84) says, “It is confessed that all priests, and none but priests, have power to forgive sins; that private confession to the priest is a very ancient practice in the church. We urge it in extremis, we require it in case of perplexity.” (Appeal to Cæsar, p. 299) he says: “This is my Popery, for which I bring as my authority the injunction, direction, and practice of the Church. Priests have power, not only to pronounce, but to give remission of sins, ’tis the doctrine of our Prayer Book, and that of the Church of England.”

2nd. Dr. Sparrow (Cambridge Sermon on Confession, pp. 14, 15) says: “Our confession must be *integra et perfecta*, not by halves; all our sins must be confessed, *omnia venialia, omnia mortalia*, God alone blots out our sins; true! but there is another confessor that would not be neglected; he who would be sure of pardon, let him find a priest, and make his humble confession to him, God having delegated Priests his judges here on earth, and given them the power of absolution, so that they can forgive the sins of those who humbly confess to them. Heaven waits, and expects the priests’

sentence here, ‘and what the servant binds or looses, the Lord confirms in Heaven.’” (Mind, Dr. Sparrow exceeds the precept of the Catholic Church, he requires the confession even of venial sins.)

3rd. Bishop Andrews speaks plainly of the necessity of Confession when he says on the text of John, 20, v. 23.—“There are here expressed, three persons:—1st. The person of the sinner, in *quorum* (whose sins). 2nd. Of God, *Remittuntur* (they are forgiven them). 3rd. Of the Priest, in *Remiseritis* (you shall forgive). Three are expressed, three are required, and when three are required, two are not enough.” (Court Sermon on St. John, 20, 23.) He also quotes the authority of St. Augustine, where that Holy Father declares, that if confession be deemed unnecessary, then to no purpose were the keys given, and we make void the words of Christ.

4th. Chillingworth charged his hearers to have recourse to a confessor, “as to one that hath authority, delegated to him from God himself, to absolve and acquit you of your sins.” (Serm. 7, Religion of Protestants, pp. 408, 409.)

5th. The immortal Leibnitz, distinguishing what is essential in Confession, and what was left to the Church to determine, such as the periods when the priest to whom, and the manner and form according to which, the Confession should be made, says (*Systema. Theolo.* p. 272), “Nor will Confession be the less of divine institution, as the Church has determined and prescribed, although it be certain, that the mode has varied at different times; for God has left many things regarding the dispensation of his Sacraments to be appointed and regulated by his Church, not that the Church can directly make any thing be of Divine right, but that God himself has made certain conditions and circumstances of those things which are of Divine right,

to depend upon the dispositions of the Church." Same work (p. 270) he also says, "It cannot be denied that the whole of this institution is worthy of the Divine wisdom, and if there be anything in the Christian religion of superior excellence, and worthy of praise, it is assuredly this, which filled even the Chinese and Japanese with admiration; for the necessity of confession both deters many from sins, those especially who are not yet hardened, and affords to those who are fallen great consolation; so that I consider a pious, grave, and prudent confessor, as a great instrument of God for the salvation of souls, for his counsel is profitable for governing our affections, for detecting our vices, for teaching us to avoid occasions of sin, to restore what has been stolen, to repair losses, to remove doubts, to alleviate the afflicted mind, finally to remove or mitigate every evil of the soul."

6th. Luther, in the seventh tome of his works, in his Inquiry whether the Pope has power to command Confession, thus writes: "I look upon private confession," says he, "to be a very precious and salutary thing. O how much ought all Christians to rejoice that it exists, and to thank God that he has permitted and given it to us." "Two reasons," continues he, "ought powerfully to excite us to confess willingly and cheerfully. The first is, the holy Cross, that is, the shame and confusion for a person to accuse himself of his own accord, before other men, and to be tried by them. O! if we but knew what pain this voluntary confusion prevents, and how propitious it renders God, when a man thus humbles and annihilates himself, we would dig up confession from the very earth. No fasting, no prayers, no indulgence, no suffering, can contribute so much as this voluntary shame to render a man humble, that is to say, susceptible of grace. And would to God it were

a custom to confess publicly before the whole world our secret sins as St. Austin did. O God! how soon should we become men rich in grace! And why are we so much ashamed before one man, when we shall have to endure so much on our death bed, which is not far distant, before God, all his angels, and the devils, which will go infinitely harder with us; all which we may now easily prevent, by this momentary shame before one man? Besides, I do not know, whether a person can have a true and lively faith, who is not willing to suffer so much, and to take up so small a piece of the cross. The second reason which ought to incite us to make a voluntary confession, is the precious and noble promise of God, Matt. 16, 'And whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in Heaven;' and John, 20, 23, 'Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them.'—Thus Luther.

Again, in his second tome, fol. 84, edit. Lat. Wittemberg, 1546, he says:—"There is no doubt but that the Confession of sins is necessary and commanded by God. But private Confession which is now in use, pleases me in every regard, and is not only useful, but even necessary. I would not that it were not; nay I rejoice, that it is in the Church of Christ, because it is the only remedy to an afflicted conscience!"

Again, in his book against the Anabaptists, and *alibi*, he declares, speaking of the Church of Rome, that "she is the true Church, the pillar and ground of truth, and the most holy place. In this Church God miraculously preserves baptism, vocation, and ordination of Pastors, the image of the crucifix, the remission of sins, and absolution in Confession," &c. Again—"We confess that under the Papacy are many good Christian things, yea, all that is good in Christianity, and that we had it from thence: For

we acknowledge that under the Papacy is the true Scripture, true baptism, the true Sacrament of the Altar, true keys for the forgiveness of sins, true office of preaching, true Catechism, as the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the articles of the faith. I say, moreover, that under the Papacy is true Christianity, even the very kernel of Christianity."

7th. In the Augsburg Confession or Apology, art. 11, 12, 22, Apol. de pœnit, pp. 167, 200, 201, it is expressly laid down, that "Absolution ought to be retained in confession: that to reject it is an error of the Novatians, and a condemned error; that this absolution is a true sacrament and properly so called; that the power of the keys remits sins, not only in the sight of the Church, but also in the sight of God." In Luther's little Catechism, which is unanimously received throughout the whole party, we find these words: "In the sight of God we must hold ourselves guilty of our hidden sins: but with respect to the minister, we must confess those only, which are known to us, and which we feel within our hearts." The better to discover the Lutherans' conformity with us, in the administration of this sacrament, the reader need only refer to the Absolution which, as the same Luther in the same place sets it down, the Confessor gives the penitent, after confession, in these terms: "Do you not believe that my forgiveness is of God?" "Yes," answers the penitent. "And I," replies the Confessor, "by the orders of our Lord Jesus Christ, forgive you your sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

8. Melancthon corroborates the testimony of the Arch-Reformer; for in the 11th Article (Acts of Ratisbon) he declares, "As for absolution there is no doubt about it, for it is

evident that we retain it in our churches and approve and defend it." So, according to Melancthon, there is no doubt about it.

9. The Church of England also is so well convinced of the divine institution of confession, that she enjoins a special charge to be given to those of her communion, to confess their sins on two occasions: the one, when about to receive communion they shall find their consciences charged with any grievous sin, which we call mortal; the other when they are sick. It is thus the minister addresses the first in the conclusion of his exhortation before communion, as laid down in the Book of Common Prayer (latest edition printed in England)....." And because it is requisite that no man should come to the holy communion, but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

10. I now come to the Book of Common Prayer; and what doctrines do we find in the order for the Visitation of the Sick given to the minister who visits the dying Protestant? Among the rest, the following: "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter—after which confession the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort—Our Lord Jesus who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his

great mercy forgive thee thine offences, and by his authority committed to me I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

11. In the great Protestant Council held at London, under James the First, the 113th canon declares, " That if any one confess his secret sins privately to a minister, for the disburthening of his conscience, and that he may get spiritual relief, we strictly forbid to make known to any person any sin or crime so entrusted to his honour and mercy." This canon is quoted by Dr. Marsh, in his Comparative View of the Churches of Rome and England, page 195.

12. Also the 19th canon of the Protestant Council, held at Dublin, in the reign of Charles I. A.D. 1634, says, " Whereas every lay person is bound to receive the holy communion thrice every year, and many notwithstanding do not receive that Sacrament once in a year. We do require every minister to give warning to his parishioners publicly in the church at morning prayer, the Sunday before every time of his administering the holy Sacrament, for the better preparation of themselves ; which said warning we enjoin the said parishioners to accept and obey, under the penalty and danger of the law. And the ministers of every parish, and in cathedral and collegiate churches, some principal minister of the church, shall, the afternoon before the said administration, give warning by the tolling of the bell or otherwise, to the intent that if any one have any scruple of conscience, or desire the special ministry of reconciliation, he may afford it to those that need it. And to this end the people are often to be exhorted to enter into a special examination of the state of their own souls ; and that finding themselves extremely dull, or much troubled in

mind, they do resort unto God's ministers, to receive from them as well advice and counsel for the quickening of their dead hearts, and the subduing of those corruptions whereunto they have been subject, as the benefit of absolution, likewise for the quieting of their consciences by the power of the keys which Christ hath committed to his ministers for that purpose."

Now, this Canon peremptorily proves that private Sacramental Confession is a doctrine inculcated by the Protestant Church.

13. We read in the third of the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, drawn up in the tenth year of the reign of Queen Anne, by the Archbishops and Bishops and the rest of the Clergy of Ireland: "for preventing abuses in commutations of penance, suitable penance shall be decreed for every crime; and the said penance, or any part of it, shall not be relaxed or commuted by any vicar-general, chancellor, or official of the diocess, without consent of the bishop of the diocess; or in the absence of the bishop, by the consent of two or more grave clergymen commissioned by the said bishop for that purpose; which consent shall be signified under the hand and seal of the said bishop or clergymen. And neither the said bishop or clergymen shall allow any commutation for the whole penance enjoined, but only for some part thereof, which may be thought inconvenient to be executed; and the money taken on such commutations shall be employed by appointment of the bishop or clergymen deputed by him, on some pious or charitable work, to be performed in the parish where the crime was committed." Here we have not only penances, but their commutation, even their reservation to a vicar-general.

14. In one of the late charges of the present Lord

Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Philpotts, we read, " We possess the power to give to men the full and free absolution of all their sins."

15. In the form of ordaining in the Established Church, the Bishop is directed to lay his hands severally upon the head of each one that receiveth the order of Priesthood, the receiver humbly kneeling upon his knees, and the Bishop saying, " Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. ' Whose sins thou shalt forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.' And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of his holy sacraments. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

16. I beg to subjoin an extract from a Sermon preached in Exeter Cathedral, on the 27th July, 1684, by John Reynolds, M.A., one of its Prebendaries. The Sermon was dedicated to the Right Rev. Father in God, the then Lord Bishop of Exeter. In page 19, the Rev. Preacher thus expresses himself:—" Our ministerial employment is so noble, that nothing but that of angels can come near it. Yea, may I with the Apostle in this sense magnifie my office. Rom. 11, v. 13. There are some parts of our holy ministry that do excel and surpass the ministry of angels. The power of the keys whereby Heaven is opened or shut is by God committed unto us, and not unto the angels. Did Christ ever say unto the angels, ' Whatsoever ye shall bind shall be bound, and whatsoever ye shall loose shall be loosed?' Matthew 16, v. 19, and c. 18, v. 18, John 20, v. 23. And yet this power hath he left with the ministers of the gospel. Therefore, in such an honourable service assigned us, give us leave to expect of you the double honour allotted

us, namely, that of reverend respect, and of worthy comfortable maintenance. 1 Tim. 1, v. 17.”

17. The Centuriators acknowledge the antiquity of the belief in Penance; as well as the early practice of Confession. “Private confession,” they own, “was practised in the time of St. Cyprian.” (Cent. 3.)

18. Dove, in his “Innovations unjustly charged,” p. 557, says, “To advise the use of private confession to the priest, is no Popish innovation, but agreeable to the constant practice of this Church. And if any call it auricular, because private and in the priest’s ear, I know not why they should be condemned of Popery.” Assuredly, from all these clear and satisfactory authorities, it follows, that the doctrine of the Established Church is in perfect accordance with the Catholic, on the important subject of Confession. Still how few among Protestants are aware of this! How many among them treat the doctrine of Confession with almost contempt! at least as lightly as any other subject may be treated. I trust this will not happen with the kind Protestant reader, but that, free and high-minded, he will acquiesce with the evidence given him by Protestant Divines of the highest rank and authority, and commence to believe, that Confession is of divine institution.

Connected as is the subject of Indulgences with Penance, I beg to submit, in this Addenda, the doctrine of the Catholic Church regarding the same—

On the subject of Indulgences, the belief of the Catholic Church ever was, is, and will be, that no indulgence remits, or has the power of remitting sin, that neither the Head of the Church—the Pope, or the whole Church of God, does, or ever did, arrogate to itself the privilege or authority of pardoning sin, unless by absolution in the tribunal of

Penance ; and that, not indiscriminately to all, but only to those, whose dispositions of heart, and whose sincerity of contrition and repentance, entitle them to that favour from God by the ministry of the priest. The truth of this appears by defining or explaining the nature of an Indulgence, which is thus defined, “a relaxation or forgiveness of the temporal punishment due to sin.” That we may the better understand this, we are to observe, first, that when we have forfeited the grace of God, and incurred the displeasure of Heaven, by offending mortally, eternal punishment is due to the justice of an offended God, unless a sincere repentance disarms it, and obtains a forgiveness ; in which case the everlasting punishment, which a deadly or mortal offence had merited, is changed into a temporal one, which must be some time expiated ; for it is but just and rational, that some atonement should be made to the offended Majesty of Heaven, which has graciously remitted the eternal vengeance due to our crimes. This atonement, if considered in this life, consists either in the penitential works prescribed by the canons, or imposed by the confessor. In the primitive ages of Christianity, the canons or rules of the Church, prescribed years of public or private penance, according to the reigning discipline, in proportion to the number and enormities of the offences committed. The Church, in its wisdom, has since mitigated this rigour of discipline, by shortening these anxious and afflicting scenes of penance, uniting the merits of Christ to less painful and laborious works, for the remission, not of the sins, but of the temporal pain due to them.

In every sin, therefore, two things are to be distinguished—the crime, and the punishment due to it : the crime is the offence or injury offered to God ; the punishment is the consequence of that offence. It is no less certain and evi-

dent that frequently after the crime has been remitted, the eternal pain or punishment due to capital or mortal offences is changed into a temporal or temporary one. (See page 202.)

The next proposition to be established is, that Christ has left in his Church a power to remit the temporal punishment which has been proved to exist after the remission of sin. For this purpose the reader has only to open his Bible, and see the extensive and unbounded power which our Redeemer bequeathed to the Apostles and their legitimate successors. To Peter he says—

Catholic Version.

Matthew, 16.

19 And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound also in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in Heaven.

Protestant Version.

Matthew, 16.

19 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.

Again, to the other Apostles—

Matthew, 18.

18 Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in Heaven: and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in Heaven.

Matthew, 18.

18 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.

Here is promised by the Blessed Jesus to his Apostles and their lawful successors, a clear, ample, uncontrolled, and unlimited power of removing every obstacle which can, by any construction, impede the ingress of the soul into the kingdom of Heaven; consequently the power of dispensing with the temporal punishment, to be endured after the eternal has been pardoned by the Sacrament of Penance, which pardon depends upon the dispositions of the penitent, for, without them, the sentence of pardon pronounced, is destitute of efficacy.

Finally, it is necessary to observe, that the remission of this temporal punishment, or the use of Indulgences, has been constantly practised in the Church. I beg to refer my reader to—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 5.

1 It is absolutely heard that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as the like is not among the heathens; that one should have his father's wife.

2 And you are puffed up; and have not rather mourned, that he might be taken away from among you, that hath done this deed.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 5.

1 It is reported commonly *that there is* fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife.

2 And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you.

Here the Apostle reproves the Corinthians, for not having publicly excluded from the Church, a certain man who had been guilty of a most scandalous crime. He expressly

censures them, because the man was permitted to remain in full communion, while they were puffed up, and unconcerned for his grievous crime; then, in the following verses, he proceeds to sentence the notorious sinner to a course of salutary penance, and imposes this penance by Divine authority—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 5.

3 I indeed absent in body, but present in spirit, have already judged, as though I were present, him that hath so done.

4 In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, you being gathered together and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus;

5 To deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The last words of this Chapter deserve particular notice—

1 Cor. 5.

13 Put away the evil one from among yourselves.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 5.

3 For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed.

4 In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ,

5 To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

1 Cor. 5.

13 Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person.

From which we see, that the notorious sinner was not ex-

pelled from the communion of the faithful, before St. Paul authoritatively enjoined his expulsion and penance. "I have already judged," &c.

Now, in referring to the second letter to the Corinthians, chap. 7—

Catholic Version.

6 But God, who comforteth the humble, comforted us by the coming of Titus.

7 And not by his coming only, but also by the consolation wherewith he was comforted in you, relating to us your desire, your mourning, your zeal for me, so that I rejoice the more.

8 For although I made you sorrowful by my epistle, I do not repent; and if I did repent, seeing that the same epistle (although but for a time) did make you sorrowful;

12 Wherefore, although I wrote to you, *it was* not for his sake that did the wrong, nor for him that suffered it; but to manifest our carefulness that we have for you.

Protestant Version.

6 Nevertheless God, that comforteth those that are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus;

7 And not by his coming only, but by the consolation wherewith he was comforted in you, when he told us your earnest desire, your mourning, your fervent mind toward me; so that I rejoiced the more.

8 For though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not repent, though I did repent: for I perceive that the same epistle hath made you sorry, though *it were* but for a season.

12 Wherefore, though I wrote unto you, *I did it* not for his cause that had done the wrong, nor for his cause that suffered wrong, but that our care for you in the sight of God might appear unto you.

From which we learn, that St. Paul, being informed by the coming of Titus, of the man's sincere repentance, and of the great desire of the Corinthians that he should be pardoned, authorizes them to grant him an Indulgence. For, he then continues—

Catholic Version.

2 Cor. 2.

10 And to whom you have pardoned any thing, I also. For, what I have pardoned, if I have pardoned any thing, for your sakes have I done it in the person of Christ.

Protestant Version.

2 Cor. 2.

10 To whom ye forgive any thing, I *forgive* also: for if I forgave any thing, to whom I forgave *it*, for your sakes *forgave I it* in the person of Christ.

He had previously authoritatively decided that it was expedient to relax the offender's course of penance, and restore him to the communion of the faithful:—

6 To him that is such a one, this rebuke is sufficient, that is given by many.

6 Sufficient to such a man *is* this punishment, which *was inflicted* of many.

7 So that contrariwise you should rather pardon and comfort him, lest perhaps such an one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow.

7 So that contrariwise ye *ought* rather to forgive *him*, and comfort *him*, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow.

8 For which cause I beseech you, that you would confirm your charity towards him.

8 Wherefore I beseech you that ye would confirm *your* love toward him.

The words, "if I have pardoned," in 10th verse, deserve

our deepest consideration. We see, the Apostle speaks doubtfully, and he might well do so, for he did not consider the man already absolved, and his intention was only to grant him a relaxation from a remaining debt of temporal punishment. The man's austerity and sincerity of penance already undergone, gave great reason to hope, that there might not remain before God any further debt for him to discharge, hence the Apostle expressed himself doubtful if there was need of his favour while he conditionally granted the Indulgence. However, this scriptural fact establishes three important points: First, that the Apostle bound the offender to a course of penance; secondly, that at the desire and for the sake of the Corinthians, he afterwards loosed him, not only from the censure of excommunication, but from whatever debt might still remain upon him of temporal punishment; and, thirdly, that St. Paul thus acted by the authority and power of Christ, committed to the pastors of his Church in these memorable words:—
 “Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.”

Perhaps the reader has never read the extraordinary Bull or Indulgence of the seven great Patriarchs of Protestantism, sanctioning polygamy and adultery! I submit it, and inform him, the original may be consulted in the Catholic College of Carlow, Ireland.*—

* This infamous Indulgence, with the deeds belonging to it, was published from the original, by permission of a descendant of the Landgrave, and republished by Bossuet, Variat. book vi.

*The Consultation of Luther and the other Protestant Doctors
concerning Polygamy.*

“ To the most Serene Prince and Lord, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, of Catzenlenbogen, of Diets of Zeighain and Nidda, our gracious Lord, we wish above all things the grace through Jesus Christ.

“ Most Serene Prince and Lord,

“ 1st. We have been informed by Bucer, in the instruction which your Highness gave him, and have read the trouble of mind and the uneasiness of conscience your Highness is under at present; and although it seemed to us very difficult so speedily to answer the doubts proposed, nevertheless we would not permit the said Bucer, who was urgent for his return to your Highness, to go away without an answer in writing.

“ 2nd. It has been a subject of the greatest joy to us, and we have praised God, for that he has recovered your Highness from a dangerous fit of sickness; and we pray that he will long continue this blessing of perfect health, both in body and mind.

“ 3rd. Your Highness is not ignorant how great need our poor, miserable, little, and abandoned Church stands of, in virtuous princes and rulers to protect her; and we doubt not but God will always supply her with some such; although, from time to time, he threatens to deprive her of them, and proves her by sundry temptations.

“ 4th. These things seem to us of greatest importance in the question which Bucer has proposed to us. Your Highness sufficiently of yourself comprehends the difference there is betwixt settling a universal law, and using (for urgent reasons and with God’s permission) a dispensation

in a particular case; for, it is otherwise evident, that no dispensations can take place against the first of all laws—the divine law.

“ 5th. We cannot advise to introduce publicly, and establish as a law in the New Testament that of the Old, which permitted to have more wives than one. Your Highness is sensible, should any such thing be printed, that it would be taken for a precept, whence infinite troubles and scandals would arise. We beg your Highness to consider the dangers a man would be exposed unto, who should be convicted of having brought into Germany such a law, which would divide families, and involve them in endless strifes and disturbances.

“ 6th. As to the objection that may be made, that what is just in God’s sight ought absolutely to be permitted, it must be answered in this manner: If that which is just before God be, besides, commanded and necessary, the objection is true; if it be neither necessary nor commanded, other circumstances, before it be permitted, must be attended to; and, to come to the question in hand, God hath instituted marriage to be a society of two persons and no more, supposing nature were not corrupted. This is the sense of that text of Genesis—‘there shall be two in one flesh;’ and this was observed at the beginning.

“ 7th. Lamech was the first that married many wives; and the Scripture witnesseth that this custom was introduced contrary to the first institution.

“ 8th. Nevertheless, it passed into custom among infidel nations; and we find afterwards, that Abraham and his posterity had many wives. It is also certain, from Deuteronomy, that the law of Moses permitted it afterwards, and that God made an allowance for frail nature. Since it is, then, suitable to the creation of men, and to the first esta-

blishment of their society, that each one be content with one wife, it then follows that the law enjoining it is praiseworthy, that it ought to be received in the Church, and no law contrary thereto to be introduced into it, because Jesus Christ has repeated, in the 19th chap. of St. Matthew, that text of Genesis, ‘there shall be two in one flesh;’ and brings to man’s remembrance what marriage ought to have been before it degenerated from its purity.

“9th. All this notwithstanding, there is room for dispensation in certain cases; for instance, if a married man, detained a captive in a distant country, should there take a second wife, in order to preserve or recover his health; or that his own became leprous; we see not how we could condemn, in these cases, such a man as by the advice of his pastor should take another wife, provided it were not with a design of introducing a new law, but with an eye only to his own particular necessities.

“10th. Since, then, introducing a new law, and the using a dispensation with respect to the same law, are two very different things, we intreat your Highness to take what follows into consideration.

“In the first place, above all things, care must be taken that plurality of wives be not introduced into the world by way of law, for every man to follow as he thinks fit. In the second place, it may please your Highness to reflect on the dismal scandal which would not fail to happen, if occasion be given to the enemies of the Gospel to exclaim that we are like the Anabaptists, who have several wives at once—and the Turks, who take as many wives as they are able to maintain.

“11th. In the third place, the actions of Princes are placed in a fuller light than those of private men.

“12th. Fourthly, that inferiors are no sooner informed

what their superiors do, but they imagine they may do the same; and by that means licentiousness becomes universal.

“ 13th. Fifthly, that your Highness’s estates are filled with an untractable nobility, for the most part very averse to the Gospel, on account of the hopes they are in, as in other countries, of obtaining the benefices of cathedral churches, the revenues whereof are very great. We know the impertinent discourses vented by the most illustrious of your nobility; and it’s easily seen how they and the rest of your subjects would be disposed, in case your Highness should authorize such a novelty.

“ 14th. Sixthly, that your Highness, by the singular grace of God, hath a great reputation in the empire and foreign countries; and ’tis to be feared lest the execution of this project of a double marriage should greatly diminish this esteem and respect. The concurrence of such a number of scandals obliges us to beseech your Highness to examine the thing with all the maturity of judgment God has endowed you with.

“ 15th. With no less earnestness do we intreat your Highness by all means to avoid fornication and adultery, and own the truth sincerely. We have a long time been sensibly grieved to see your Highness abandoned to such impurities, which might be followed by the effects of divine vengeance—distempers and many other dangerous consequences.

“ 16th. We also beg of your Highness not to entertain a notion that the use of women out of marriage is but a light and trifling fault, as the world is used to imagine, since God hath often chastised impurity with the most severe punishment; and that of the Deluge is attributed to the adulteries of the great ones; and the adultery of David has afforded a terrible instance of divine vengeance. And St.

Paul repeats frequently, 'that God is not mocked with impunity,' and 'that adulterers shall not enter into the kingdom of God;' for it is said, in the 2nd of the first epistle to Timothy, 'that obedience must be the companion of faith, in order to avoid acting against conscience;' and in the 3rd chapter of the 1st of John: 'if our hearts condemn us not, we may call upon the name of God with joy;' and in the 8th chapter of the epistle to the Romans: 'if by the spirit we mortify the desires of the flesh, we shall live;' but on the contrary shall die, if we walk according to the flesh; that is, if we act against our own conscience.

"17th. We have related these passages to the end that your Highness may consider seriously that God looks not on the vice of impurity as a laughing matter, as it is supposed by those audacious libertines who entertain Heathenish notions on this subject; we are pleased to find that your Highness is troubled with remorse of conscience for these disorders. The management of the most important affairs in the world is now incumbent on your Highness, who is of a very delicate and tender complexion, sleeps but little; and these reasons, which have obliged so many prudent persons to manage their constitutions, are more than sufficient to prevail with your Highness to imitate them.

"18th. We read of the incomparable Scanderbeg, who so frequently defeated the two most powerful emperors of the Turks, Amurat II, and Mahomet II; and whilst alive, preserved Greece from their tyranny; and that he often exhorted his soldiers to chastity, and said to them that there was nothing so hurtful to men of their profession as venereal pleasure; and if your Highness, after marrying a second wife, were not to forsake those licentious disorders, the remedy proposed would be to no purpose; every one ought to be master of his own body in external actions, and see

according to the expression of St. Paul, ‘ that his members be the arms of justice.’ May it please your Highness, therefore, impartially to examine the considerations of scandal, of labours, of care, of trouble and of distempers, which have been represented; and at the same time remember that God has given you a numerous issue of such beautiful children of both sexes by the Princess, your wife, that you have reason to be satisfied therewith. How many others in marriage are obliged to exercise and practice patience, from the motive only of avoiding scandal? We are far from pushing on your Highness to introduce so difficult a novelty into your family; by so doing, we should draw upon ourselves not only the reproaches and persecution of those of Hesse, but of all other people, the which would be so much the less supportable to us; as God commands us in the ministry which we exercise, as much as we are able, to regulate marriage and all the other duties of human life, according to the divine institution, and maintain them in that state, and remove all kind of scandal.

“ 19th. ’Tis now customary among worldlings to lay the blame of every thing upon the preachers of the Gospel. The heart of man is equally fickle in the more elevated and lower stations of life; and much have we to fear on that score.

“ 20th. As to what your Highness says, that it is not possible for you to abstain from this impure life, as long as you have but one wife, we wish you were in a better state before God, that you lived with a secure conscience, and laboured for the salvation of your own soul, and gave better example to your subjects.

“ 21st. But, after all, if your Highness is fully resolved to marry a second wife,* we judge it ought to be done

* Let the reader peruse this paragraph with the attention it merits.

secretly, as we have said with respect to the dispensation demanded on the same account, that is, that none but the person you shall wed and a few trusty persons know of the matter; and they too obliged to secrecy under the seal of confession; hence no contradiction, nor scandal of moment, is to be apprehended, for 'tis no extraordinary thing for Princes to keep concubines; and though the vulgar should be scandalized thereat, the more intelligent would doubt of the truth; and prudent persons would approve of this moderate kind of life, preferable to adultery and other brutal actions. There is no need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided all goes right with conscience. So far do we approve it, and in those circumstances only by us specified; for the Gospel hath neither recalled nor forbid what was permitted in the law of Moses, with respect to marriage. Jesus Christ has not changed the eternal economy, but added justice only and life everlasting for reward; he teaches the true way of obeying God, and endeavours to repair the corruption of nature.

“ 22nd. Your Highness hath, therefore, in this writing, not only the approbation of us all in case of necessity, concerning what you desire, but also the reflections we have made thereon: we beseech you weigh them as becoming a virtuous, wise, and Christian Prince. We also beg of God to direct all for his glory and your Highness's salvation.

“ 23rd. As to your Highness's thought of communicating this affair to the Emperor before it be concluded, it seems to us that this Prince counts adultery among the lesser sort of sins; and it is very much to be feared, lest his faith being of the same stamp with that of the Pope, the Cardinals, the Italians, the Spaniards, and the Saracens, he might make light of your Highness's proposal and turn it to his own advantage, by amusing your Highness with vain

words. We know he is deceitful and perfidious, and he has nothing of the German in him.

“24th. Your Highness sees that he uses no sincere endeavour to redress the grievances of Christendom; that he leaves the Turk unmolested, and labours for nothing but to divide the empire, that he may raise up the house of Austria on its ruins. It is, therefore, very much to be wished that no Christian Prince would give in to his pernicious schemes. May God preserve your Highness: we are most ready to serve your Highness.—Given at Wittemberg, the Wednesday after the Feast of St. Nicholas, 1539.”*

“Your Highness’s most humble, and most obedient
Subjects and Servants,

“MARTIN LUTHER,
PHILLIP MELANCTHON,
MARTIN BUCER,
ANTHONY CORVIN,
JOHN LENINQUE,
JUSTUS WINTFERTE,
DENIS MELANTHER.

“I, George Nuspicher, notary imperial, bear testimony by this present Act, written and signed with my own hand; that I have transcribed this present copy from the true original, which is in Melancthon’s own handwriting, and hath been faithfully preserved to this present time, at the request of the most Serene Prince of Hesse; and have examined with the greatest exactness every line and every word, and collated them with the same original; and have

* Here are adultery and polygamy sanctioned by an entire college of Apostolical Reformers!! Let the reader contrast the principles of these lights of modern Christianity with the supposed abuses of Catholicity, and he will shortly perceive on which side the greatest indulgence is required.

found them conformable thereunto, not only in the things themselves, but also in the signs manual; and have delivered the present copy in five leaves of good paper, whereof I bear witness.

“ GEORGE NUSPICHER,

“ Notary.”

*The Marriage Contract of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, with
Margaret De Saal.*

“ In the name of God. Amen.

“ Be it known to all those, as well in general as in particular, who shall see, hear, or read this public instrument, That in the year 1540, on Wednesday the fourth day of the month of March, at two o'clock, or thereabouts, in the afternoon, the 13th year of the Indiction, and the 21st of the reign of the most puissant and most victorious Emperor, Charles the Fifth, our most gracious Lord the Serene Prince, and Lord Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Count of Catzenlenbogen, of Diets of Zeighain and Nidda, with some of his Highness's councillors on one side, and the good and virtuous Lady Margaret De Saal, with some of her relations on the other side, have appeared before me, Notary and Witness under written, in the city of Rotenburg, in the castle of the same city, with the design and will publicly declared before me, notary public and witness, to unite themselves by marriage; and accordingly hath ordered this to be proposed by the Rev. Denis Melander, preacher to his Highness, much in sense as follows:—Whereas the eye of God searches all things, and but little escapes the knowledge of men, his Highness declares that his will is to wed the said Lady Margaret De Saal, although the Princess, his wife, be still living; and that this action be not imputed to inconstancy or curiosity.

To avoid scandal, and maintain the honour of the said Lady, and the reputation of her kindred, his Highness makes oath here before God, and upon his soul and conscience, that he takes her to wife through no levity, nor curiosity, nor from any contempt of law or superiors, but that he is obliged to it by such important, such inevitable necessities of body and conscience, that it is impossible for him to save either body or soul, without adding another wife to his first: all which his Highness hath laid before many learned, devout, prudent, and Christian preachers, and consulted them upon it. And these great men, after examining the motives represented to them, have advised his Highness to put his soul and conscience at ease by this double marriage. And the same cause and the same necessity have obliged the most Serene Princess Christina, Duchess of Saxony, his Highness's first lawful wife, out of her great prudence and sincere devotion, for which she is so much to be commended, freely to consent and admit of a partner, to the end that the soul and body of her dear spouse may run no further risk, and the glory of God may be increased, as the deed written with this Princess's own hand sufficiently testifies. And lest occasion of scandal be taken from its not being the custom to have two wives, although this be Christian and lawful in the present case, his Highness will not solemnize these nuptials in the ordinary way, that is, publicly before many people, and with the wonted ceremonies, with the said Margaret De Saal, but both the one and the other shall join themselves in wedlock privately and without noise, in presence only of the witnesses under written.

“After Melander had finished his discourse, the said Philip and the said Margaret accepted of each other for husband and wife, and promised mutual fidelity in the name of God. The said Prince hath required of me, notary

under written, to draw him one or more collated copies of this contract; and hath also promised, on the word and faith of a Prince, to me a public person, to observe it inviolably, always and without alteration, in the presence of the reverend and most learned masters, Philip Melancthon, Martin Bucer, Denis Melander; and likewise in the presence of the illustrious and valiant Eberthard De Thou, Counsellor of his Electoral Highness of Saxony, Herman De Hundelshausen, the Lord John Fegg of the Chancery, Rodolph Schenck; and also in the presence of the most honourable and most virtuous Lady Anne of the family of Millick, widow of the late John De Saal, and mother of the spouse, all in quality of requisite witnesses, for the validity of the present Act.

“And I, Balthazar Rand of Fula, notary public imperial, who was present at the discourse, instruction, marriage, espousals, and union aforesaid, with the said witnesses, and have heard and seen all that passed, have written and subscribed the present contract, being requested so to do, and set to it the present seal for a testimonial of the truth thereof.

“BALTHAZAR RAND.”

Against this extraordinary indulgence, a book entitled “*Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ*,” is brought against Catholics. This work is said to contain a tariff of the prices at which sins may be redeemed in the Roman Chancery; I beg for the information of the reader to give a few extracts from the celebrated Dr. Lingard bearing on this subject, and invalidating its authenticity. I shall then give my own reasons for considering it one of the vilest fabrications ever invented by interested, designing, and faithless men.

“ Mr. Le Mesurier,” says Dr. Lingard, “ had a third and still more powerful argument in reserve. He hopes to silence his adversary by the testimony of a book which has long been the pride of the bigot and the polemic ; has often reddened with shame the cheek of the most obdurate Papist ; and what is still of more utility to mankind, has furnished the learned, pious, and visionary Mr. Granville Sharp with a key to unlock to astonished mortals the secrets contained in the Book of Revelations. This book, so pregnant with important consequences, is the ‘ *Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ*,’ or a tariff of the prices at which sins may be redeemed in the Roman Chancery,—the great custom-house of human guilt. If the reader will be at the trouble to peruse the different articles of this valuable code he will at least acknowledge, that the Pope is extremely moderate in his demands, and wonder that his Holiness has not employed a British financier to improve the receipts of his treasury. In England you cannot obtain a licence to keep a setting-dog without paying a tax of ten shillings ; at Rome, it seems, a man may murder his father, and enjoy his estate for the payment of the same duty. Here, one-and-twenty shillings are demanded for permission to powder your hair once in twelve months ; there for an equal sum you may keep a mistress without endangering your salvation. However, should Mr. Le Mesurier or his friend stray so far as Rome, I would not have them rely with too much confidence on the ‘ *Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ*,’ they might find themselves in the same unpleasant situation as the Roman nobleman mentioned by O’Leary, who, when he was accused of having three wives living at the same time, attempted to justify his conduct by observing that he had ‘ not been able to meet with one with whom he could be happy.’ ‘ Since it is difficult,’ replies the pontiff Sixtus

Quintus, 'to please you in this world, you shall go and try your fortune in the other, there women are more numerous, and you may find one to your liking.' The '*Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ*' could not save him. He was tried for polygamy, and executed.

"The Roman Chancery is a very ancient establishment, the regulations of which were originally formed by John XXII., and brought into their present state by Nicholas V. At the death of each Pope these regulations are supposed to expire; but his successor is always careful to revive them, and thus they remain at the present day substantially the same as they were some centuries ago. From them—the *Regulæ Cancellariæ Romanæ*, it appears that the causes before that tribunal, regard the temporalities of vacant bishoprics; the collation, permutation, or resignation of benefices; absolutions from canonical censures; and dispensations from the canonical impediments of marriage. With the guilt of sin the Roman Chancery has no concern whatever. All its absolutions are styled in 'foro externo:' they regard only the punishments inflicted by the canons; and of course all the reasoning and accusations, the pious invectives and indignant exclamations, to which the contrary supposition has given birth, are the offspring of error or fiction. It is indeed true, that for the transaction of business in the Papal Chancery, as well as in the Ecclesiastical Courts in England, fees have been required by the officers; but fees are not paid as the price of sin, but for the expedition of business. This circumstance, however, furnished a useful hint to some of the Fathers of the Reformation, who had no objection to a pious fraud, when it might promote the godly work in which they were engaged. The *Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ* were ingeniously corrected, interpolated, and enlarged; the improved copy was circu-

lated by the Reformers, as a proof that Rome was the great custom-house of sin; and the cheat was greedily devoured by the prejudices of their disciples. That during a period of religious ferment it should have obtained credit in England, cannot excite surprise: but I had thought that in the present enlightened age it had been consigned to the contempt which it deserves. Even from Guthrie's Geography, in which it retained an honourable place during so many editions, it has recently been expunged by the liberality of the publishers, and I am happy to observe that its present existence entirely depends on the credit of the firm of Messrs. Le Mesurier, Granville Sharp, and Co. The principal Protestant editions of the *Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ* are those given by Pinet and Bank, and both were censured as spurious at Rome and Madrid, and one of them by the Archbishop of Paris. Bayle (and I believe it is to Bayle, either mediately or immediately, that most of our adversaries are indebted for the knowledge which they display on this important subject) observes, that it is difficult to explain the great difference between these two editions, and to understand the real value of monies which they mention. He adds, that there are also several editions given by the Catholics at Paris and Cologne: but he, it appears, was never able to meet with any one copy of them. I have been equally unfortunate. I have, however, read the *Regulæ Cancellariæ*, printed in 1484, and several other editions from that period to the close of the last century, and in none of them have I met with a single absolution from sin. I have also examined the fees, which are really permitted to be taken by the officers of that Court, and find that none of them regard any other absolutions than those from canonical censures. They are demanded as a remuneration for trouble. *Quæ solvuntur pro litterarum*

expeditione, communiter dicuntur Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicæ. Van Espen., p. 248. I should conceive, that whatever may be the opinion of Mr. Le Mesurier, those who have had to pay those fees, have seldom thought that they were inducements to sin. Probably he would adopt the opposite opinion.”—Dr. Lingard to the Bishop of Durham.

So much for Dr. Lingard’s opinion of the Taxæ Cancellariæ. Now for the reasons which I myself have, for considering it a spurious production. First, it is a palpable forgery, because even the printer has not dared to put his name to it. Secondly, because it has not the censor’s approbation; and no work, as it is well known, can be printed in a Catholic country without such approbation. Thirdly, because it is asserted to be printed at Rome, in the year 1744—a work, to be sure, printed at Rome more than two hundred years after the Reformation, to expose the infamies of Popes!! Fourthly, because it is said to be printed at Rome in Latin, and in French forsooth for the benefit of the Italians. Fifthly, because immediately after its first appearance it was condemned at Rome, at Paris, and at Madrid, as a manifest calumny against the Church of Christ.

I shall close this important subject with the following remark of the learned Dr. Milner:—

“The above explanation of an Indulgence, conformably to the doctrines of Theologians, the decrees of Popes, and definitions of Councils, ought to silence the objections, and suppress the sarcasms of Protestants on this head; but if it be not sufficient for this purpose, I would gladly argue a few points with them concerning their own indulgences. Methinks, Rev. Sir, I see you start at the mention of this, and hear you ask, what Protestants hold the doctrine of Indul-

gences? I answer you, all the leading sects of them with which I am acquainted. To begin with the Church of England: one of the first articles I meet with in its canons regards indulgences, and the use that is to be made of the money paid for them.* In the Synod of 1640, a canon was made which authorized the employment of commutation money, namely, of such sums as were paid for indulgences from ecclesiastical penances, not only in charitable but also in public uses.† At this period the established clergy were devoting all the money they could any way procure to the war which Charles I. was preparing in defence of the Church and State, against the Presbyterians of Scotland and England; so that, in fact, the money then raised by indulgences was employed in a real crusade. It has been before stated that the second offspring of Protestantism—the Anabaptists, claimed an indulgence from God

* ‘*Ne qua fiat posthac solemnissimæ poenitentiae commutatio nisi rationabilibus, gravioribusque decausis, &c. Deinde quod multa illa pecuniaria vel in revelam pauperum, vel in alios pios usus erogetur.*’ *Articuli pro Clero, A.D. 1584.* Sparrow, p. 194. The next article is, ‘*De moderandis quibusdam indulgentiis pro celebratione matrimonii,*’ &c. p, 195. These indulgences were renewed, under the same titles, in the Synod held in London in 1597. Sparrow, pp. 248, 252.

† ‘That no Chancellor, commissary, or official, shall have power to commute any penance, in whole or in part; but either together with the Bishop, &c., that he shall give a full and just account of such commutations to the Bishop, who shall see that all such monies shall be disposed of for charitable and public uses, according to law, saving always to ecclesiastical officers their due and accustomed fees.’ Canon 14. Sparrow, p. 368. In the remonstrance of grievances, presented by a committee of the Irish Parliament to Charles I. one of them was that ‘Several Bishops received great sums of money for commutation of penance (that is for indulgences), which they converted to their own use.’ *Commons’ Journ.* quoted by Curry, vol. 1, p. 169.

himself, in quality of his chosen ones, to despoil the impious, that is, all the rest of mankind, of their property ; while the genuine Calvinists of all times have ever maintained, that Christ has set them free from the observance of every law, of God, as well as of man. Agreeably to this tenet, Sir Richard Hill says : ‘ It is a most pernicious error of the schoolmen to distinguish sins according to the fact, and not according to the person.’* With respect to Patriarch Luther, it is notorious that he was in the habit of granting indulgences of various kinds to himself and his disciples. Thus, for example, he dispensed with himself and Catherine Boren, from their vows of a religious life, and particularly that of celibacy ; and even preached up adultery in his public sermons.† In like manner, he published Bulls, authorizing the robbery of Bishops and Bishopricks, and the murder of Popes and Cardinals. But the most celebrated of his indulgences is that which, in conjunction with Bucer and Melancthon, he granted to Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, to marry a second wife, his former being living ; in consideration, for so it is stated, of his protection of Protestantism.‡ But if any credit is due to this same Bucer, who, for his learning, was invited by Cranmer and the Duke of Somerset into England, and made the Divinity Professor of Cambridge, the whole business of the pretended Reformation was an indulgence for libertinism. His words are these ; ‘ the greater part of the people seem only to have embraced the Gospel in order to shake off the yoke of discipline and the obligation of fasting, penance, &c., which lay upon them in Popery, to live at their pleasure,

* Fletcher’s Checks, vol. iii.

† ‘ Si nolit Domina, veniat ancilla, &c.’ Serm. de Matrim. t. v.

‡ Bucer, De Regn. Chris. 1. i. c. 4.

enjoying their lusts and lawless appetites without control. Hence, they lent a willing ear to the doctrine, that we are saved by faith alone, and not good works, having no relish for them.'”

END OF THE LECTURES ON THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.

LECTURE VI.

ON THE EXISTENCE OF A MIDDLE STATE, CALLED PURGATORY, AND ON PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

THE doctrine of the Catholic Church regarding Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead, is thus defined by the Fathers of the Council of Trent :—

“As the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Spirit, has taught in her councils, from the Sacred Writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, and this Synod has now recently declared that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar—therefore this holy Synod gives her commands to the Bishops to be particularly careful that the sound doctrine concerning Purgatory, which has been delivered by the Holy Fathers and Sacred Councils, be taught, and held, and believed, and be every where preached; that all abstruse and subtle questions which tend not to edification, and from which piety seldom draws any advantage, be avoided in public discourses before the people; that uncertain things, and such as have the appearance of falsehood, be not allowed to be made public, nor be discussed; and that whatever may tend to encourage idle curiosity, and superstition, or may savour of filthy lucre, be prohibited as scandalous impediments to virtue.”—(Sess. xxv. Decretum de Purgat, p. 286).

This Doctrine is contained in the two following propositions :—

First, Catholics hold there is a Purgatory, that is to say, a place or state where souls departing this life with remission of their sins, as to the guilt or eternal pain, but yet liable to some temporal punishment (of which I have just spoken) still remaining due, or not perfectly freed from the blemish of some defects, which we call venial sins, are purged before their admittance into Heaven, where nothing that is defiled can enter.

Secondly, we also believe that such souls so detained in Purgatory, being the living members of Christ Jesus, are relieved by the prayers and suffrages of their fellow members here on earth. But where this place be—of what nature or quality the pains be—how long souls may be there detained—in what manner the suffrages made in their behalf be applied—whether by way of satisfaction or intercession, &c., are questions superfluous and impertinent as to faith. The reader will have observed that I have joined Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead in one, because the custom of praying for the dead evidently pre-supposes the belief of a middle place between Heaven and hell. The word Purgatory is derived from a Latin one, which signifies a place, or state of purification. Where the place is, we do not pretend to know, nor the nature of the pains which are there endured ; we do not pretend to know the individuals who are sentenced to it, nor for what space of time they are detained ; we do not attribute to any Priest, or Bishop, or the Pope himself, or to any individual on earth the arbitrary power of detaining, or releasing them ; all that the Catholic Church has defined, and all that a Catholic is required to believe on the subject is, that such a middle state does exist, and that the souls therein detained are

helped by the prayers of the faithful, particularly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar.

This is our belief in the existence of a middle state. Now that the dead can be benefited by us is supported not only by the holy Scriptures, but also by reason. Reason teaches us, that all crimes are not equal; that there is a material difference between imbruing our hands in the blood of a parent, and telling a lie of excuse; in short, that he is not equally criminal who speaks only an idle word as he who plunges a dagger into the breast of his sovereign. On this self-evident distinction then between venial and mortal sins I shall take my stand, and prove the existence of a middle state. Common sense tells us, that all crimes should be punished according to their heinousness; that it would be unjust to punish as severely the man who sins venially as the man who sins mortally. Now, it is acknowledged that the unrepenting sinner, who dies in the state of mortal sin, is condemned to the flames of hell; the man, then, who has only sinned venially, and yet dies contaminated with these venial sins, must have a different destination—not Heaven, for nothing impure can enter into it; not hell, for this is the habitation of those alone, who die polluted with deadly guilt. Reason, therefore, bears testimony to the existence of a middle state of souls, where the divine justice shall be satisfied; where sins, even of inadvertence, shall be punished according to their deserts; where man's works following him he shall be saved, yet so as by fire—

Catholic Version.

Matt. 12.

36 I say unto you that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall ren-

Protestant Version.

Matt. 12.

36 I say unto you that every idle word that men shall speak they shall give

Catholic Version.

der an account for it on the
day of judgment.

Protestant Version.

account thereof in the day
of judgment.

Besides in this momentous question, the justice of God, that grand and peculiar attribute of the Deity, is deeply involved. It is repeated in various parts of the sacred oracles, that God will render to every man according to his works; indeed this notion is dictated by the first principles of reason and religion. This clearly implies, that there exists a diversity of merit which God will treat with unerring justice; and on examining the state of those who are removed from the present stage of existence, we may safely rank three separate classes of persons. The first class consists of those who have preserved their baptismal innocence inviolate, as infants and others who, by a constant and unremitting co-operation with divine grace, have on all occasions persevered in the friendship of God; as also of those, who have sealed their faith with their blood, or of the martyrs of penance, who have atoned for their misdeeds. The second class contains those who live with little regard for God and Eternity, who freely indulge in the gratification of their passions, and who make no preparation for a future life. Of the professed unbeliever, and of him who trades in iniquity, I say nothing. The third class comprises such as have true faith, working by charity in Jesus Christ; it includes those who love God, and make a provision for eternity, but who are habitually guilty of a variety of venial offences; whose souls exhibit an infinite number of stains, which disqualify them for the society of the Angels, and who, in very many instances, may be conceived to depart life in this state. Now, what is to become of such as leave this world in this condition; of those, for instance, who are

hurried out of life by sudden death, without having time to call for mercy? Will the God of all sanctity, who cannot endure iniquity, admit such persons instantly to his eternal kingdom, and place them with the first class of the faithful here described? This is utterly impossible, for we learn that nothing defiled can enter the kingdom of Heaven.* Will the God of all justice discard them from his presence for ever, and place them with the sinner and unbeliever? This is incompatible with the justice of Him who will render to every man according to his works. What, then, remains to be done with respect to these good though imperfect individuals, but to confine them to the prison of Purgatory till their stains are washed away, and they are prepared for a purer abode? Of this confinement our Redeemer appears to speak, when he says,† “ Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.”

“ But, there is no distinction,” say some Protestant divines, “ between venial and mortal sins.” If not, how can they reconcile the words of the wise man, taken from the book of Proverbs, the “ just man falleth seven times” (Prov. xxiv. 16), with the idea which men form to themselves of sanctity in general? If all sins be equal, the just man falling seven times a day must be seven times contaminated with the guilt of mortal sin, and yet be pure and holy at the same time. Inasmuch as he is just, he is the friend of God; inasmuch as he is guilty of mortal sin, he is the devil’s servant; inasmuch as he is just, the Holy Ghost dwelleth in him; inasmuch as he is a deadly sinner, he has Satan for a tenant. His justice entitles him to eternal glory; his mortal sins suit him for eternal perdition. Here, then, on such principles is an unhallowed union between light

* Rev. 21, v. 27.

† Matt. 5, v. 26.

and darkness, between God and Belial, Heaven and Hell!! Besides, if there is no distinction between venial and mortal sin, the most absurd consequences must follow. St. James says, "in many things we all offend." St. John bears testimony, that "if any man say that he is no sinner, he is a liar, and the truth is not in him." Therefore, at the very time in which the sacred writers penned these dictates they were guilty of many offences. The crimes to be imputed to them were either mortal or venial; if venial, the Catholic doctrine is victorious; if mortal, the beloved of Christ were in a state of damnation, even when writing these—their inspired Epistles. But Christ Jesus evidently establishes the inequality of sins: "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him neither in this world, nor in the world to come." (Matt. xii., 32). Here our blessed Redeemer expressly states, that a sin against the Holy Ghost is greater than a sin against the Son of Man; that the one is unpardonable, and the other pardonable: consequently, that all sins are not equal. Again. "But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council, but whosoever shall say thou fool shall be in danger of hell fire." (Matt. v. 22.) Here not only the inequality of sins, but also an evident distinction between venial and mortal sins is explicitly established. A venial sin, according to Catholic doctrine, is that which does not exclude us from the kingdom of God, nor condemn the guilty individual to eternal perdition. A mortal sin is that which excludes from the kingdom of Heaven, and condemns the impenitent sinner to everlasting punishment. Now, Christ

Jesus evidently distinguishes in the above cited texts between these two kinds of sins; for he there says that there are lesser breaches of charity, which make men guilty of the judgment, and of the council; and greater breaches of charity, which make men guilty of hell fire.

But enough, and more than enough upon this subject; a doctrine which puts an idle word on a par with blasphemy, the taking of a gooseberry from a neighbour's garden on a par with parricide, is so monstrously absurd that it should not be even noticed: a judge who would inflict the same punishment on the stealer of a pin as on a regicide, must be a fit subject for a lunatic asylum.

Secondly, Sacred Writ bears testimony of the existence of a Purgatory. In the Book of Genesis, 37th chapter, we read the following words:—

Catholic Version.

33 It is my son's coat; an evil wild beast hath eaten him, a beast hath devoured Joseph....

35 ...He would not receive comfort, but said: I will go down to my son, into hell, mourning.

Protestant Version.

33 ...*It is* my son's coat: an evil beast hath devoured him;...

35 ...but he refused to be comforted; and he said, For I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning.

Here, Jacob says, "I will go down," &c. &c. The hell here specified, into which Jacob was about to descend mourning, was either the hell of the damned, or the grave, as it is in the Protestant version; or, in fine, that middle state for the existence of which we are contending? First, it cannot be the hell of the damned, for Jacob had hopes full of a more happy immortality. Secondly, it cannot be the

grave, for Jacob was persuaded that an evil beast had devoured his son Joseph. Therefore, it must be that middle state which we Catholics believe to exist.*

Again, we read in 1st Cor. 15th chapter—

Catholic Version.

29 What shall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for them?

Protestant Version.

29 Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?

* It is evident that, by the word *hell* he could not mean the *grave*, since he believed that his son was devoured by a wild beast, and, therefore, that even his body was not in the grave, much less his soul. "He was dead and *buried*, he descended into *hell*."—Apostles' Creed. Here, *buried* shews what happened to his body, and *descended into hell* shews where his soul went. "As Christ died for us, and was buried; so also it is to be believed, that he went down into *hell*."—Third of the Thirty-nine Articles. "He descended to the *lower parts of the earth*" (Ephes. 4, v. 9), which we call *Limbus Patrum* or *Purgatory*.

This is that place to which the Scriptures sometimes attribute the name *hell*, as you may see by the following text: "Whom God hath raised up; having loosed the sorrows of *hell*." (Acts, 2, v. 24.) Protestant Translators by putting the word *death* instead of the word *hell*, have thereby obscured the meaning and force of the text; yet I see they have truly translated, with us, that prophecy of David: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hell*: nor wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." (Psalm, 15, v. 10.) St. Peter applies these words to Christ's soul, and not to David's; "For," saith he, "David being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn to him with an oath, that of the fruit of his loins, one should sit upon his throne, seeing he spoke of the resurrection of Christ; for neither was he left in *hell*, neither did his flesh see corruption." (Acts, 2, v. 30, 31.) What more proof of Christ's soul descending into *hell* can reasonably be required by a Christian who pretends not to be an infidel?

Here, St. Paul is proving the resurrection from the dead. The converted Jews who were at Corinth had a practice, as is evident from the text, of baptizing for the dead, which rite or ceremony they considered useful for them. From this belief prevailing amongst them, St. Paul thus argues: "Baptism for the dead you must acknowledge to be useful for the dead; but it would be useless if they arose not. Therefore there is a resurrection from the dead."

From this text, thus considered, I propose the following dilemma; either the practice of baptizing for the dead was a useless and superstitious practice, or it was not; if it were a useless and superstitious rite, which a blind charity suggested to them, why did not the Apostle instruct them to that intent, and publicly censure their unprofitable conduct? A Protestant Apostle of the present day would not let such an occasion slip. If it were not, the Catholic dogma is triumphant; it is a good and wholesome thought to pray, and perform good works for the dead, that they may be freed from their iniquities.

To what purpose do men undergo penance for the dead if there be no resurrection, and if the soul do not still survive, expecting to be reunited to the body. St. Paul can speak here of no other baptism that can profit the dead but the baptism of penance; for, so St. Mark (c. 1), and St. Luke (Acts, c. 2), speak; and it is most certain, that St. Paul takes his argument from that which can be performed for the dead, with profit to them. We, therefore, who do well in baptizing with water young children that are not able to assist themselves, do also well to baptize the dead, by taking on ourselves this painful baptism of penance and prayer in their behalf, whom we know to be then wholly unable to help themselves or ease their pains; and

as God's infinite goodness is so merciful as to give effect to the baptism of children performed by us, even so he is merciful in giving effect to that baptism of penance which we perform for these poor souls who depart out of this life with some small sins, namely, an idle word, or a jocose lie, &c. for which his great goodness doth require severe punishment. But because "nothing defiled can enter into Heaven" (Rev. 21, v. 27), therefore he orders them to suffer in that temporal purging fire of purgatory until they are sufficiently cleansed from those spots of small sins, and when they are thus purified, then he admits them to the enjoyment of his heavenly glory, as the following text doth clearly evince: "I will wait for God my Saviour, my God will hear me: rejoice not thou my enemy over me, because I am fallen; I shall arise, when I sit in darkness the Lord is my light. I will bear the wrath of the Lord because I have sinned against him, until he judge my cause, and execute judgment for me: (behold what follows) he will bring me forth into the light, I shall behold his justice." Micha. c. 7, v. 7, &c. Now, whence will God bring him to that light? Surely we will not say, that it is out of the hell of the damned spirits, for out of that there is no redemption; therefore it must be out of some other place, in which the soul suffers only for a time, and not perpetually.

Again, in the Acts of the Apostles, 2nd chapter, we read—

Catholic Version.

29 Ye men, brethren, let me freely speak to you of the Patriarch David; that he died, and was buried, and his sepulchre is with us to this present day.

Protestant Version.

29 Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the Patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day.

Catholic Version.

34 For David ascended not into Heaven; but he said, the Lord said to my Lord, sit thou on my right hand,

35 Until I make thy enemies thy footstool.

Protestant Version.

34 For David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself, The Lord saith unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand,

35 Until I make thy foes thy footstool.

Here David is said to be dead and buried; it is, however, stated of him that he did not yet ascend into Heaven. Where must he then have been during that period? He was not in Heaven, as the text fully demonstrates; he was not in the hell of the damned, for this cannot be said to be the abode of a man after God's own heart; he was therefore in that middle state, the existence of which we advocate.

That the souls of none of the ancient Saints went to Heaven at their death is expressly declared by Jesus Christ himself, who in his conversation with Nicodemus, says, "No man hath ascended into Heaven, but he that descended from Heaven, the Son of Man who is in Heaven." (John 3, v. 13.) "David did not ascend to Heaven." (Acts, 2, v. 34, and Psalm 131, v. 11.) Now, if David did not ascend to Heaven, neither did any other who died before our Saviour; where were those souls? Were they in Heaven? Not possible; because Christ had not then set open Heaven to mankind. Were they in hell? again, not possible; from hell there is no return: nor would it have been consistent with the justice and goodness of God to have condemned thither his holy and just patriarchs, prophets, &c. To say it, and that Christ descended thither among the damned, would be blasphemy. If, then, they

were neither in Heaven nor in hell, where were they, unless in a middle state ?

Again,—

Catholic Version.

Matt. 12.

32 And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him, but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him neither in this world nor in the world to come.*

Protestant Version.

Matt. 12.

32 And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him, but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him neither in this world, neither in the world to come.

* Upon these words St. Augustine justly remarks, that they evidently imply that some sins may be remitted in the next world, not those grievous sins which deserve eternal condemnation, and of which blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is one of the most enormous, but those lesser sins of which our Saviour points out one kind in the 36th verse of the same chapter, where he says “that every idle word which men shall speak, they shall render an account for it in the day of judgment.” In the moment in which we leave this world we pass to the judgment-seat of Christ, and if then our consciences are stained with the guilt of a single idle or unprofitable word, we shall be called to an account, and must make due reparation for it to the justice of God before it can be wiped off from the soul, and forgiven in the divine sight. But where is the reparation to be made ? Or where is this forgiveness to be obtained ? Most assuredly not in Heaven, for we cannot enter there till complete pardon and purification have been imparted to the soul ; nor in hell, where the sentence of condemnation is irrevocable, and no remission of sins can ever take place. By the same words, therefore, by which Jesus Christ gives us to understand that some sins may be forgiven in the next world, he sufficiently establishes the existence of a middle state, neither Heaven nor hell, a place of atonement for such lesser faults, which place is what the Church means by Purgatory.

Here Christ makes a distinction between sins that will not be forgiven in this world, and sins that will not be forgiven in this world or in the world to come, which evidently supposes that some sins will be forgiven in the world to come ; not in hell, for out of hell there is no redemption ; not in Heaven, for *there* is no sin. It must be then in purgatory, where certain sins, through the blood of Jesus Christ, have their remission. This is not my interpretation of this text, but that of the Austins, of the Gregories, and the Bernards.

Again, we read—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 3.

11 For other foundation no man can lay but that which is laid ; which is Christ Jesus.

12 Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble :

13 Every man's work shall be manifest : for the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed in fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.

14 If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon he shall receive a reward.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 3.

11 For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

12 Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble :

13 Every man's work shall be made manifest ; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire ; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.

14 If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.

Catholic Version.

15 If any man's work burn he shall suffer loss : but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.

Protestant Version.

15 If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss ; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.

The foundation here mentioned is Christ and his doctrine, or true faith in him working through charity. The building on this foundation, gold, silver, and precious stones, signifies the more perfect preaching, and practice of the Gospel. The wood, hay, and stubble, such preaching as was that of the Corinthian teachers, who were desirous to dazzle with the glittering of human eloquence, and such practice as is mixed with much imperfections, and many lesser sins. Now, the day of the Lord, and his fiery trial (in the particular judgment immediately after death) shall make manifest of what sort every man's work hath been, of which during this life it is hard to make a judgment. For, then, the fire of God's judgment shall try every man's work. They whose works, like wood, hay, and stubble, cannot abide the fire, shall suffer loss, these works being found to be of no value ; yet they themselves, having built upon the right foundation (by living and dying in the true faith, and in the state of grace), though with some imperfection, shall be saved, "yet so as by fire;" being liable to this punishment, by reason of the wood, hay, and stubble which were mixed with their building. The fire here mentioned is not the fire of hell, for salvation cometh not by the flames of the pit ; it is not a celestial fire, for in Heaven no man shall suffer loss ; it must then be that purgatorial fire which is under discussion.

But it may be objected, that the fire mentioned in this text, is a fire that will try every man's work. "Now,"

say many Protestants, "you Catholics will not admit that every man's work will be tried by the fire of purgatory. Therefore the fire alluded to in the text, is not a purgatorial fire in the Catholic sense." I answer, that the first mentioned fire is not purgatorial, in our sense of the word, but it is the fire in which the day of the Lord shall be revealed, which shall make manifest the hidden works of all men, so that all may receive their reward according to their labour. Those who have raised a perfect superstructure upon the groundwork of faith, eternal life without further trial; while those whose superstructure being in some respect imperfect, yet, at the same time, having many beauties, shall suffer loss for a time, and feel the effects of a purgatorial flame, but finally shall be received into the mansions of bliss, and there sleep in the bosom of the Lord.

It is again objected, that it cannot be the fire of purgatory which is specified in the text, for there it is mentioned, that it is not the man that shall be burned, but his work. "Now Catholics," say our opponents, "assert that it is not the work, but the man, that shall be burned in purgatory, therefore," &c. &c.

To this difficulty I shall reply, by proposing a question to them. Is it the work abiding, or the *man* whose *work abides*, that shall receive a reward? If they answer that it is the man, and not the work, that shall be rewarded, I answer them, that it is the man, and not the work, that shall be punished by fire. His works, it is true, shall follow him, and they may be said, in some sense, to burn, as their imperfections are the immediate cause of his burning.

A late Protestant divine, on this text, has remarked indeed, that the fire there mentioned means temporal affliction. He argues thus: "In many parts of the Old Testa-

ment fire means tribulation; therefore, in this place in the New Testament, the word *fire* should mean tribulation." The reverend gentleman's manner of concluding, from these premises laid down, appears to me extremely illogical, fallacious, and even fatal in its consequences to Christianity; for it would go to subvert the entire economy of the Gospel law. Were we only to understand things in the new, as they were understood in the old law, away then with the Christian belief altogether—away with the mysteries of the Trinity—of the Incarnation—of the election of the Gentile, and the reprobation of the Jew. These dogmas were enigmatically understood in the Mosaic dispensation; therefore, if my friend reasons rightly, they should be only enigmatically understood in the Christian dispensation.

Again, how, on his principles, would he refute a Socinian, who, denying the existence of the fire of hell, would urge him thus: Fire, in many parts of Sacred Writ, means tribulation: eternity, in the Scriptures, also means a length of time; therefore, when Christ Jesus said, that the evil doers would go into *eternal fire*, he only meant to say, that they would suffer *tribulation* in this world for a length of time. A satisfactory refutation of the Socinian would very much please me. Consulting, however, the Holy Fathers, I find, that though they differ as to the meaning of various parts of this difficult text, it is still true that by far the greater number understand this fire to refer to the middle state, which we call Purgatory. Even St. Cyprian alludes very evidently to this text, in the following words: "It is one thing to receive immediately the reward of faith and virtue, another to be long tormented, cleansed, and purified by fire."

By the context, however, it may appear, that St. Cyprian alludes, under the names of the *prison* and *fire*, to the

canonical course of penance, by which the lapsed were detained, while the martyrs at once arrived at glory. But there is considerable ground for supposing that the Holy Father, by using such pointedly strong expressions, alluded also to the state of the lapsed after this life, detained in prison, and tormented in fire, for not having completed their course of penance before their departure. This seems the more probable, from his expression of their waiting and depending with uncertainty for the judgment of the Lord. Thus, learned and acute commentators have understood this passage to allude to expiatory suffering in the next life, by those whose penance had been imperfect in this. De Pamele is of opinion, that St. Cyprian here distinguishes the state of the lapsed departing with imperfect penance, from the state of the martyrs, who immediately received their crown, without having to wait for the judgment of the Lord in trembling uncertainty. He mentions that the same was the opinion of the renowned Aiala, Bishop of Guadix, and afterwards of Valencia, who wrote the valuable treatise on Apostolical Traditions. Bellarmin quotes the passage with the same view, in illustration of the texts to which it refers.

St. Ambrose speaks in words not to be mistaken, on this text: "If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss, nevertheless he may be saved through fire. Whence it is gathered that the same man is both saved in part, and condemned in part."* Again, commenting on this very text: "But when he says: *yet so as by fire*, he shews that he shall be saved, but that he shall suffer the pains of fire; that being purged by fire he shall be saved, and not, like the perfidious,

* Si cujus opus arserit, detrimentum patietur, potest tamen et ipse per ignem salvari. Unde colligitur quia idem homo et salvatur, ex parte, et condemnatur ex parte. S. Ambros. Serm, xx. in Ps. cxviii.

be tormented in eternal fire for ever.”* St. Jerom says : “ If the man whose work has burnt and perished, and who suffered the loss of his labour, shall lose indeed the reward of his labour, but shall himself be saved, yet not without the probation of fire ; therefore the man whose work shall abide which he has built, shall be saved without the probation of fire, and there will be some difference between salvation and salvation.”† On these words of the prophet Amos : “ You were, as a firebrand, plucked out of the burning,” the same illustrious expositor quotes the text of St. Paul, and adds : “ He, therefore, who is saved by fire, is plucked like a firebrand out of the burning.”‡ Finally, the great St. Augustin’s words are well known in allusion to this passage : “ That thou mayest purify me in this life, and make me such as not to stand in need of the chastising fire on account of those who shall be saved, yet so as by fire.....And because it is said, he shall be saved, that fire is thought lightly of. Thus plainly, although saved by fire, yet that fire will be more severe than any thing that a man can suffer in this life.”

Again we read, in 1st of Peter, chap. 3—

Catholic Version.

18 Because Christ also died once for our sins, the just for the unjust : that he might offer us to God, being

Protestant Version.

18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, be-

* Sed cum dicit : Sic tamen quasi per ignem, ostendit salvum illum quidem futurum, sed poenas ignis passurum, ut per ignem purgatus fiat salvus, et non sicut perfidi æterno igne in perpetuum torqueatur. S. Ambr. Comment. in 1 Cor. iii.

† S. Hieron, Adv. Jovin, L. 2, c. 13.

‡ S. Hieron, Com. in Amos. c. 4.

Catholic Version.

put to death indeed in the flesh, but enlivened in the spirit.

19 In which also coming, he preached to those spirits that were in prison :

20 Which had been some time incredulous, when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noe, when the ark was a building : wherein a few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water.

Protestant Version.

ing put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.

19 By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison ;

20 Which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight, souls were saved by water.

Here, the Apostle states, that the same Christ who was put to death in the flesh, but was brought to life again by the spirit, that that same Christ came and preached to those spirits that were in prison for their incredulity, or rather, as the words of the text would seem to insinuate, for their over-anxiety, while waiting for the patience of God in the days of Noah. This prison, into which Christ entered and preached to the spirits detained there, was either hell or that middle state of souls which Catholics admit? It cannot be said to be the prison of hell, for Christ, in that hypothesis, would have preached in vain; it must, then, have been that third place which Catholics believe to exist.

To this some Protestants object, that the prison into which Christ entering, preached, was the antediluvian world. This strange assertion I anticipate, and answer, first, that Christ is said in the text to have preached to spirits. Surely Protestants will not be inclined to admit that the

inhabitants of the earth in “ the days of Noah ” were mere spirits? Secondly, I reply, that the antediluvian prison was a spacious one, and so agreeable to those confined in it, that, were they not surprised by the Deluge, they would have never looked for more liberty, nor for less confinement.

Some Protestant divines confess that this is the celebrated *limbus patrum*; this is perfectly just—no other solution of the difficulty can possibly be given; this is what they openly profess in the Apostles, when they say of Christ that “ he descended into hell.” It appears, then, that a middle state of souls, perfectly distinct from heaven or hell, in the usual acceptation of the word, is clearly expressed in the Scripture, and as clearly contained in the creed which Protestants, as good Christians, are supposed frequently and devoutly to recite. Such a state, therefore, is by no means an ingenious fiction, an unmeaning fable, an artful invention of the Papists, for the basest and most ignoble purposes; but it is founded on real fact, recorded in Scripture, and transmitted by the Apostles to successive ages.

Hence, if we take the Holy Scriptures for our guide, we cannot doubt of there being some other state distinct from those of heaven and hell. This appears, in particular, in the case of those persons whom our Lord raised from the dead during his lifetime, or at the time of his death. Lazarus, for example, who had been four days dead, had been neither in heaven nor in hell: from which places the mercy and justice of God forbid men to return, and live again upon this earth. There is, therefore, some state in the other world, besides those of heaven and hell.

Here, is it not lawful to ask, if the Almighty could under the old covenant detain souls in the other life in a third place, and if, according to the text above mentioned,

his all-wise providence could hold the ancient just in a state remote from his sacred presence till a Redeemer came to liberate them, is there not a similar reason for withholding the joys of heaven for a time from those who depart life, unincumbered indeed with the weight of any grievous crime, but covered with a variety of stains, which, without degrading the soul to the situation of a reprobate, tarnish its beauty and splendour, and render it unworthy of enjoying its Maker? In plain language, let me ask, what is to become of those, who at their departure hence are too good for hell, and are not prepared for heaven? In the mean time, I think it necessary to state, that the note upon this text (1 Peter, 3) in the Douay Bible, does not pretend even to urge it as a proof of purgatory; it merely says it is a proof of a third place, "See here a proof of a third place or middle state of souls; for these spirits in prison, to whom Christ went to preach after his death, were not in heaven, nor yet in the hell of the damned;" because heaven is no prison, and Christ did not go to preach to the damned.

Referring now to 2nd Mac. 12, v. 43, 44, 45, 46, we read, that Judas, the valiant commander, having made "a gathering, sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection. (For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.) And because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness had great grace laid up for them. It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins."

This passage so manifestly establishes the existence of a third place, that, to get rid of the weight of its authority,

Protestants have expunged the books of Maccabees altogether from their Bible; but, as Dr. Milner justly observes, "Protestants, who do not receive the books of Maccabees as canonical Scripture, venerate them as authentic and holy records; as such, then, they bear conclusive testimony of the belief of God's people on this head, one hundred and fifty years before Christ."

But Dr. Jeremy Taylor, who cannot be objected to, speaking in the name of a Catholic, but without a reply, argues thus on this text: "We find in the History of the Maccabees, that the Jews did pray, and make offerings for the dead (which also appears by other testimonies, and by their Forms of Prayer, still extant). It is very considerable that our Saviour, who reprov'd the evil doctrines and traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees, and did argue concerning the dead and the resurrection against the Sadducees, never spoke a word against this public practice, but left it as he found it. Which he, who came to declare to us the will of his Father, would not have done if it was not innocent, pious, and full of charity." Nothing is more clear than that our Lord and his Apostles condemn'd the practices of the Jews, which they found blameworthy. If they had accounted among these the praying for the dead, which was in constant use among the Jews before the Christian era, as is proved from this book of the Maccabees, even to those who regard it merely as common history; if, I say, such prayer had seem'd sinful to our Lord and his Apostles, our Lord would have condemn'd it, and would have told the priests, whose disorders he reprov'd with so much freedom, that it was an invention to gratify their avarice. The Apostles would have instructed the converted Jews to lay aside this custom: instead of which, our Lord and his Apostles leave the Jews in this respect to their old devotions.

Proceeding now to Luke, 23, we read—

Catholic Version.

42 ... Lord, remember me when thou shalt come into thy kingdom.

Protestant Version.

42 ... Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.

Here, then, the good thief was upon the point of expiring with the Lord Jesus; nevertheless, he does not say, "Grant me to enter with thee into thy kingdom:" his desire is only to enter thither after our Lord, and he says, "Remember me when thou shalt come into thy kingdom." He conceived, then, that death which would transport our Lord into his kingdom, would carry him not into his kingdom, but to a place in which Jesus Christ, reigning in glory, might shew him mercy.

But some Protestants will have it, that this reflection is of no great weight; for as the penitent thief was unacquainted with religious truths, it is not surprising he should believe that souls might, after death, enter into a state which is neither paradise nor hell. I beg to reply that the penitent thief was filled upon his cross with extraordinary grace from the Holy Ghost. It is, therefore, agreeable to the light of the Holy Ghost to think with him, that after death there was some state in which men might receive favour from God. Besides, if we consider the penitent thief merely as a person brought up in the Jewish Church, this passage shews, that the Church of God then believed that men could, after death, be in a state to expect divine mercy; which is sufficient to prove, that it is useful to pray to God for the departed. In short, whatever might give occasion to this opinion in the penitent thief, we must observe, that our Lord approves of it by his silence, and far from condemn-

ing him of error, promises him more than he had desired. The penitent thief had only entreated our Lord to remember him when he should come into his kingdom; and our Lord promises to give him entrance into this kingdom at the same time that he should enter into it himself. What passed upon this occasion is, therefore, incomparably a more weighty argument to prove the utility of praying for the dead, than to deny it.

I beg now to direct attention to the second letter to Timothy, chap. 1, where we find that the great Doctor of Nations prays for a person deceased—

Catholic Version.

16 The Lord give mercy to the house of Onesiphorus: because he hath often refreshed me, and hath not been ashamed of my chain:

17 But when he was come to Rome he carefully sought me, and found me.

18 The Lord grant unto him to find mercy of the Lord in that day. And in how many things he ministered unto me at Ephesus, thou very well knowest.

Protestant Version.

16 The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus; for he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain:

17 But, when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and found me.

18 The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day: and in how many things he ministered unto me at Ephesus, thou knowest very well.

Nothing is clearer than that St. Paul prays for Onesiphorus: and we can scarce doubt his being dead when the Apostle wrote this Epistle. This appears on comparing the end of the Epistle with the beginning. In the end,

where St. Paul salutes his friends, he salutes the family of Onesiphorus, and not Onesiphorus himself: on the other hand, in the beginning, he prays for him apart, after having prayed for his family. The reason of this difference is that Onesiphorus being dead, could not be saluted but could be prayed for.

Besides, if Onesiphorus had not been dead, St. Paul would have asked of God for him, as he had just done for his family, the gift of mercy: for this is the ordinary form in which St. Paul and the other Apostles pray for the living. But he says: "The Lord grant to him to find mercy of the Lord in that day." This is the form of praying for the dead, which has always been used in the Church, as "to fall asleep in the Lord" is the Scriptural expression for the death of the just. The Church uses the same words for all her brethren departed in the peace of Christ, and in the communion of the Church, signifying that although they might be for a time detained in suffering, they were sure of eternal rest when fully purified for Heaven.

"To which if we add that St. Paul did pray for Onesiphorus, 2 Tim. 18, that God would shew him mercy on that day—that is, according to the style of Scripture, the day of judgment. The prayer was for such a blessing, whose demonstration and effect could not be till after death, which implies clearly that there is need of mercy, and by consequence the dead are even at the day of judgment the subjects of a misery, objects of God's mercy, and, therefore, fit to be commemorated in the duties of our piety and charity. It being certain, continues the Doctor, that they have need of mercy, and it being uncertain how great this need may be, it may concern the prudence of charity to be the more earnest, as not knowing the greatness of their necessity." (Dr. Jeremy Taylor.)

Finally, St. John tells us, that there is a sin not unto death, for which let one ask, also that there is a sin unto death for which we are not to ask; unquestionably, this is to be understood concerning the faithful departed, who are not yet admitted to everlasting life—

Catholic Version.

1 John, 5.

16 He that knoweth his brother to sin a sin *which* is not unto death, let him ask, and life shall be given to him, who sinneth not to death. There is a sin unto death: for that I say, not that any man ask.

Protestant Version.

1 John, 5.

16 If any man see his brother sin a sin *which is* not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it.

We see the Apostle places the sins for which one may ask in opposition to the mortal sins, for which one may not ask. "I do not say," says he, "that any one should ask for that sin." Now, it is only concerning the dead that a distinction can be made of sins, which should only hinder us from praying to God for them, when they have been seen to die in impenitence. For, whilst men are in this world there is no sin which should hinder us from praying for them. It follows, therefore, that we may pray for the dead. I shall now proceed to the objections.

LECTURE VII.

 OBJECTIONS AGAINST PURGATORY AND PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

FIRST Objection.

The blood of Christ washeth away all sins; and consequently those venial sins, which would subject us to the pains of Purgatory.

Answer.

The blood of Christ washeth away all sins, but not unconditionally. There is mercy held out to all; for Christ has died for all, provided they repent and have recourse to those means of grace, which he has established for the perfection of the saint and for the reconciliation of the sinner. Man, as it must be acknowledged, may die impenitent with respect to mortal sin; why, therefore, should it not in like manner be admitted, that man could be surprised by death in venial sin, without derogating from the all-sufficient merits of Christ?

Second Objection.

Purgatory is an encouragement to sin.

Answer.

Purgatory, on Catholic principles, is a place where men for sins even of inadvertence, namely, for an idle word or an immoderate laughter, are afflicted with the severest punishments. If the pains to which those who sin venially are

subjected in a middle state be inducements to crime, the pains of hell must be the cause of all the corruptions and depravity of the universe. But who will assert this?

Third Objection.

No spiritual substance can be purified by material fire.

Answer.

I am glad and sorry to hear such objections: I am glad, inasmuch as it proves what an *ignis fatuus* private judgment is when guided by its own light; sorry, to see the divine revelations evacuated by the sophistry of men. If there be no Purgatory, because a material fire cannot act on a spiritual substance; therefore, *a pari*, there is no hell, because there, forsooth, a material fire cannot act on a spiritual substance. Again, would it not follow, that if a material fire in purgatory could not act upon the soul, the fire of hell would be equally inefficacious in that respect; and that, if we denied the existence of a purgatory for the above reason, we are, in like manner, obliged to deny the existence of a hell? Some Protestants, to shew that there is no parity, assert, that the souls of the wicked do not descend into the pit before the day of judgment; that, therefore, being united to their bodies, they can through that medium be subjected to this kind of punishment.

But, I ask, if God, through the medium of our bodies, can by a material fire excite disagreeable affections in our souls, why can he not in like manner, without these bodies, make the same corporeal fire the occasional cause of similar affections? There is not a greater difference between fire and spirit, than between flesh and spirit.

But leaving philosophy aside, which is in revealed matters a guide avowedly dangerous, I will decide the matter at once by the written word—

Catholic Version.

Luke, 16.

19 There was a certain rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen ; and feasted sumptuously every day.

20 And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, who lay at his gate, full of sores.

22 And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. And the rich man also died : and he was buried in hell.

23 And he lifted up his eyes when he was in torments, he saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.

24 And he cried and said : Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, to cool my tongue ; for I am tormented in this flame.

Protestant Version.

Luke, 16.

19 There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day:

20 And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus; which was laid at his gate, full of sores.

22 And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom : the rich man also died, and was buried ;

23 And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.

24 And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue ; for I am tormented in this flame.

Here, we see, even before the day of judgment and the reuniting of the spirit to the body, the soul of a Dives tor-

mented in the flames of hell; this I think sufficient to subvert such principles.

Fourth Objection.

Purgatory is opposed to the goodness of God.

Answer.

I would ask for what reason? Is it because it inflicts a transitory punishment for venial transgressions? If so, hell must deprive God altogether of that transcendent attribute; because men are there subjected to eternal torments for transgressions which, all sins being equal, are not more heinous.

Fifth Objection.

We cannot say who is in Purgatory.

Answer.

It matters little, whether or not; God knows it, and he will not permit our charity to be frustrated in its effect. Our peace will return to us, and the incense of fraternal love ascending, will at least descend like dew in benedictions on our heads. When we pray for absent friends, it may be they are no more. Are our prayers, therefore, superstitious and vain?

Sixth Objection.

It is a heathen invention.

Answer.

That the heathens believed in it, I willingly acknowledge; but does it therefore follow, that they invented it? The heathens admitted a heaven—the heathens admitted a hell. A heaven, then, and a hell, if some argue rightly, are heathen inventions. Heathens believed in the existence of a God, though they erred about his nature. Does it therefore follow that there is no God? They had their temples, their ministers, their sacrifices. Should Christianity there-

fore have no temples, no ministers, no sacrifices? The Pagans had their houses, their apparel, &c. Does it therefore follow that we should not have houses, nor wear garments; but, savage-like, betake ourselves to the woods? Shame on those who are capable of proposing such difficulties! The very fact of Purgatory being a universal dogma amongst the Pagans, is an evidence of the truth of its revelation; for it establishes a unanimous consent in its favour. The Jew, the Gentile, and the Catholic Christian, bearing testimony to the verity of this tenet, evince, that a common ray of primitive tradition must have, on this head, illumined the intelligences of mankind—*vox populi vox Dei est!*

Seventh Objection.

Scripture makes mention only of two places or states men enter into after death, *i. e.*, Heaven and Hell, taking no notice of purgatory.

Answer.

Scripture mentions only Heaven and Hell, and takes no notice of purgatory. The answer to this is most simple and obvious. The Scriptures name not, in express terms, the Trinity, the Consubstantiality of the Son, and many other essential points, which, however, in the estimation of the Protestant, are clearly proved from the Sacred oracles. On the subject of purgatory, we are not contending for the name, but the substance of the thing; and this we deem sufficiently proved by the arguments adduced.

Eighth Objection.

The Greek Church at this day gives no credit to this doctrine.

Answer.

The testimony of St. Gregory of Nyssa, is decisive as to the belief of the ancient Greek Church. The declaration

of the Greeks, in the Council of Florence, demonstrates their religious sentiments after the schism; and the manner in which the question was settled, implies that no real difficulty existed.* The sentiments of the more modern Greeks may be collected from many learned works. I cannot, however, resist the temptation of going farther than a mere reference—of transcribing a most forcible testimony, from the attestation of the Patriarch of the Copts, whose jurisdiction extends to Egypt, to Ethiopia, to Nubia, and to the principal part of the continent of Africa. His words on this point are, “ We acknowledge that when we die, and are then under the guilt of certain transgressions, we are conveyed to purgatory, from which we are delivered by the prayers and masses said, both before and after death, and the particular supplications for the dead, which have been at all times used.”

Ninth Objèction.

Good men are said to rest from their labours from the moment of their death. (Rev. 14, v. 13.) But how do they rest, if they suffer torments?

Answer.

“ I heard a voice from Heaven, saying to me : write, blessed are the dead who die in the Lord. From henceforth now, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours : for their works follow them,” applies to the martyrs and Saints, who are immediately admitted to Heaven; but it equally applies to the souls in purgatory, for they are blessed, because sure of ultimate felicity, and they rest from their earthly labours, and are no longer anxious and doubtful about their salvation. Though they suffer a painful detention in purgatory, they may be still said to rest in the certain assurance of Heavenly glory, and in sweet

* See Baron. ad Ann. 1439, tom. vii. p. 864, et seq..

acquiescence to the decree of infinite justice, which requires their temporary purgation.* Here, by what epithet shall I designate those temporizing and inconsistent bishops, who, in convocation, drew up the Book of Common Prayer, and who wilfully left out a part of this verse, in the Order for the Burial of the Dead? In the Protestant Bible the verse runs thus: "I heard a voice from Heaven, saying unto me: write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them." In the Order of the Burial of the Dead, the verse is mutilated; the words "and their works do follow them," are omitted; and for what reason? Because they go to establish the merit of good works; and lest the mention of *good works* might be a source of uneasiness to the survivors, their feelings are flattered at the expense of Revelation. Is not this, I ask, garbling Scripture? Is not this taking away from the words of the prophecy? Is not this making Scripture suit their doctrine? I ask every Protestant, does he not

* By those who die in the Lord, are probably meant the martyrs, as even Calvin understood it: and undoubtedly they pass into immediate happiness. Others interpret it of the perfectly just, who die without any defilement of even venial sins, or any satisfaction due for past mortal sins repented of, and pardoned; and such pass unquestionably into immediate bliss. But if, though just, they die with the least stain of lesser sins, they must pass through some previous expiation, since we learn from the same book of the Apocalypse, chap. 21, v. 27, that into Heaven there shall not enter any thing defiled. But again, the just, even in purgatory, sufficiently accomplish this text. They are blessed, because they are certain of eternal happiness; and they are at rest from their labours endured in this life, their trials, mortifications, persecutions, and arduous exertions to persevere in virtue; and they rest in certain hope of glory everlasting. Thus nothing can be legitimately inferred from this text in opposition to the doctrine of purgatory.

perceive in that Book of Common Prayer, which, besides the Scriptures, he must have recourse to in his public worship, in that of all his other duties the most awfully important—the worship of his God: does he not perceive in that book, which is intended to be his guide, a manifest design to lead astray—an omission—a falsifying of the text, because it seems to favour Catholic doctrine?

Tenth Objection.

If it be inquired, why our Divine Redeemer did not inculcate purgatory in more direct and formal terms? I reply, with that edifying Catholic convert, from the French Protestant clergy, Pierre le Joux, that there was the less necessity, because the belief of some state of temporary purification after death was as universal among nations as that of the immortality of the soul; and it is a consequence most obvious from that belief, that those who quit the world in a state of defilement, must be purified in some state of temporary detention, and, during that time, deprived of the presence of a God of infinite holiness. As well might a Protestant argue, that the soul is not immortal, or deny original sin, because we nowhere find that our Saviour taught either of these great truths in express terms.

Eleventh Objection.

To the passage of the Holy Scriptures taken from the 2nd book of Maccabees, many Protestants object. First, that it never mentions purgatory; secondly, that it can prove nothing, because the slain alluded to must have died in mortal sin: and thirdly, that it occurs in a book not admitted as canonical Scripture, especially as it mentions, with approbation, a case of suicide; and as its author apologetically confesses, that he has written only to the best of his ability, therefore not under Divine inspiration.

Answer.

The first of these objections is puerile enough. For if a belief of the existence of purgatory can be sufficiently collected from the words of the text, we may be well contented without any express mention of the name or place of purgatory. The name is allowed to be of ecclesiastical appropriation, like Trinity, Incarnation, and others, but is of no consequence provided we have evidence of the existence of the state of souls, which it indicates. This evidence some Protestants, however, deny to the passage in question; the prayers and sacrifices therein mentioned having been, in their idea, only a sin-offering for the departed, mean, I presume, a sacrifice to deprecate the anger of God, provoked by the sin of the slain. But either this anger was likely to fall upon the departed themselves, or upon the survivors? If they mean the latter, they are not borne out by the text, for it is expressly stated that Judas prayed for the dead, because he believed that they were to rise again; that is, he believed that their souls were immortal, and, one day, to be reunited to their bodies, and he feared, lest the souls of these slain might be detained in punishment in the other world, which detention he hoped to mitigate by prayers and sacrifices. The text itself tells us, that the object of his prayers for the dead was, that they might be delivered from sin. Therefore, by the very wording and argument of the text, it is plain that the anger which Judas sought to avert, was not that which might have impended over the rest of his army, for the sin of their brethren, but over the departed delinquents themselves. There is no other way of accounting for the introduction of the future resurrection; the prayers would not have been vain and superfluous if offered in behalf of the survivors, whether the slain were to rise again or not.

The second objection is much more to the purpose, as founded on an apparent inconsistency, which however will soon be shewn to be only apparent. The men died, it is said, in an unrepented act of mortal sin, the enormous sin of idolatry; therefore their souls must have been consigned to Hell, and not to Purgatory. But I would rather take the opinion of Judas Maccabeus, and he evidently thought otherwise. Idolatry, doubtless, is the greatest of all sins, because it aims at dethroning the Almighty, and setting up an idol in his place. Now, the question here is, were these men guilty of Idolatry? Judas certainly considered them free from mortal sin; for he perceived that there was great favour for those that died godly. Our translation from the Vulgate is: "he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness, had great grace laid up for them." The difference is unimportant, as will appear from the original Greek, which runs thus: *Emblepon tois met' eusebias, koimomenois kallison apokeimenon chariserion*. Judas believed, that the men had died godly, therefore, he did not profess to pray for persons departed in mortal sin. Well, then, what was their crime?

It was this, that they had abstracted and secreted under their coats some of the donaries, or votive offerings of the idols of Jamnia, "which," continues the text, "the law forbiddeth the Jews, so that all plainly saw that for this cause they were slain." To establish a mortal sin against these soldiers, we ought to be certain that they were guilty of a wilful violation of the law, or that they died without repentance. To this it may be objected, that this act was the cause of their being slain, but who shall say if the Almighty, in inflicting this immediate judgment upon them, did not mercifully regard their repentance in death, and spare them from eternal punishment? We have strong

evidence, at least, that Judas so considered it, for he prayed for them as having died godly; if he was mistaken, and judged too favourably, still we see what his intention was; and the fact of his praying for them, in hopes of benefiting their souls, is sufficient for our purpose. It proves, that the Jews believed in some state of souls after death, where the prayers of the living could afford them succour. We require no more for the establishment of the belief of Purgatory.

Now to the third objection, that our proof is from a book not inspired and canonical. But, if we were to concede this, our proof would be strong and legitimate. For we should still have proved from an ancient and venerable book, the veracity of which no one disputes, and which the Established Church allows to be read in churches "for example of life and instruction of manners," the important doctrinal fact, that the Jews, always under the peculiar direction of God, publicly by the mouth of their sacerdotal leader, Maccabeus, acknowledged their belief in the benefit of prayers for the dead, and consequently of a state of souls who could be assisted by them. Had their faith been erroneous, there is every reason to believe, that the Almighty would have interposed, in accordance with his uniform especial guidance of his people, and corrected their error, or that our Saviour would have reproved it among other abuses; neither was the case, and therefore without insisting on the book being inspired Scripture, it would still furnish satisfactory evidence of the truth, as well of the antiquity of a belief in Purgatory, as in the utility of prayers for the dead.

But we shall make no such concession. The Second Book of Maccabees must be received as canonical Scripture divinely inspired. (See vol. 1, page 333.) If to this

it be objected, that by some of the Fathers in the early ages of the Church they would not have been adduced to confirm any point of faith; the reason is apparent, the books were not yet universally received, but by some held of doubtful authority; the Church had not yet judged proper to decide the question; hence the production of any text from these books would not have been of sufficient weight with many, who did not allow their divine inspiration. St. Augustine in 397 wrote his book "On the Christian Doctrine," in which he enumerates the self-same canonical Books as the Council of Trent. The Council of Hippo in 392 and two Councils of Carthage in 397 and 419, declared the same Books canonical. Pope Innocent 1st in 405, and Gelasius in 494, enumerated the same.

Now, to two other arguments against the divine inspiration of the Books of Maccabees, included in this third objection. One is, that the writer praises a deed of deliberate suicide. He alludes to the act of Razias, who when Nicanor, the governor of Judea, had sent soldiers to take him not being able to escape by flight, "struck himself with his sword. Choosing to die nobly, rather than to fall into the hands of the wicked;" but not having given himself a mortal wound, he "manfully threw himself down" from the wall, and "as he had yet breath in him, being inflamed in mind he arose: and while his blood ran down with a great stream, and he was grievously wounded, he ran through the crowd: and standing upon a steep rock, when he was now almost without blood, grasping his bowels, with both hands, he cast them upon the throng, calling upon the Lord of life and spirit, to restore these to him again; and so he departed this life."* Protestants argue, that the writer could not have been inspired, since

* 2 Maccab. xiv. 37, to the end.

he encomiastically lauds this deed of deliberate suicide. But they ought first to have proved that the writer does laud it. The writer tells us, that Razias chose to die nobly, and that he threw himself down from the wall manfully, but this is all; he merely relates what was the opinion of Razias himself as to the glory or lawfulness of such a death. The writer relates it, as the sacred penmen are wont to do, without any comment from which proof could be gathered of the lawfulness, or criminalty of the action recorded. Razias himself might have been excused from mortal sin by a mistaken persuasion, that in such an extreme case, it was both honourable and lawful to kill himself, and his final prayer, full of hope, seems to attest his own conviction of his innocence. But if he was not excusable, I see no reason at least for accusing the writer of praising suicide. St. Augustine has most happily anticipated this very objection. "We ought not," he says, "to approve by our consent every thing that we read of in the Scriptures as done even by men who are praised by the testimony of God, but by consideration to distinguish.—This Razias, therefore, is praised as the lover of the city, as a man of good report, since he is called the Father of the Jews, and because he kept himself pure in Judaism: but the Scripture has related this death of his, which is more wonderful than prudent, in the way in which it happened, but not praised it as a thing that ought to have been done."* Evidently,

* Non itaque debemus quicquid in Scripturis, etiam Dei testimonio laudatos homines fecisse legerimus, consentiendo approbare, sed considerando discernere.

Laudatus est itaque iste Razias amator civitatis, ut valde bene audiens, id est, bonæ famæ, quia pater Judæorum appellatus est, et quod continentiam tenuerit in Judaismo: istam vero ejus mortem mirabiliorem quam prudentiorem narravit quemadmodum facta esset, non tanquam facienda esset, Scriptura laudavit.—S. AUG. *Contra 2, Gaudentii Epist. lib. ii., cap. 23.*

then, Protestants are not warranted in their assertion, that the author praises the deed of Razias; consequently, no exception can be taken from that passage against the inspiration of the author.

The other argument adduced has even less solidity. The writer, we are assured by our opponents, could not have been really inspired, because he modestly apologizes for the composition of his book, as having been executed only to the best of his ability. This they ground upon the concluding words of the author: "I will here make an end of my discourse. If, indeed, it has been carried on handsomely and worthily of the subject, this also is what I desired; but if slenderly and meanly, I have at least done my best."* This is an apology certainly: but for what? Not for any error of facts or doctrines, but, merely for the inelegance of his style; and if they had only been candid enough to quote the very next words, this would have been manifest. Then, however, their own charge would have stood self-refuted; therefore, its suppression best suited their policy. Thus continues the sacred writer: "For as it is hurtful to drink always wine, or always water, but pleasant to use sometimes the one, and sometimes the other; so if the speech be always nicely framed, it will not be grateful to the readers. But here it shall be ended."† If St. Paul admitted that he himself was rude in speech yet not in knowledge,‡ the author of the book before us might be conscious of failing in elegance of language, which the Holy Spirit does not necessarily dictate, yet be equally with St. Paul secured by divine inspiration against any error of facts or doctrines. I need only add, that this argument is most dishonourable in Protestants, because it is not merely unfounded, but palpably uncandid and self-refuted. Controvertists who descend to such mean artifices

* 2 Maccab. xv. 38—39.

† Verse 40.

‡ 2 Cor. xi. 6.

are not always sufficiently guarded even for their own purposes. Protestants while busily arraying charges against the author of the Second Book of Maccabees, of praising suicide, and apologizing for the imperfection of his work, ludicrously forget that their own Church “doth read” this, among the other books styled Apocrypha, “for example of life, and instruction of manners.”* This Church must surely admire the consistent zeal of her members, to prove that a book so edifying commends self-murder!

I have now answered every objection against our proof of Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead, taken from the Second Book of Maccabees. I have proved that the book is justly received as inspired canonical Scripture;—that the text on which our proof is grounded does not warrant the inference, that persons who have died in mortal sin may go to Purgatory;—and that its evidence is perfectly conclusive of the doctrine, though no mention is made of the name of Purgatory. Also, that even if the book were not canonical, its testimony of the belief of the Jews on a point never contradicted or reprov'd by divine authority, must have its weight in establishing the existence of Purgatory, and the lawfulness, as well as utility of Prayers for the Dead.

It is urged, again, by our adversaries, “that where the tree falleth, whether to the south or north, that there it shall lie.” (Eccles. xi. 3.) But supposing this text to refer to the state of a soul after death, which yet is not certain, we agree, that if the soul attains to the south of eternal bliss, or to the north of perdition, that its condition will be irrevocable; still this inviolable decree of Heaven, in these cases, cannot be looked upon as a revocation of that other one, equally indispensable, founded on the rules of strict justice, of rendering to us according to our deeds; there-

* Article vi.

fore, supposing a man to quit this mortal life in the mean between the two extremes, neither worthy to be immediately admitted to the heavenly joys, nor yet deserving an eternal punishment, the decree objected can be no bar to such a one being dealt with by an equitable judge according to his deserts in these respective circumstances.

But was not the good thief, say they, who had been in all appearance a grievous sinner all his life, and effaced his guilt by a dying repentance, immediately translated to paradise without passing through a fiery trial, or the furnace of a Purgatory? He was; and if any one else were favoured with the same extraordinary grace of a perfect repentance, namely, his unparalleled faith, and a consummate love of God—the happy fruits of the advantageous circumstances he was providentially placed in, of being sprinkled as it were with the blood of his dying Saviour, God, and Man, — I say such a one, in like singular and extraordinary circumstances, and indued with such graces, might, no doubt, partake of the same distinguished privilege.

No wonder that our blessed Redeemer, laying down his sacred life for the conversion and salvation of sinners, should on this occasion make a perfect conquest of this penitent sinner's heart, and carry him with him as a trophy of his victory, and as the first fruits of his death and passion into the joys of paradise.

But this extraordinary case, connected with such unparalleled incidents, can with no colour of reason be brought as a precedent in behalf of the generality of mankind steering within the ordinary course of Providence; nor the condition of one and the other be considered in the same advantageous light.

I shall now close this Lecture with the following beautiful

but expressive remark of the learned Husenbeth, in his incomparable Confutation of Faberism: "When rightly understood and impartially considered, is it (Purgatory) not a doctrine worthy of our merciful Redeemer: establishing, as it does, a holy and consolatory communion of charitable offices between the faithful on earth, and their brethren gone a little before them with the sign of faith? Is it not a reflection full of comfort to the survivor, that he may solidly benefit his departed friends by those pious prayers which so naturally ascend from a heart in anguish and desolation? Is it not even for us who are yet alive a source of enlivening hope, when reflecting on the consummate purity required to enter Heaven, to consider that when we shall fail, there will be our friends surviving, who by fervent prayers will help to procure our more speedy reception into the everlasting dwellings of bliss? Ought not such considerations to convince every impartial mind that such a state of things is at least desirable? Yes; and when such a mind considers the strong body of evidence here accumulated in proof, that Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead have been the constant belief and practice of the Church from the beginning, he will acknowledge it most rational to embrace a belief so desirable in itself, and so incontrovertibly established."

A D D E N D A

TO THE LECTURES ON PURGATORY AND PRAYERS FOR
THE DEAD.

Testimonies of our Opponents, and of Antiquity.

1. Calvin (L. 3, Inst. C. 5), intimates, that the souls of the just are detained in Abraham's bosom till the day of judgment. It is well known that his disciples at Geneva, and perhaps every where else, instead of adhering to his doctrine in condemning mortals to eternal torments without any fault on their part, now hold that the most confirmed in guilt and the finally impenitent shall in the end be saved (Encyclo. Art. Geneva) : thus establishing, as Fletcher of Madeley observes, " a general purgatory." (Checks on Antinom. vol. 4.)

2. On some occasions Luther admits of purgatory as an article founded on Scripture. (Assertiones, Art. 37, Disp. Leipsic.)

3. Melancthon confesses that the ancients prayed for the dead, and says that the Lutherans do not find fault with it. (Apolog. Conf. Aug.)

4. Dr. Thorndike, Just Weights, &c. ch. 16.—" The practice of the Church in interceding for them (the faithful departed) at the celebration of the Eucharist, is so general and so ancient, that it cannot be thought to have come in upon imposture, but that the same assertion will take hold of the common Christianity.

5. The Protestant translators of M. Du Pin, Cent. p. 3, confess, "It is evident from some very ancient records of the Church (nothing can be more so), that it was a custom among Christians, *ab antiquo*, to pray for the souls of the faithful departed, in the dreadful mysteries." A little after they tell us, that "St. John Chrysostom, in his third Homily on Philippians, plainly asserts, it was decreed by the Apostles." "And this we find practised," say they, "by many eminent Fathers of the Church."

6. "Let not, for example," says Dr. Forbes, "the ancient practice of praying and making oblations for the dead, received throughout the universal Church of Christ almost from the very time of the Apostles, be any more rejected by Protestants as unlawful or vain. Let them reverence the judgment of the primitive Church; and admit a practice strengthened by the uninterrupted profession of so many ages." (Discourse on Purgatory.)

7. "Nay," says Dr. Taylor, "we find by the history of the Maccabees, the Jews did pray and make offerings for the dead. This practice was at first, and universal; it being plain in Tertullian, Cyprian, and others." (Liberty of Prophesying.)

8. Bishop Montague also (in his Appeal, c. 18) asserts a middle state, or third place, for he says positively, "That the souls of the righteous, before Christ's ascension, were not in Heaven, strictly taken, not in that Heaven which is now the receptacle of the righteous." Then in relation to the texts, which seem to restrain the state of departed souls either to Hell or Heaven, he says, "This is to be understood of the final state of souls after the day of judgment, when there will be no more than two conditions of souls everlastingly, *viz.* Heaven and Hell, and in this both Churches agree."

9. Bishop Andrews, in his "Private Devotions," printed at Oxford, an. 1675, says: "Give to the living mercy and grace; and to the dead, rest and light perpetual." p. 326.

10. Dr. Barrow, Bishop of St. Asaph, and Dr. Thorndike, in the epitaphs they composed for themselves, desire the prayers of the faithful—the one, that he may find mercy in the day of the Lord; the other that he may have rest and a happy resurrection. Here are the two epitaphs, which will unfold the ideas of these two divines regarding the doctrine in question. They had themselves composed their own epitaphs in Latin: "The remains of Isaac (Barrow), Bishop of St. Asaphs, deposited in the hands of the Lord, in the hope of a joyful resurrection solely by the merits of Christ. O all ye that pass by into the house of the Lord! the house of prayer, pray for your fellow-servant, that he may find mercy in the day of the Lord!"——"Here lies the body of Herbert Thorndike, formerly a prebendary of this collegiate church (Westminster), who in his lifetime endeavoured by prayer and study to discover the right method of reforming the Church. Do thou, reader, implore for him rest and a happy resurrection in Christ!"

11, 12, 13. Bishops Usher, Sheldon, and Blandford, believed, that the dead ought to be prayed for: and were wont, like the Catholic, to pray for them. (Collier's Hist.)

14. The published Meditations of the religious Dr. Johnson prove, that he constantly prayed for his deceased wife.

15. The present Bishop of Exeter (not Dr. Philpotts), in a sermon just published, prays for the soul of poor Princess Charlotte, "so far as this is lawful and profitable." (Dr. Milner's End of Controversy.)

16. "Indeed," say the Encyclopedists, "the belief in Purgatory is now—by one of those strange revolutions to which the human mind is subject—becoming the general belief of Protestants."

17. What were the opinions of the Fathers on Purgatory, may be collected from the following remarkable confession of Mr. Fulke in his "Confutation of Purgatory," p. 362, where he says, that "Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustin, Jerom, and a great many more of the Fathers, have erred in believing that sacrifice for the dead was an Apostolic tradition."

All antiquity speaks of some intermediate place where souls, previously to entering Heaven, must be purified from their lesser stains. St. Cyprian, Ep. 2. Origen, Hom. 6, upon Exod. St. Greg. of Nyssa, Disc. on the Dead, passim. St. Greg. Great, B. 4, Dialog. ch. 39, and on the 3rd penit. psm. St. Aug. City of God, B. 21, ch. 16 and 24, Hom. 16, and often elsewhere. St. Jerome at the end of his Com. on Isaias. Theodoret on 1 Cor. ch. 3. St. Isidore, Lib. de Offic. Divin. ch. 18. Boetius, B. 4, ps. 4. Ven Bede on Ps. 37. St. Peter Damian, Serm. 2 on St. Andrew. St. Anslem on 1 Cor. ch. 3, &c., &c.

18. The Jewish Church to this very day employs prayer for the dead, as is evident from the books written by the Jewish Rabbis, who lived before and after the birth of Christ. The following distinguished authors declare this truth: Rabbi Simeon in lib. 20, ar. in cap. 18 Gen. Menachim Siam in Comment. ad Levit. c. 16. Rabbi Hisim Alphen Scholiastes, ad cap. Roch. Rabbi Kimchi David in Psalm 32, and Rabbi Moses in his Symbolum fidei Judeorum, printed in the year 1569, fol. 26, 27, and 32, where we see the Jewish prescribed form of prayer for the dead; nay, Whitaker's words are a sufficient testimony; for he acknowledges (Cont. Duræum, lib. 1, p. 85) "that prayer for the dead is some of the Jewish doctrine."

Josephus vouches for the belief which was held at his day by the Jews, "who," as he assures us (Wars of the Jews, c. 91.), "would not pray for those amongst their brethren

who committed suicide." The exception proves that they prayed for those who had died by other kind of death.

In the form of prayers for the day of Atonement, which is used in the Synagogue and in private families, occur the following supplications :—

“ Memorial of departed Souls.

“ It is customary among the dispersions of Israel to make mention of the souls of their departed parents, &c. on the day of atonement, and the ultimate days of the three festivals ; and to offer for the repose of souls.

“ May God remember the soul of my honoured father (A. A.), who is gone to his repose : for that I now solemnly offer charity for his sake. In reward of this may his soul enjoy eternal life with the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Sarah, Rebecca, and Leah, and the rest of the righteous males and females that are in Paradise, and let us say Amen.”

The same form is used for the soul of their honoured mother (C. D.), &c.

Then—“ May God remember the souls of my father and mother, my grandfathers and grandmothers, my uncles and aunts, my brothers and sisters, whether paternal or maternal, who are gone to their repose ; for that I now solemnly offer charity for their sake,” &c.

“ May God remember the soul of (A. B.), and the souls of all my relatives, both male and female, whether paternal or maternal ; whether they have been killed or slain, slaughtered, burnt, drowned or strangled, for the sanctification of thy holy name, for that I offer charity for the memorial of their souls. In reward of this may their souls enjoy eternal life with the souls of Abraham,” &c.

19. In the "Saturday Magazine," July 27th, 1833, p. 30, under the title "The Manner in which the early Christians treated their Dead," we read, "From the more early writers, we learn that the primitive Christians did sometimes offer up both private and public prayers for the dead; that is, for 'all the servants of Christ departed this life, in his faith and fear.' For Saints and Martyrs, and not for ordinary Christians only, they offered up prayer as well as praise. They gave thanks to God, 'for delivering the deceased out of the miseries of this sinful world;' and they prayed that he would receive to himself, to rest and happiness, the souls that he had taken out of this world; and that at the general resurrection he would consummate the glory and bliss of his elect, both in body and soul. Orations were likewise very frequently made in honour of those who had been eminent for piety and virtue. A deacon read such portions of Scripture as contained promises of the resurrection; and appropriate psalms and anthems were sung at the interment, as well as during the procession. The Eucharist was likewise commonly celebrated, when the funeral happened to be in the morning; for at that time the communion was generally received by all fasting."—(Abridged from Shepherd.)

20. The following is the conclusion of the learned Leibnitz: "The most ancient sentiment of the Church is, that prayers are to be offered for the dead, and the dead are helped by prayers, and that those who are departed out of this life, though received by God to grace through Christ, their eternal punishment remitted, and themselves made heirs of life eternal, do still oftentimes suffer some paternal chastisement or purgation from sins, particularly if in this life they have not sufficiently washed away this stain: and to this some have applied the words of Christ

about paying the last farthing, and that all flesh shall be salted with fire: others the passage of Paul, concerning those who have built upon the foundation of wood, hay, stubble, and shall be saved yet so as by fire, others the passage about Baptism for the dead. The holy Fathers differ as to the mode of purgation.But be that as it may, almost all have agreed in a paternal chastisement or purgation after this life." *Vetustissima Ecclesiæ sententia est orandum esse pro mortuis et mortuos precibus juvari, et eos qui ex hac vita discesserunt, etsi in gratiam per Christum a Deo recepti, remissa æterna pœna, hæredes vitæ æternæ effecti sint, subinde adhuc pro peccatis castigacionem aliquam paternam sive purgacionem pati, præsertim si hanc labem in hac vita non satis diluerunt: et huc accomodarunt alii verba Christi de solvendo novissimo quadrante, et quod omnis caro igne salietur, alii locum Pauli de his qui fundamento inædificaverunt lignum, fœnum, stipulam, et salvi erunt quasi per ignem, alii locum de Baptismo pro mortuis. Sancti Patres variant quidem circa purgacionis modum..... Quidquid hujus sit, plerique omnes consensuerunt in castigacionem paternam, sive purgacionem post hanc vitam.—* (Leibnitz, *Systema Theologiæ*, ad finem.)

21. Bishop Bull: "All the Christian churches in the world, however distant from each other, agree in the prayer of the oblation of the Christian sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, or Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (and the same applies to prayers for the dead); which consent is indeed wonderful. All the ancient liturgies agree in this form of prayer, almost in the same words, but fully and exactly in the same sense, order, and method; which whoever attentively considers must be convinced that this order of prayer was delivered to the several churches in the very first plantation and settlement of them."—(Bishop Bull on Common Prayer, Sermon 12, vol. i.)

22. Bishop Overal, "Notes on the Common Prayer," p. 64, says "Besides, prayer for the dead cannot be denied but to have been universally used of all Christians in the ancientest and purest times of the Church, and by the Greek fathers, who never admitted any Purgatory, no more than we do, and yet pray for the dead notwithstanding."

23. Dr. Nicholls "Additional Notes on the Common Prayer," p. 64, says "Although it cannot be exactly and distinctly declared what benefit the dead receive by these prayers, which the living make for them; yet if there be nothing else, there is this at least in it, that hereby is declared the communion and conjunction which we have still with one another, as members of the same body whereof Christ is the head."

24. Bishop Cosin, "Upon the prayer that we with all those that are departed in the true faith of God's holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss," says, "And whatsoever the effect and fruit of this prayer will be, though it be uncertain, yet hereby we shew that charity which we owe to all those that are fellow-servants with us to Christ; and in this regard our prayers cannot be condemned, being neither impious nor unfit for those that profess the Christian religion."

25. In King Edward's first Liturgy we read the following suffrage in behalf of the deceased—

" Let us pray.

" O Lord, with whom do live the spirits of them that be dead; and in whom the souls of them that be elected, after they be delivered from the burden of the flesh, be in joy and felicity: Grant unto this thy servant, that the sins which he hath committed in this world be not

imputed unto him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell, and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the regions of light," &c. &c. &c.

Concerning particular prayers for the dead, Bingham says, " Now this was rather done, because in the Communion service, according to the custom of those times, a solemn commemoration was made in favour of the dead in general, and prayers offered to God for them : some eucharistical, by way of thanksgiving for their deliverance out of this world's afflictions ; and others by way of intercession, that God would receive their souls in the place of happiness ; that he would pardon their human failures, and not impute to them the sins of daily incursion, which in the best men are remainders of natural frailty and corruption." (Antiquities of the Christian Church, Book 23, c. 3, s. 12, 13.) Milles, who was afterwards elevated to the Protestant Bishopric of Waterford, in the edition of St. Cyril's works which he printed at Oxford in 1703, candidly acknowledges that " the custom of praying and offering up sacrifice for the faithful departed, though not supported by any express testimony of sacred Scripture, most evidently appears to have prevailed in the Church, even from the very times of the Apostles." (Opera S. Cyrilli, a Thoma Milles, p. 297.) An admittance, that this article of Christian faith was warranted by holy writ, would have been too great a concession to be expected from a Protestant Divine, and a member of the University of Oxford.

26. Finally, leading eminent Protestant divines confess and admit, that " All the Liturgies published from the Council of Ephesus to the 16th century, Catholic, Nestorian, Eutychian, Malabar, Chaldean, Egyptian, Abyssinian, and Ethiopian ; those of Constantinople, of the Greeks, Syrians,

whether Orthodox or Jacobites; those of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, St. James, explained in the fourth century by St. Cyril of Jerusalem; that, in fine, of the Apostolic constitutions written before the others in the third century—all are uniform on the subject of praying for the dead.”

END OF LECTURES ON A MIDDLE STATE, CALLED PURGATORY, AND ON PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

LECTURE VIII.

ON THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

THE Catholic Faith regarding the Supremacy of the Pope, is contained in the Decree of the General Council of Florence, 1439. "We define, that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold the primacy over all the world; and that this Roman Pontiff, the successor of the blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, is the true Vicar of Christ, the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in the person of Peter, was committed, by our Lord Jesus Christ, the full power of feeding, directing, and governing the Universal Church, according to the manner specified in the acts of general Councils, and in the Holy canons."

All that the Council of Trent defined on the subject, is thus expressed in our profession of faith: "We acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Roman Church, for the Mother and Mistress of all churches; and we promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, who is the Successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ."

This is our doctrine, from which the reader will at once collect: 1st. That we regard the jurisdiction of the Supreme pastor of the faithful—the Pope, to be purely spiritual—abstracted from all temporal pretensions or imagi-

nary encroachments : we merely believe, that on earth is a visible head of the Church, constituted by Jesus Christ as his Vicar, and that this is the Pope, who is the centre of unity, or the means by which we become united together to the Invisible Head—the Lord Jesus Christ. 2nd. We wish it also to be understood, that when we say that the Pope is the legitimate successor of St. Peter, in governing the Church and the See of Rome, still the Pope would be equally the Supreme Head of the Church, if he had succeeded St. Peter in any other see *last* occupied by this Apostle, or in no determined see at all. For we must always keep in mind the first great principle, that the Son of God intended and appointed a Supreme Pastor to rule at all times over His Church, who would always have been such, provided canonically and duly elected by the Church, even though St. Peter had never fixed upon any particular see, or appointed his successor. Our Canonists everywhere declare, that the person so constituted by the Church, would have inherited, by *Divine institution*, all the prerogatives of St. Peter. 3rd. The reader will observe, that the Supremacy and infallibility of the Pope are two distinct questions ; the former is an article of the faith, and the latter an object of *school* opinion.* Having premised thus far, I have now to submit, that Catholic Divines, treating of the Pope's Supremacy, 1st. Prove that St. Peter was appointed by Jesus Christ himself to be His Vicar and Representative on earth, and invested by Him with an absolute and supreme spiritual jurisdiction over the whole body of

* On entering Maynooth College, the students subscribe the Declaration and Oath of 1794. One of the clauses is as follows :—“ I declare that it is not an article of the Roman Catholic faith, neither am I thereby required to believe or profess that the Pope is infallible.” This Declaration is prescribed by the Irish Act of the 33 Geo. III.

the Church. 2nd. That in constituting St. Peter pre-eminent, the blessed Jesus established his supremacy as a permanent constitution of his Church; therefore its foundation, centre, and head, was to endure, not merely during the life of St. Peter, but in his successors; in other words, his primacy was not merely a personal, but a ministerial prerogative, instituted by Jesus Christ to preserve the unity of pastoral care, and the integrity of the Church, and, as such, of necessity, was, and is, transmitted to St. Peter's successors. Hence the texts of the Sacred Scriptures which establish the supremacy of St. Peter, prove, with equal solidity, that St. Peter's successors were to inherit the same supreme and absolute spiritual jurisdiction.

Section 1st.

St. Peter was divinely appointed the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and Supreme Head of His Church upon earth; in other words, the supremacy of St. Peter, clearly, solidly, and triumphantly proved from the Holy Scriptures.

The first remarkable occurrence in the life of St. Peter is his first interview with the blessed Jesus; this is related by—

Catholic Version.

John, 1.

40 And Andrew, the brother of Simon Peter, was one of the two who had heard of John, and followed him.

41 He findeth first his brother Simon, and saith to him: we have found the MESSIAS, which is, being interpreted, the CHRIST.

Protestant Version.

John, 1.

40 One of the two which heard John *speak*, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother.

41 He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ.

Catholic Version.

42 And he brought him to JESUS. And Jesus looking upon him said: Thou art Simon, the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, interpreted, Peter.

Protestant Version.

42 And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, by interpretation, a stone.

Peculiarly striking; no sooner is Peter presented for the first time to Jesus, than his name is changed, assuredly a preparatory sign that Heaven intended him for some special character or dignity; the eternal wisdom of the Father must intend something great for him. In selecting his faithful servants of old, God Almighty was thus pleased occasionally to change their names. Genesis 17—

5 “Neither shall thy name be called any more Abram, but thou shalt be called Abraham, because I have made thee a father of many nations.”

15 “..... Sarai, thy wife, thou shalt not call Sarai, but Sarah.”

Genesis, 32, v. 28. “Thy name shall not be called Jacob, but Israel.”

Taking, however, the above circumstance in connexion with what is related in Matthew 16, we shall find that it meant, that the blessed Jesus was to give to Peter a distinguished Pre-eminence and Authority—a Supremacy of Jurisdiction and honour over his Church, and over the other Apostles—

Matthew, 16.

13 And Jesus came into the quarters of Cesarea, Phi-

Matthew, 16.

13 ¶ When Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea

Catholic Version.

lippi, and he asked his disciples, saying : Whom do men say that the Son of Man is ?

14 But they said : Some John the Baptist, and other some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the Prophets.

15 Jesus saith to them : But whom do you say that I am ?

Protestant Version.

Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am ?

14 And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets.

15 He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am ?

This, kind reader, is an interesting circumstance in the life of the blessed Jesus. Aware of the diversity of opinions regarding his person, He calls a Council of his Apostles, and interrogates them thereon. Having heard from them what were the sayings of men in his regard, he at once emphatically asks, saying, “ Whom do you say that I am ? ” By thus addressing them—“ Whom do *you* say ? ” He intimates that he does not regard them *merely* as the sons of men, but as persons of a superior character. From such he expects to hear himself described in his proper capacity—

Matthew, 16.

15 Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God.

Matthew, 16.

16 And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God.

strange, as the Apostles were all assembled in this Council, so, of course, were Andrew—Peter’s brother, and

John. Andrew was first called to the mission, and no doubt was John. (John, 1, v. 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41.) Andrew was also in years senior to Peter—John also was the greatest favourite with the blessed Jesus; yes, Jesus singularly and tenderly loved John, still they are both silent. The glorious confession of the divinity of Jesus was *only* made by Peter. Hence our Blessed Lord and Master immediately pronounces him blessed, and singularly favoured, in having had this sublime mystery revealed to him, not by flesh and blood, but by His Heavenly Father—

Catholic Version.

17 And Jesus answering said to him : Blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in Heaven.

Protestant Version.

17 And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven.

—that is, His Heavenly Father used the ministry of an Angel, either by representing to him a corporal form, and causing him at the moment to hear a distinct sound of voice, or by representing to his mind a strong, sensible, and lovely image and impression of the divinity of the blessed Jesus.

18 And I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

18 And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

—that is, I, the Son of the living God, say to thee that

thou art not Simon, the Son of Jona, but Peter ; that is, a rock, and upon this rock I will raise my church—I, the Son of the living God, will be its principal foundation stone, but you shall be next to me, also its chief foundation in quality of chief porter, ruler, and governor. At our first interview I changed your name—behold now my intention in so doing ! Thou hast truly said to me, that I am Christ, the Son of the living God, in return I say to thee that thou art a *rock*, and upon this rock I will build my church ; and raised upon this rock, my church shall be proof against every storm ; so that though hell shall assail her with all its infernal forces, and put every stratagem in execution to undermine her foundations, still the powers of darkness shall fail in their attempt—“ the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

Catholic Version.

19 And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth it shall also be bound in Heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth it shall be loosed in Heaven.

Protestant Version.

19 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.

As if the blessed Jesus had said, “ Having conferred upon thee, Peter, the distinguished privilege of becoming with me the foundation of my Church, since the same Church is likened to a city or kingdom, so in token of your being its supreme ruler, or as holding the spiritual supreme jurisdiction of it, I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, that is, the supreme power and authority

of governing this Church, so that in opening and shutting this church to men by these keys, thou mayst in like manner open or shut to them the kingdom of Heaven." For, by giving to Peter the keys of Heaven, what else is meant than the supreme government of his church over the other Apostles, and the power of making laws, of calling Councils, of confirming their decrees and canons, of appointing, of abrogating, of ordaining Bishops, or of appointing others to do so, of deposing, of suspending, &c. ? The appellation *keys* denotes, that Christ gave to Peter an eminent power distant from, and superior to, what he gave the other Apostles. For though our blessed Redeemer afterwards gave the power of binding and loosing to the other Apostles, it is here promised to Peter *alone*, and as a reward for the confession which he alone made. It would have been no special reward to him if it had been no higher power and privilege than that conferred on the other Apostles. But being promised in such peculiar circumstances, and promised here especially to Peter alone, it is evidently a grant of higher and singular jurisdiction and primacy over the whole Church of God. The other Apostles had the power of binding and loosing, but a subordinate and limited power, in granting which our Saviour made no mention of the keys. To St. Peter alone he said, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven." So in a house or city the servants of inferior magistrates have the power of opening or shutting certain doors or gates ; but the master or governor keeps the principal key to himself, by which he can *so* shut that none can open.

I am aware that this explanation of the giving of the keys is contested by very many of our opponents, but upon what grounds I know not, particularly since, according to the Holy Writings, the delivery of keys has always been

considered as a symbol of the entrusting an individual with supreme authority to command. The Almighty God, speaking of the Messiah, says (Isaiah, 22, v. 22), "And I will lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder; and he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open." These words were also addressed to Eliacim, and in them, according to eminent Protestant divines, the priesthood and the supremacy over the Synagogue were promised. But with respect to the Messiah, Isaias, 9, v. 6; Job, 12, v. 14; Apoc., 1, v. 18, and 3, v. 7, may be consulted. Thus, with respect to Peter, the delivery of the keys means in the metaphorical language a superintendency, a command, and a transferring of power. Others object to the first part of this text, that the Church was built on St. Peter's faith, and not on his person. But as this is a mere arbitrary interpretation of the words, wresting them from their natural import and meaning, so it may be answered beyond a reply, that though St. Peter's faith (as Abraham's faith heretofore) was the meritorious cause of the respective promises made by Almighty God to one and the other, still the promises themselves were undoubtedly given to their persons; namely, to Abraham, that he should be the father of nations; to St. Peter, that he, Christ, would build his church upon him.

Proceeding now to establish Peter's supremacy on other Scriptural grounds, we find that at the Last Supper—

Catholic Version.

Luke, 22.

24 There was also a strife among them (the Apostles) which of them should seem to be greater.

25 And he said to them ;

Protestant Version.

Luke, 22.

24 And there was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest.

25 And he said unto them,

Catholic Version.

the Kings of the Gentiles lord it over them ; and they that have power over them, are called beneficent.

26 But you not so : but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger : and he that is the leader as he that serveth.

Thus, the blessed Jesus first suppresses their ambitious contention by an exhortation to humility ; 2ndly, he inculcates a lesson essential to all in authority, that they should not lord it imperiously over their subjects, but should ever govern with an humble sense of their own infirmity ; 3rdly, having thus pointed out that there should be one greater and a leader among them, he proceeds to point out Peter as this person—

31 And the Lord said : Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat.

32 But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not : and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren.

Protestant Version.

The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them ; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors.

26 But ye *shall* not be so ; but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger ; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.

31 And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired *to have* you, that he may sift *you* as wheat :

32 But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not ; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.

Now, is it not evident that our beloved Redeemer intended that Peter should be the head of the Apostolic Col-

lege, not only in honour but in jurisdiction, else why the sudden transition from the *plural* to the *singular*? Satan had desired to sift all the Apostles, but Jesus prays for Peter in particular, that his faith should not fail: "I have prayed for *thee* that thy faith fail not," and thou being once converted, confirm whom? thy brethren—the Apostles. Unquestionably, the rest of the Apostles were confirmed in grace by the descent of the Holy Ghost indiscriminately, upon them all; they were certainly equal to St. Peter in the participation of this gift, as well as in the Apostleship: this direction, then, of their Lord and Master to him must have some other tendency or meaning, and none else could it be but to give him a distinctive prerogative, by constituting him their head and superior. It is evident also from several passages of the Evangelical history, that they unanimously respected him in this capacity, and that he himself on sundry occasions deputed himself as such. For instance, in the election of St. Mathias to the Apostleship, in order to fill up the place of the traitor Judas, St. Peter took upon himself the speech of the whole assembly, prescribed the method of election, and the rest acquiesced in his directions: in consequence thereto, the lot fell upon Mathias, and he was entered into the list of the twelve, a member of the Apostolic college. St. Chrysostom quotes this act of St. Peter as an undoubted proof and an actual exercise of his superior jurisdiction over his brethren: "See," says he, "how he acknowledges the flock entrusted to him, how he is the prince of the choir; he had reason to act here the first of all with authority, having them all delivered into his hands." (Chrys. Hom. 3, in Act.)

St. Leo most beautifully explains this text, and introduces the passages of Scripture to be next considered. "The danger of their strength being tried was common to

all the Apostles ; they all needed the aid of the divine protection, for the devil desired to sift them all, and overthrow them all ; and yet special care of Peter is taken by the Lord, and he prays in particular for the faith of Peter, as if the state of the others would be more secure if the mind of their prince were not conquered. Therefore, in Peter the fortitude of them all is protected, and the help of divine grace is so ordered that the firmness which is bestowed through Christ upon Peter, shall be conferred through Peter upon the Apostles. For, after his resurrection, the Lord said thrice to the blessed Apostle Peter, after the keys of the kingdom, mystically to insinuate a triple profession of eternal love, ‘ Feed my sheep.’ ”* Thus far St. Leo; and St. Ambrose also says: “ Finally, Peter is placed over the Church, after having been tempted by the devil.”†

Proceeding now to another important Scriptural evidence, it is clear, that after our blessed Saviour had triumphed over death by his glorious resurrection, he made several visits for the space of forty days, in his resuscitated state, to his dejected disciples, for the support of their trust in him as their Messiah and Redeemer; for their comfort under their late dereliction; for their own instruction for the time to come, and for the perpetual instruction of his Church, which was to be founded by their Apostolical labours to the end of time.

In the first of these comfortable visits, appearing to the Apostles gathered together, he gave to them indiscriminately their Apostolic charge, saying, “ As the Father hath sent me, so I also send you,” &c. (St. John, ch. 20, v. 21.) But, appearing afterwards to St. Peter, St. John, St. James, St. Thomas, &c. he singled out St. Peter from the rest,

* St. Leo. Serm. de Natali Apost. Pet. et. Pauli.

† St. Ambrose in Psalm 43.

and made a triple demand of a profession of his pre-eminent love, saying—

Catholic Version.

John, 21.

15Jesus said to Simon Peter: Simon *son* of John, lovest thou me more than these? He saith to him: yea, Lord: thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my lambs.

16 He saith to him again: Simon *son* of John, lovest thou me? He saith to him: yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my lambs.

17 He saith to him the third time: Simon *son* of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because he said to him the third time, lovest thou me? And he said to him: Lord, thou knowest all things: thou knowest that I love thee. He said to him: Feed my sheep.

Protestant Version.

John, 21.

15Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon *son* of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord: thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs.

16 He saith to him again the second time, Simon *son* of Jonas lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep.

17 He saith unto him the third time, Simon *son* of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep.

Now, why this triple demand of love from Peter? Why

command him to feed his lambs and sheep, if not to intimate that he had unrestricted commission to feed the entire flock—pastors designated by *sheep*, and flocks confided to their charge by *lambs*; in other words, that he had a primacy and jurisdiction over the whole Church of the blessed Jesus. Bishop Wiseman observes, “that in the oldest classics, such as Homer, whose imagery approaches the nearest to that of Scripture, kings and chieftains are distinguished by the title of ‘shepherds of the people.’ In the Old Testament the same idea perpetually occurs, especially when speaking of David and contrasting his early occupation of watching his father’s flocks with his subsequent appointment to rule over God’s people (2 Kings, (Sam.) v. 2; Ps. 71, 72, 77; Ezech. 32; Jer. 3-15, 23, 1, 2, 4; Nah. 3, 18, &c.) It is a favourable image with the prophets to describe the rule of the Messiah and of God over his chosen inheritance, after it should be restored to favour, Isai. 40, 11; Mich. 7, 14; Eccl. 32, 10, 23, &c. Our blessed Redeemer himself adopts it when speaking of the connexion between him and his disciples—his sheep that hear his voice and follow him, John, 10. In the writings of the Apostles, we find at every step the same idea. St. Peter calls Christ ‘the Prince of Shepherds,’ 1 Peter, 5, 4, and tells the clergy to *feed* the flock which is amongst them, *ibid*, 2; St. Paul warns the bishops whom he had assembled at Ephesus, that they had been put over their flocks by the Holy Ghost ‘to rule the Church of God,’ Acts, 20-28.” (Lectures, &c.) Under these premises, then, the blessed Jesus invests Peter with the high and important charge of Supreme Pastor and Ruler, to lead the sheep and lambs of Christ—the pastors and people to wholesome pastures, to direct and rule them, to keep them from straying and preserve them from noxious pastures and

ravenous wolves. St. Cyprian (de Unit. Eccles.) on the test in question, tells us, "Although to all his Apostles after his resurrection he imparts an equal power, and says: 'as my Father hath sent me, I also send you, receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall remit they shall be remitted unto him; whose you shall retain, they shall be retained:' yet that he might manifest unity he appointed one chair, and disposed by his authority the origin of that same unity beginning from one." St. Bernard, writing to Pope Eugenius (lib. 2, de Consider. cap. 8), says also regarding the same "They (the bishops) have each their respective flocks assigned to them, but to thee all are entrusted; one to one, nor of the sheep only, but of all the pastors thou art the one pastor. You ask how I prove this? From the Lord's word. For to which, I do not say of bishops but of the Apostles, were the sheep all thus absolutely and indiscriminately committed? 'If thou lovest me, Peter, feed my sheep:' what sheep? does he mean the people of this or that city or country, or at least kingdom? My sheep, he says: and who does not plainly see that he did not designate some only, but gave charge of all: no exception is made where there is no distinction."

Now to sum up, in the text of the rock and the keys, our Saviour promised the supremacy to St. Peter; in the text of the prayer that Simon's faith might not fail, he still further prepared the way for performing his intentions; and in the striking passage of "feeding the sheep," which we have just considered, he gloriously fulfilled his promise—constituted St. Peter the supreme head and ruler of his Church on earth.

But these are not the only scriptural texts which concur to establish St. Peter's supremacy. St. Peter is frequently mentioned by name in the same verse in which the other

Apostles are only spoken of in general terms. For example, St. Mark says, "Simon and they that were with him, followed after the Lord." The same Evangelist relates, that the Angels said to the women, "Go tell his disciples and Peter, that he goeth before you into Galilee."* St. Luke speaks in the same manner. "Peter," says he in his Gospel, "and they that were with him, were heavy with sleep,"† and in the Acts: "But Peter and the Apostles answering, said: We ought to obey God rather than men."‡ Surely St. Peter would not be distinguished in this manner from the others, unless on account of some Superiority.

Again, St. Peter is generally mentioned before the other Apostles, even before his brother Andrew, though, as I have already remarked, he was younger than he, and called after him to the Apostleship. When the Evangelists give the names of all the Apostles, they mention the others promiscuously. By St. Matthew St. Andrew, and by St. Mark St. James is named before the other ten; by St. Luke sometimes St. Andrew, and sometimes St. John.§ But they all agree in naming St. Peter first, when they give a catalogue of the Apostles. Besides, when the sacred penmen mention St. Andrew, they commonly add this observation, that he was the "brother of Simon Peter."|| But they never have styled St. Peter the brother of St. Andrew. Which shews, they knew there was a dignity in St. Peter, that made it honourable for St. Andrew to be related to him. When St. Matthew delivers the names of the twelve Apostles, he does not only mention St. Peter before

* Marc 1, v. 36, and 16, v. 7. † Luke 9, v. 32. ‡ Acts 5, v. 29.

§ Matth. 10, v. 2 & 4, v. 18. Luke 6, v. 14. Acts 1, v. 13.

|| Matth. 4, v. 18 & 10, v. 2. Mark 1, v. 16. John 1, v. 40, & 6, v. 8.

the others, but expressly gives him the name of the first. "The first," says he, "Simon who is called Peter."*

Indeed, it is not my intention to assert, that these scriptural facts *alone* would establish Peter's Supremacy, but, if taken with the others just recorded, they assuredly confirm the first in a manner deserving serious attention. These texts are referred to, not only because they name St. Peter the first, but because several of them speak of him as the leader and head above his brethren. "Simon and they that were with him—Peter, and they that were with him—Tell his disciples and Peter—Peter standing up with the eleven—They said to Peter and to the other Apostles—Peter and the Apostles said—Like the other Apostles and brethren of the Lord, and Cephas." Such passages, of so frequent occurrence in the sacred pages, plainly indicate a Superiority of rank in St. Peter. It is absurd to affect not to perceive the strong corroboration which all this united evidence affords.

But it is further remarkable, that St. Peter was associated with his Divine Master in the payment of the tribute money : that to St. Peter alone was especially revealed the mystery of Christ's divinity ; that to St. Peter alone did our Saviour foretell what death he should die ; that to St. Peter before all the other Apostles, even before his beloved St. John, Christ appeared first after his resurrection : that St. Peter is always found at the head of the Apostles, speaking in the names of the rest, and acting as their leader and chief, in all things concerning the Apostolic ministry. He first spoke for the election of an Apostle in the place of Judas, a most important measure, worthy to be authoritatively proposed by the head of the Apostolic college.

* Matth. 10, v. 2.

He first solemnly opened the preaching of the gospel after the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. When the Apostles were called to account before the Sanhedrim, St. Peter, as the oracle of the rest, gave glorious testimony of their faith, and of the awful name in which they preached. St. Peter, as the Prince of the Apostles, solemnly judged and condemned Ananias and Sapphira. St. Peter first began the conversion of the Gentiles in the case of Cornelius; and was specially favoured with a vision to assure him of their being destined also to share in the blessings of the gospel. St. Peter is found solemnly opening the Council at Jerusalem, although St. James was bishop of that city, and a near relative of our Lord. It is impossible, that all these things should have fallen to St. Peter by mere accident; and the only rational conclusion is, that these numerous passages, taken together with the three splendid texts, first examined, conspire to establish the most powerful scriptural evidence in favour of St. Peter's Supremacy.

Having then proved, that St. Peter was constituted by the Blessed Jesus the Supreme Head of his Church upon earth, I trust that the reader will have no difficulty in believing, that the same scriptural texts which establish this, prove with equal solidity, that St. Peter's successors were to inherit the same supremacy; for what should hinder us from applying the same reasoning to the successors of St. Peter in the Primacy, which we use towards the successors of all the Apostles in the ministry? Christ, rising from the dead, charged his Apostles to go and teach all nations, and gave them the requisite mission and faculties for so important a charge: adding that he would be with them all days even to the end of the world. These words say nothing of any continuation of their powers to their succes-

sors ; but our opponents justly deduce with us, that Christ intended whatever ministry he himself appointed, to be continued till the end of time, devolving regularly upon succeeding pastors. If they are justified in such reasoning in the case of the Apostolic commission generally, we contend that the same argument holds good, when applied to those texts which establish St. Peter's Supremacy. It is plain, that in constituting St. Peter pre-eminent, our Saviour established his supremacy as a permanent constitution of his Church : " Upon this rock I will build my Church." The Church was to endure to the end, and bid defiance to the gates of hell ; therefore its foundation, and centre, and head, was to endure not merely during the life of St. Peter, but in his successors. Also the commission of feeding the lambs and sheep of Christ, was not merely a personal, but a ministerial prerogative, instituted to preserve the unity of pastoral care, and the integrity of the deposit of Faith, and as such of necessity to be transmitted to St. Peter's Successors.

Besides, our Blessed Saviour instituted that form of government which was to continue in his Church. That form was of a Supreme Pastor governing in his own place, as he himself had been the Head of his Church during his stay on earth. He ceases not indeed to be so now ; but as he appears and acts no longer visibly among men, he appointed a Vicar to represent him upon earth. Whatever texts then concur to prove that Christ appointed St. Peter the Head, prove at the same time by implication and legitimate inference the Supremacy of St. Peter's successors. If a Supreme Pastor was judged proper by infinite wisdom to preside over, and preserve unity even among the Apostles, how much more would such a supremacy and authority become requisite in after ages ? The Scripture therefore which

intimates St. Peter's Primacy, with double reason establishes, that the same should devolve upon his Successors. Hence, the Supremacy of the Pope is legitimately established upon unquestionable Scriptural evidence. Next, if we consult the Fathers we have in their writings most satisfactory evidence. Ignatius, second Bishop of Antioch after St. Peter, thus commences his Epistle to the Romans, "Ignatius to the sanctified Church that *presides* in the country of the Romans." St. Ireneus also, in the second century, writes thus (Lib. 3, de Hærin. cap. 3.)—"As it is a very long task, in such a volume as this, to enumerate the successions of all the churches;—by pointing out that tradition from the Apostles, and that faith announced to men, by the succession of bishops coming down to our own times, of the greatest, and most ancient, and universally known Church, founded and constituted at Rome, by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, we confound all those who any way gather otherwise than it behoveth them, whether by evil self-complacency or vain glory, or through blindness and evil sentiments. For to this Church on account of its pre-eminent principality, it is necessary that every Church should come together; that is, the faithful who are on every side; in which that tradition which is from the Apostles, has ever been preserved by those who are on every side."

This passage evidently bears powerful evidence upon the point in question. St. Ireneus argues, that all the faithful, wherever they may be, "*eos qui sunt undique fideles,*" must resort in all questions of faith to the Church of Rome, and that every other church must hold communion with it, "*ad hanc Ecclesiam.....necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam.*" He also assigns the reasons—because it is the greatest, the most ancient, and universally known, "*maximæ et*

antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ.” Secondly, because it is pre-eminent above all others, “*propter potentio rem princip alitatem ;*” thirdly, because in that pre-eminent Church of Rome, the true traditional doctrine of the Apostles had been always preserved by the faithful wherever else they were scattered, “*in qua semper, ab his qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis tradita.*”

Tertullian, in his Book of Pres., §. 32—36, says :—“ Let the heretics, then, produce the origins of their Churches ; let them unfold the order of their bishops (so passing down by successions from the beginning, that the first bishop shall have had some one of the Apostles, or apostolic men, who continued however with the Apostles, for his original predecessor. For in this manner the apostolic Churches deduce their successions) : as the Church of the Smyrneans, having Polycarp, records him to have been appointed by John ; as that of the Romans produces Clement, ordained by Peter ; the rest also in like manner (exhibit those whom they have as graffs from the apostolic seed, having been appointed by the Apostles to the episcopacy. Come, now, you who wish to employ curiosity better in the affair of your salvation), run through the apostolic Churches, in which the very chairs of the Apostles still preside (in their places, in which their own authentic epistles are recited, sounding the voice and bringing back the face of each one of them). Is Achaia near to thee ? thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedon, thou hast the Philippians, thou hast the Thessalonians. If thou canst go into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art near to Italy, thou hast Rome ; whence to us also authority is near at hand. Happy Church, for which the Apostles poured forth all their doctrine with their blood ! ... let us see what it learned, what it taught, since it has uniformly agreed with the African Churches also.”

St. Cyprian, De Unit. Eccles. § 3, p. 296, wrote thus in the third century:—"The Lord speaks to Peter: 'I say to thee,' he says, 'that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,' &c. And again, to the same, he says, after his resurrection:—"Feed my sheep.' And although he grants a like power to all the Apostles, and says, 'As the Father hath sent me,' &c. nevertheless, in order to manifest unity, he disposed by his authority the origin of the same unity beginning from one. The other Apostles, indeed, were what Peter was, endowed with a like fellowship of honour and power; but the beginning proceeds from unity, that the Church may be shewn to be one.

"For first to Peter, upon whom he built his Church, and whence he instituted and shewed forth his unity, the Lord gave this power, that what he had loosed upon earth, should be loosed in heaven. And, after his resurrection, he speaks also to the Apostles, saying, 'As the Father hath sent me, I also send you,'" &c.

Again, in his 48th Epist., written to Cornelius, he says: "I admonish each, sailing or journeying to Rome, that they would acknowledge (in the person of Cornelius) the root and foundation of the Catholic Church." And he congratulates him, because all the bishops of the African provinces had at length approved of and held communion with him; that is to say, the unity as well as the charity of the Catholic Church. St. Jerome, in his Epist. to Pope Damasus, says: "I, following no head but Christ, I am united to your Holiness, that is to say, to the chair of St. Peter. Upon this rock I know the Church of Christ is built; whosoever gathereth not with you, scattereth; that is, he that is not of Christ must be anti-Christ." St. Augustin, in his 43rd, *alias* 162nd Epist, says: "In the Roman Church,

the precedency of the Apostolic chair always prevailed." St. Optatus, Book 2nd, contra Parmen., says: "The Chair is one first in privilege; Peter sat first, whom Linus succeeded; Clement to Linus. Damasus was succeeded by Siricius, who now is our fellow labourer, with whom the whole universe is in communion."

I will conclude the quotations from these ancient irrefragable vouchers for the Supremacy with a short extract from an emphatical discourse on this subject, spoken on the eve of the feast of St. Peter, by Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, who lived in the beginning of the fifth century. "First Christ entrusted him with his lambs, next with his sheep; because he made him not only a shepherd, but the shepherd of shepherds. Peter, then, feeds the lambs, he also feeds the sheep—he feeds both the young and the mother—he rules both subjects and prelates; he is, therefore, a shepherd over all; for, besides lambs and sheep there is nothing in the Church."

If, then, to the Scriptural texts, and the suffrages of the primitive Fathers, we add "prescriptive possession," which our opponents must admit we have had for many centuries, by our own calculation from the establishment of Christianity, we have every right to conclude, that the providence of Heaven is peculiarly striking, in preserving, amidst the convulsions of nations, the spiritual Supremacy of St. Peter's successor—the Supreme Pontiff. This was one of the prevailing notions, which kept St. Austin within the pale of the Catholic Church. His words are very remarkable, "a succession," says he, "of bishops from the see of St. Peter (to whom Christ, after his resurrection, committed his flock) to the present episcopacy, holds me in the Catholic communion." (St. Aust. lib. 3, contra Epist. pend. cap. 3.)

That the successors of St. Peter have from the beginning,

and at all times, asserted their prerogative of spiritual supremacy will appear from the following plain, unquestionable facts, which are only a few out of the many that the history and records of every age furnish us with. In the next age to the Apostles, as we gather from ecclesiastical history, St. Victor, sitting at that time in St. Peter's chair, intimidated the Churches of Lesser Asia with menaces of excommunication for their undue celebration of Easter. (Euseb. lib, v. c. 24.) Now this act must be undoubtedly reputed an exercise of his superior jurisdiction over those Churches.

In the third age, St. Stephen, Pope, acted with the same vigour, in the exercise of his authority on the occasion of the then controverted point about the validity of heretical baptism.

The great council of Chalcedon, held in the year 451, in their epistle to the Pope, style him "their Father and their Head" (Tom. iv. Conc. p. 833, et seq.); which, if it be not acknowledging his Supremacy, words cannot express it, or they must be divested of their proper and natural meaning.

St. Gelasius, Pope, who lived in the fifth century, asserts the Supremacy of his see from the appointment of Christ, and his promise so often alleged to St. Peter—"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church." (Tom. iv. Conc. Lab. p. 1261. E.)

To omit a cloud of other witnesses, which the reader may have recourse to in sundry treatises on this subject, I will conclude with the words of one of the Pope's legates, opening his commission to the General Council of Ephesus, An. 341. "No one," says he, "doubts, nay, it is a thing known to all ages, that St. Peter (prince and head of the Apostles, who is the pillar of faith, and the foundation of the Catholic Church) received from Christ the keys of the

kingdom of heaven, and had the power of binding and loosing sins given him; and who to this time, and always, lives in his successors, and exercises his authority; whose canonical successor, Pope Celestin, holding his place, has sent us to this Council to represent his person." (Act. 3, Conc. Epes. T. 3, Conc. Lab. p. 626. A.)

LECTURE IX.

OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF THE SUPREMACY
OF ST. PETER, AND HIS SUCCESSORS—THE SUPREME
PONTIFFS.

FIRST Objection.

The Fathers explaining the words "Thou art Peter," &c., according to our opponents, invariably understood the "rock" as Christ himself, therefore they conclude, that the first argument in support of St. Peter's supremacy is without foundation.

Answer.

It is well known that some few of the holy Fathers have interpreted the rock as meaning Christ himself, or St. Peter's confession; but these did not even exclude the application of it to the person of St. Peter. The Fathers often expounded allegorically what bore a literal sense. Here is ample room for such allegorical exposition, inasmuch as the Church may justly be considered to be built on Christ as the primary and essential foundation; on St. Peter as the secondary and ministerial foundation: on the faith and confession of Christ's divinity, as the formal; and even, as Erasmus took it, on the faithful themselves, as the material foundation. Thus the holy Fathers, according to their argument, at the time of writing, accommodated the words of Christ to an allegorical sense, but did not on that

account exclude the literal interpretation of the rock being St. Peter himself.

Dr. Whitby, in his Paraphrase on these words, tom. i, says, "Thou art Peter by name, that is, a rock : and upon thee, who art this rock, I will build my Church : and I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, the power of making laws to govern my Church."—p. 143.

Dr. Hammond, in his Annotations on the New Testament, expounds this text in the same sense. "Seeing thou hast freely confessed me before men, I will confess thee also : thou art Peter, &c., my Church shall be built on thee, founded on thee, so that it shall never be destroyed. And after—what is here meant by the Keys is best understood by Isaiah 22, v. 22. And this being by Christ accommodated to the Church, denotes the power of governing in it." Here are, then, two great Protestant divines against a figurative interpretation.

Second Objection.

If St. Peter had been appointed the Vicar of Christ upon earth, why not of *his own* authority appoint a new Apostle in the room of Judas ? But the Scriptures testify, that the whole assembly of the disciples appointed two candidates, and even *then* left the choice to be determined by divine interposition. Answer—

We do not teach, that St. Peter's authority extended to the absolute appointment of an Apostle. He might well be the vicar of Christ for every other act of authority, without possessing an extraordinary power like this. It is remarkable, however, that St. John Chrysostom admits, that St. Peter might have done so. Our opponents should bear in mind, that the occasion in question did not require any strongly marked exercise of supreme authority. Indeed, the election of a new Apostle, in the place of Judas, was an

affair of the greatest weight and importance. It was, however, directed by St. Peter, as the supreme head of the infant Church. He rose up in the assembly, and with astonishing accuracy and wisdom, interpreted and applied different passages of Scripture, then, with a tone of decision and authority, declared, that these scriptural predictions must be fulfilled, and that another must be made a witness with the rest of the Apostles. If the assembly chose two candidates, it was by St. Peter's permission and direction, that thereby the Apostle elect might be more beloved and revered by the assembly as being their own choice, and that by taking the suffrages of all the brethren, the will of Heaven might be more clearly ascertained. In all this St. Peter plainly acts as supreme pastor of the Church; no one speaks after him, no one contradicts his arguments or opposes his authoritative decision; but the brethren immediately obey his direction, and proceed to elect two candidates so apparently equal in merit, that they are obliged to apply at last by fervent prayer to heaven to determine the choice. The first exercise, therefore, of St. Peter's supreme authority is not in the slightest degree invalidated by the proposed objection.

Third objection—

On the day of Pentecost, Peter does not speak alone, as has been said—all the other Apostles spoke at the same time in substance to other divisions of the multitude, hence, the inspired writer says, that St. Peter stood up “*jointly with the eleven,*” and that the multitude “*spoke unto Peter, and unto the rest of the Apostles.*”

Answer.

Unquestionably Peter stood up with the eleven, but the text says, “*he lifted up his voice;*” it does not say, nor insinuate, that the other Apostles spoke at the same time.

Again, St. Luke testifies, that he spoke in one tongue, and by a miracle, which was part of the wonderful gift of tongues, he was understood by all. This is evident from his address which is directed to the whole multitude, "Ye men of Judea, and all you that dwell in Jerusalem." That he stood up *jointly* with the other Apostles, and that the multitude replied not to him *alone*, but to the rest of the Apostles was natural enough, since they found the eleven standing up with their chief, and giving their concurrent approbation to his words, and since so vast a number could not be supposed to have addressed themselves to St. Peter alone. But, we should observe, that it is St. Peter alone who replies to the multitude in continuation of his harangue:—"But Peter said to them: do penance, and be baptized... and with very many other words did he testify and exhort them." St. Luke distinctly marks, that it was not from the preaching of any of the others, but from St. Peter's words alone, that the three thousand were converted; "They therefore that received his word, were baptized." From all which it is manifest, that St. Peter spoke alone in the name of the rest, as their supreme head, whose privileged office it was to be the first to make a solemn promulgation of the Gospel. Let St. Chrysostom confirm this with his own golden stream of eloquence: "Peter, the mouth of them all, pleads for all the cause of faith, and instructs all by his doctrine; he is the chief assertor of the faith, he is considered the principal catechist, and first stood forth a preacher of the word, and first brought together the Church, and that not only from the men of Jerusalem, and the Jews round about; but from the Parthians, Medes, Phrygians, Lybians, Egyptians, Arabians, strangers from Rome and others. And he, who was appointed Pastor of all by the Lord, began to collect sheep from all nations; he taught

them faith, together with apostolic manners, namely, to renounce all things, to assemble together in prayer, and the breaking of bread as taught by Christ." (Hom. 4, in Act. Apost.)

Fourth Objection—

Is taken from the fact of St. Peter having been sent with St. John by the Apostles, to the converted Samaritans, Acts, 8, v. 14, whence our opponents argue that he could not have been "Christ's monarchial vicar and their own lawful dominant Primate."

Answer.

I suppose that they will not deny, that Phinees was the High Priest of the Jews, because it is said in the Book of Josue, that he was sent even by all the people to confer with the children of Ruben. They all assembled in Silo, to go up, and fight against them. In the mean time they sent to them into the land of Galaad, Phinees the son of Eleazar the priest.* Of course they will not for a moment doubt the perfect equality of the Son of God with his Eternal Father, or of the Holy Ghost with both, although we read of each of these two Divine persons being sent for the good of mankind. Therefore, they must admit, that as there are various ways of being sent, so a superior may be occasionally sent by his inferiors; as when the members of a Chapter send their Bishop on any affair of moment to the Holy See. In the case before us, St. Peter was sent by his own ready acceptance of the commission, and by that mutual advice and consent, which characterized the measures of the Holy College of Apostles; and which while it experienced little of that "dominant" command which our opponents are so fond of imputing to us, fully recognised in St. Peter that supreme pastoral authority for which we contend.

* Josue, xxii, v. 12, 12.

There was moreover a reason for St. Peter's proceeding upon this embassy to the Samaritans, closely connected with his Supremacy, inasmuch as it was peculiarly the office of the supreme Pastor to effect the reconciliation of those inveterate schismatics—the Samaritans, and their happy re-union with the Jews in the one fold of the one Shepherd.

Fifth Objection—

Is from the fact of St. Peter's having been contended with by the Jewish converts, for having gone to the Gentiles and eaten with them.* “Yet,” say our opponents, “that high officer..... did not silence them by the divine authority of his sovereign vicariate.” When they were silenced by St. Peter's meek explanation, “it is evident,” they say, “that they submitted, not to Peter's primate mandate, but to the very ample reason which he gave for his conduct.” Answer: May not a superior condescend meekly to explain his reasons to his inferiors, without forfeiting his authority? Was it any wonder that St. Peter, humble as he was, should thus himself practise the valuable lesson which he was afterwards to inculcate. “*Be ready always to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason.*” (1 St. Peter, 3, v. 15.) Those who contended with him were indeed Christians, but they had not yet fully learned the mystery of the calling of the Gentiles, nor laid aside entirely their long and deep prejudices against any communication with the uncircumcised. It was then a kind and considerate act of prudence in St. Peter, to become weak with the weak, and by a mild exhortation gain these murmurers, rather than run the hazard of irritating them by severity.

Sixth Objection—

Is from the Narrative of the Council held at Jerusalem,

* Acts, xi, v. 2, 3.

11th Acts, in which our opponents will have it, that not Peter but James presided, and because Judas and Silas were sent by the Apostles and ancients afterwards to Antioch, they will have it that Peter was no more than the other Apostles.

Answer.

Referring to chap. 11 of the Acts we find that when there had been much disputing, St. Peter arose and spokè. He first permitted the question to be freely discussed, and when the arguments on both sides had been sufficiently propounded, he rose as the supreme Judge and authoritative Head of the Church, to pronounce his decision. This is assuredly a plain instance of the exercise of his Supremacy. He proceeded to decide in plain terms, by reprovng those who would tempt God by putting an intolerable yoke upon the disciples. That the assembly looked up to St. Peter as the highest authority is evident from their respectful submission to his decree, for when he ceased to speak, *a vast multitude held their peace* and listened to St. Paul and Barnabas, who illustrated St. Peter's words by relating what great wonders had been wrought by their ministry among the Gentiles, whom the opposite party sought to impede and control by insupportable restraints. St. James then spoke: for as Bishop of Jerusalem it was for him to second and confirm the decision of St. Peter. His speech is in fact a confirmation of the decree of the Supreme Pastor; and the fact of St. James having spoken after St. Peter, is merely an exemplification of the common right and practice of every legislative assembly, where each member is allowed to express his concurrence in the decision of the President. Every Bishop in a Council has a definitive sentence: but the judgment of St. James can in no way derogate from the previous decision of St. Peter, or affect the question of his Supremacy. Nor is this invalidated by the decree of the Council being drawn up in the general names of the Apostles

and ancients; for this proves indeed, that it was the act of the whole concurrent Church, but it does not show, that the head of the Church had not the principal part in the decision. Perhaps our opponents may be willing to admit, that St. Jerom understood the matter somewhat better than themselves. That sound interpreter and profound scholar writes thus: "When a great question 'arose upon this word,' the circumcision of the Gentile converts, 'Peter, with his accustomed liberty, said: Men, brethren, &c., and all the multitude held their peace, and the Apostle James, and all the ancients together, concurred in his sentence. These things ought not to be troublesome to the reader, but useful both to me and him, that we may prove that the Apostle Paul was not previously ignorant that Peter was the prince of this decree.'"*

Seventh Objection.

Our opponents finish what they consider positive Scriptural evidence against St. Peter's Supremacy, by the very old and worn-out objections taken from three facts connected with St. Paul. First, that St. Paul laboured perfectly independent of St. Peter; second, that St. Paul "carefully and (as it were) jealously intimates that he derived his authority" by revelation from Christ alone; third, that "when he met Peter at Antioch, he withstood him to his face, because, as he assures the Galatians, he was to be blamed."

To which I answer, that no more can be collected from the words or conduct of St. Paul, than what we readily grant; namely, that he was made an Apostle immediately by Christ himself, like St. Peter and the others, and that he was not inferior to any of them in the gifts and powers common to all the Apostles; but so far from St. Paul's intimating, that St. Peter was not his superior in the Primacy of both honour and jurisdiction, he acknowledged the same

*Hieron. Epist. 89, ad Augustinum.

by going expressly to visit St. Peter and remaining fifteen days with him before he began his Apostolic ministry among the Gentiles.*

As to St. Paul's withstanding St. Peter to his face when he deserved blame, this is no argument against St. Peter's Supremacy. St. Peter had erred, not in faith, but in his imprudent dissimulation, for fear of giving offence to the Jews by being seen to eat with the Gentiles. St. Paul, considering it one of those occasions when an inferior may justly and charitably admonish a superior, reproved him. But was not David king of Israel, when he was severely reproved by Joab?† That faithful general was neither arrogant nor disrespectful, because he rebuked his king on an occasion when his conduct was unwise and dangerous to the security of his throne; nor was St. Paul the "positively contumacious rebel" which our opponents so unbecomingly and irreverently style him, because he resisted the Supreme Head of the Church, from a laudable zeal to prevent schism, and with a true charity for the great Apostle. Thus St. Augustin speaks of the transaction: "Peter himself received with the holy and benignant piety of humility what was usefully done by Paul with the liberty of charity; and he thus gave to his successors a more rare and more holy example to move them not to disdain to receive correction even from their inferiors, if at any time they should swerve from the right path, than Paul afforded for inferiors to dare confidently to resist even their superiors, for the defence of gospel truth, without prejudice to fraternal charity."—(St. August. Epist. 19, ad. Hieron.)

Eighth Objection.

Others object, that if the doctrine of the Supremacy of St. Peter and his successors be an article of faith, we may expect to find it in Scripture. But the Bible never men-

* See Galat. 1, v. 18.

† See 2 Kings, 19, v. 5.

tions it, therefore we must not admit it as Catholic doctrine. The learned Husenbeth thus admirably refutes this argument: " Mr. Faber owns the spiritual supremacy of a temporal prince. If *this* doctrine be an article of faith we may reasonably expect that it would be distinctly and explicitly stated in Holy Scripture. Yet what the Thirty-nine Articles have determined on this head, the Bible never so much as once even mentions. Not a hint on the topic of the King's absolute spiritual monarchy is dropped in any part of the inspired Ecclesiastical history : nor is Peter himself throughout his two Epistles, or Paul throughout his fourteen Letters, a whit more communicative, *although both had very fit occasions to mention the matter, when writing on the power of Kings.*—(1 St. Pet. 2, v. 17—Rom. 13, v. 1-7). Now let our opponents take their choice, either on their own grand principle of Bible *alone*, give up the King or Queen's spiritual supremacy, or with us admit, that although Scripture had been totally silent on St. Peter's Supremacy—which, however, I have shewn that it is not, we might yet, from tradition, as well have believed it, as both we and they believe the lawfulness of infant baptism and the truth of the Scriptures themselves."

Ninth Objection.

Paul does not salute Peter in his Epistle to the Romans, therefore Peter was not at Rome. Excellent logic : well may it be said Paul does not salute James the Apostle in his Letter to the Hebrews, nor Timothy in his Epistle to the Ephesians, are we, therefore, to conclude that James was not Bishop of Jersusalem, and that Timothy was not Bishop of Ephesus? If our opponents can give reasons for the omission in these two cases, they will give solutions to their own objections ; independently that they must admit, that St. Peter had first gone to Rome from Antioch, and that

the Prince of the Apostles had so firmly established the Church of Rome long before St. Paul went thither, that the latter proclaims its extent and importance in his Epistle expressly written to that Church of the Romans: "your faith is spoken of in the whole world."* Here is infallible evidence, that the Church of Rome was known and spoken of in the whole world before St. Paul had at all laboured in its foundation; consequently St. Peter was at Rome.

Tenth Objection.

If we admit the truth of the doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy, the most absurd consequences must result—amongst others, that upon the death of St. Peter, St. John, who still survived many years, must have been subject to St. Linus, and thus, strange to relate, we shall have "an inspired Apostle of the Lord paying the canonical obedience of a dependant suffragan to an uninspired bishop of Rome."

Answer.

Notwithstanding this dogmatical decision, I shall take leave to say, that even so, there would be no impropriety, and no absurd consequence. For if the blessed Mother of God was subject to the Apostles, nay if Christ himself was subject to the Holy Virgin—his mother, we need not wonder if by his all-wise decree, a surviving Apostle was to be subject to that authority vested in the successor of St. Peter, which in reality represented his own. If St. John had possessed no more humility than those, who in these days are so impatient of subjection, he might no doubt have become himself the successor of St. Peter. But it was his holy character to desire rather to be subject than to command: and there was no danger of St. Linus ever treating an inspired Apostle in any other way than with the highest respect and deference. Thus our opponents have no warrant for their inference.

* Rom. 1, 8.

Eleventh Objection.

But Paul says, the care of all the Churches was upon him. (2 Cor. xi, 28.) But what then? Each of the Apostles was solicitous for the well-being of all the different Churches; Christ said to each of them, "Go teach all nations," &c.—what has this to do with the doctrine of Supremacy? The false prophets maintained, that Paul was not an Apostle; he here refutes them, and shews he has received jurisdiction equal to that exercised by the Apostles who had lived with Christ. When a strife arose amongst the disciples, which of them should seem to be greater, he admonished them not to act as the kings of the Gentiles, who lord it over them; but that he who is the leader, let him be as he that serveth. Now I cannot see any argument against the Supremacy in this passage; did not Christ himself act as the servant of the disciples, does he therefore cease to be the head of the Church?

Twelfth Objection.

But has not Pope Gregory the Great, declared that an universal bishop is the forerunner of Antichrist.

Answer.

The title Œcumenical, or universal as Gregory calls it, was in the sense in which he understood it, sacrilegious; but quite correct in the sense in which it was understood by John, Bishop of Constantinople, who assumed it. John meant that it only signified that he was first bishop or patriarch of the East; Gregory, however, considered it to be sacrilegious, inasmuch as it seemed to import that John was entitled to jurisdiction over the whole Church. It seemed farther to signify, that John was the only Bishop, and that all other bishops were his deputies. That this was the impression on Gregory's mind is evident from a letter he wrote to the Empress:—"It is a lamentable thing to be

forced to suffer patiently, that by a general contempt my brother and fellow-bishop, John, endeavours to be called the only bishop. *Triste valde est, ut patienter feratur, quatenus despectis omnibus prædictus frater et co-episcopus meus solus conetur appellari episcopus.*—Lib. 5, Epist. p. 751. Now, then, it appears that the whole arose from a misunderstanding on the part of Gregory. The title Œcumenical, or universal, as he understood it, would certainly be blasphemous, for the bishops are not deputies, except to Christ Jesus alone.

Thirteenth Objection.

But is it not presumptuous for any Church to arrogate to itself the title of Apostolic See, such as, according to our opponents, the Church of Rome does ?

Answer.

The Church of Rome is the only subsisting Apostolic Church in the world, that can *alone* gloriously trace her Bishops in unbroken succession up to her first supreme Bishop, St. Peter ; let any other Church do this, and we *will* call it equally Apostolical. *Confingant tale aliquid Hæretici.*

Lastly—

But what necessity is there for this Papal supremacy ?

1. Standing to past experience, and to the unquestionable testimonies of the Fathers, since General Councils with the Pope at their head, the only absolute Supreme Ecclesiastical Authority, can be very seldom convened, it would be impossible without an *ordinary, constant, standing, Supreme Authority* in the Church to prevent schism, or for the Church to subsist.

2. If, according to eminent Protestant Canonists, there is a necessity of placing a bishop over priests, to prevent schism, it equally follows that over bishops should be placed one holding Supreme Authority ; unless we say that

there is only danger to be apprehended of schism among priests, and not among bishops, which is contrary to reason, truth, justice, and experience.

3. To determine or silence disputes about opinions.

4. In those causes which are said to be *causæ majores*, as unjust depositions of bishops, to restore either by appeal, or council, the persons unjustly deposed, and inflict spiritual punishment on their oppressors.

5. To take care, that Discipline be everywhere observed, and the Canons everywhere enforced.

6. To judge when it may be necessary to call a General Council.

Finally, for the preservation of *Unity*.

Thus, regarding the Supreme Pontiff as possessing these high prerogatives, why should it be a matter of surprise that his person is held in the deepest veneration by all Catholics? But, then, let it not be supposed for a moment, that we imagine his Holiness to be free from liability to moral transgression, or that he may not commit a sinful action. We repudiate so gross and absurd an imputation. We only venerate, hold, regard, and firmly believe the Pope to be the successor of St. Peter, Vicar of Jesus Christ, and Supreme Head on earth of the whole Church of Jesus Christ. Under these reflections I sincerely trust, that the impartial reader will evidently see how fully justified we are in exclaiming with the illustrious Bossuet (Sermon on the Unity of the Church), and with every faithful member of the Holy Catholic and Roman Church:—"O Church, which, taught by Peter and his successors, has never known error, and in whose Bishop Peter remains the foundation of the Church. O holy Roman Church, the Mother of all Churches and of all the faithful! O Church, chosen expressly that she might unite all her children in

the same faith and charity! To thy unity we will ever adhere with our whole souls. O Church of Rome! if I forget thee, may my right hand be forgotten: may my tongue cleave to my jaws, if I do not remember thee, if I make not thee the beginning of my joy!"

END OF THE LECTURES ON THE SUPREMACY OF ST. PETER,
AND HIS SUCCESSORS, THE SUPREME PONTIFFS.

LECTURE X.

ON THE RULE OF FAITH.

HAS Jesus Christ appointed a certain and sufficient guide in matters of Religion; and an authoritative judge in controversies of Faith? In other words, has Jesus Christ left man a guide in the way to Heaven; or, a clear, certain, unerring rule of faith, by following which he cannot go astray, but will infallibly reach it?—All parties admit, that the divine truths instituted and delivered by the Blessed Jesus to his Apostles are essentially one, and ordained to continue invariably *such* till the consummation of the world. St. Paul (Ephes. 4, 5) assures us, that as there is but one Lord, so there is but one faith and one baptism. If, then, the deposit of faith be but one, the wisdom of Heaven has established not only certain means by which it may be preserved inviolate; but, also a certain rule by which men may come to the knowledge of it. Hence, then, the question so vitally momentous, what are those means?—what is this rule? “All religions,” says Leslie, “and all sects, in the world, are built upon the dispute betwixt these two—whether men are to govern themselves by their own private judgment in their faith and religion; or to be determined by the authority of others?” (On Private judgment.)

In solving this great question, I shall commence by laying down a few unquestionable principles—

1. “When the Almighty God created man, and settled him in Paradise, the Supreme Lord and Master of the uni-

verse revealed and made known to him Religion, that is, the Worship which God—his creator, decreed to exact from him.”

This principle cannot be denied ; for how could man, a finite being, *of himself*, without a Divine Revelation, acquire the knowledge of that religious worship *alone* pleasing and acceptable to his Almighty Maker ? It was necessary, therefore, that God should speak ; and that the Almighty did reveal to man religious worship, is admitted by all.

2. “ In process of time, God revealed his religious worship to the Patriarchs and Prophets, ‘ at sundry times and in divers manners.’ (Heb. 1, v. 12.) These Patriarchs and Prophets communicated it to mankind — taught them religion by word of mouth.”

Unquestionably, religion was first taught and learned by tradition, without any written memorial, from age to age, during the series of above 2,400 years.*

3. About this period, errors in matters of religion beginning to rise and gain ground, the Almighty God was pleased for the first time to make known his will to man by written memorials. To this end, he raised up Moses, and endowed him with a supernatural wisdom and knowledge, by means of which he was enabled to commit to writing all the past important religious events, which till then were known by tradition only. Under assistance from above, Moses is the original author and penman of the first five books of the Bible—namely, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and

* If the truth of this principle be doubted, I beg to refer to Seth, the father of God’s people ; to Abraham, the father of God’s elect ; to the obedient Isaac, and to the strong one of God, Israel ; to a Job, and Melchisedeck : to the children of Israel when groaning under the galling bondage of Egyptian slavery,—all possessing their souls in peace, beneath the shield of traditional truth.

Deuteronomy. From the period in which these books were written, up to the final dispersion of the Jews, it is an unquestionable fact, that *then* the Scripture or the written word *alone* was not the rule of faith; each person was not *then* permitted to read the Bible and judge for himself. No, there was a copy of the Law given by Moses to the Priests, who were to read and interpret it to the people every seventh year, as we read—

Catholic Version.

Deut. 31.

24 Therefore after Moses had wrote the words of this law in a volume, and finished it :

25 He commanded the Levites, who carried the ark of the Covenant of the Lord, saying :

26 Take this book, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God : that it may be there for a testimony against thee.

And—

10 And he commanded them saying : after seven years, in the year of remission, in the feast of tabernacles.

Protestant Version.

Deut. 31.

24 And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished.

25 That Moses commanded the Levites, which bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying,

26 Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee.

10 And Moses commanded them, saying, At the end of *every* seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles.

Catholic Version.

11 When all Israel come together, to appear in the sight of the Lord thy God in the place which the Lord shall choose, thou shalt read the words of this law before all Israel in their hearing.

Again, same book—

Deut. 17.

8 If thou perceive that there be among you a hard and doubtful matter in judgment between blood and blood, cause and cause, leprosy and leprosy, and thou see that the words of the judges within thy gates do vary, arise, and go up to the place which the Lord thy God shall choose.

9 And thou shalt come to the priests of the Levitical race, and to the judge that shall be at that time: and thou shalt ask of them, and they shall show thee the truth of the judgment.

10 And thou shalt do whatsoever they shall say

Protestant Version.

11 When all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing.

Deut. 17.

8 If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, between stroke and stroke, being matters of controversy within thy gates, then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which the Lord thy God shall choose.

9 And thou shalt come unto the priests, the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and inquire: and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment:

10 And thou shalt do according to the sentence

Catholic Version.

that preside in the place which the Lord shall choose, and what they shall teach thee,

11 According to his law; and thou shalt follow that sentence, neither shalt thou decline to the right hand nor to the left hand.

12 But he that will be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the priest who ministereth at that time to the Lord thy God, and the decree of the judge, that man shall die, and thou shalt take away the evil from Israel.

Protestant Version.

which they of that place which the Lord shall choose shall show thee; and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee :

11 According to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee thou shalt do : thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall show thee to the right hand, nor to the left.

12 And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die : and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel.

Thus we see what authority the Almighty God was pleased to give to the Church guides in the Old Law ; we see he empowered them to decide all controversies relating to the law, and that from their decision there was no appeal. Hence, if we consult the history of the Jewish Church, we will find, that the authority of the Sanhedrim was supreme, and that no individual had a right to question

its interpretation of the law. When Herod wished to know the birth-place of the Messiah, he did not search the Scriptures to ascertain it, but he consulted the Sanhedrim, and they declared to him, that Bethlehem of Judea was to be the place where Christ was to be born. This authority was expressly recognized by our Saviour himself on different occasions, and although he well knew the hidden springs of action which influenced the wicked rulers of the synagogue, he always taught the duty of submission to them, because they sat in the chair of Moses. They even had the authority to regulate the use of the Sacred Writings ; and Origen, St. Jerom, and St. Gregory of Nazianzen mention, that they prohibited women and all persons under thirty years of age from reading certain portions of the histories of the Patriarchs, of the prophecy of Ezekiel, as also the Canticle of Canticles, or Song of Solomon. But when the Jewish dispensation was superseded, the Jews were no longer bound to submit themselves to a tribunal which had then become, if I may so speak, *de jure*, as it afterwards became *de facto*, extinct. The only point which the Jews had to consider was, whether Christ had really come ? Having satisfied themselves, by comparison of the prophecies concerning him with the great events which had just occurred, that these prophecies were accomplished, they readily embraced the Christian faith, were baptized, and became Christians and members of the New Church ; but by becoming Christians they did not acquire any right to decide upon the new dogmas which were taught them. They were then bound to submit to the authority of the Church without reservation.

“ We do not deny, that some of the Jews assumed a right to interpret Scripture in the same way that Protestants do : but what was the result ? Just what has happened in

our days. By rejecting the interpretation of their Church the Jews fell into the grossest errors—the Pharisees taught for doctrines the commandments of men, and made void the word of God by human traditions—they maintained, that the sacred text had both a literal and an allegorical, or mysterious meaning. The Sadducees, rigidly adhering to the natural meaning, rejected the traditions of the Pharisees, and denied the resurrection of the body, and the immortality of the soul. The Essenes, on the other hand, renounced the literal meaning of the text, and considered the law as an allegorical system of spiritual and mysterious truths; they believed with the Pharisees the immortality of the soul and a future state of rewards and punishments, but they maintained that these extended to the soul alone. It has been remarked, as a singular circumstance, that this last named sect is not once named in the Gospel, while it abounds with reproofs of the Scribes and Pharisees; but the silence respecting the Essenes may be accounted for, from their retired and contemplative habits, which made them shun society, and avoid all intercourse with politics and public affairs; but, it is supposed, that St. Paul alludes to them in his first Epistle to Timothy, and in those to the Ephesians and Colossians.”—(*Dialogues on the Rules of Faith*).

I am aware it will be said, that the same authority was granted to the civil power as to the religious, for (9 and 12 verses) the priest and judge are appointed to settle all religious disputes; but such was not the case, for referring to—

Catholic Version.

2 Paralepomenon, 19.

11 And Amarias the priest
your high priest shall be
chief in the things which

Protestant Version.

2 Chronicles, 19.

11 And behold Amariah
the chief priest is over you
in all matters of the Lord:

Catholic Version.

regard God: and Zabadias the Son of Ismahel, who is ruler in the house of Juda, shall be over those matters which belong to the king's office.

Protestant Version.

and Zebadiah the Son of Ishmael, the ruler of the house of Judah, for all the king's matters: also the Levites shall be officers before you.

Thus, did the Lord draw a distinction between the two powers—religious and civil. Thus we also see, that in the Mosaic dispensation, authority, not the Bible, as interpreted by each private spirit, was the guide and director of the people. Hence, the Jewish historian, Josephus, who was well acquainted with the law and religion of his nation, says (*Contra Apion, Lib. 2*), “The high priest offers sacrifice to God before the other priests, he guards the laws, judges controversies, punishes the guilty; and whoever disobeys him is punished as one who is impious towards God.”

Thus, then, the priests were the *depositories*, and *expounders* of the law—

Malachias, 2.

7 For the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth; because he is the Angel of the Lord of hosts.

Malachi, 2.

7 For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts.

The King was the only person, who, when he ascended the throne, was ordered to write out the book of the law, taking the copy from the priests of the tribe of Levi—

Catholic Version.

Deut. 17.

18 But after he (the king) is raised to the throne of his kingdom, he shall copy out to himself the Deuteronomy of this law in a volume, taking the copy of the priests of the Levitical tribe.

4. Finally, Almighty God was pleased to speak to Man by the blessed Jesus—

Hebrews, 1.

2 In these days (God) hath spoken to us by his Son.

Protestant Version.

Deut. 17.

18 And it shall be when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites.

Hebrews, 1.

2 God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.

Hence, then, from man's creation up to the coming of Christ, and from that period up to the sixteenth century, authority was the guide by which God conducted men in the ways of salvation, and not the Scripture alone, interpreted by each individual's private judgment.

But I have said from the coming of Christ up to the sixteenth century authority was the guide by which God conducted men in the ways of salvation—this is an unquestionable truth ; when Jesus Christ sent forth his Apostles to be the rulers and guardians of his divine institution, he commanded them not *to write*, but *to teach* precisely as if He himself were performing this sacred function—

Matt. 28.

18 All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.

Matt. 28.

18 All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

Catholic Version.

19 Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

20 Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.

We also find, that when he established this authoritative tribunal, invested by him with such sacred powers, he commanded all nations to acquiesce in its decrees, and submit to its commands, for he declared in plain but forcible language,—

Luke 10.

16 He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.

Again,—

Matt. 18.

17 ... And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican.

Again,—

Protestant Version.

19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:

20 Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, *even* unto the end of the world.

Luke 10.

16 He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me. \

Matt. 18.

17 ... but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.

Catholic Version.

Mark, 16.

16 He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned.

Protestant Version.

Mark 16.

16 He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.

St. Paul also repeats the same declaration. For, after having numbered heresies, and sects among the works of the flesh, he then says—

Gal. 5.

21 ... Of the which I foretel you, as I have foretold to you, that they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God.

Gal. 5.

21 ... Of the which I tell you before, as I have also told *you* in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

He also adds—

Gal. 1.

8 But though we or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.

Gal. 1.

8 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.

Here, we cannot but admire the justice, the wisdom and mercy of the Almighty God in providing man with such an authoritative tribunal, for, without it, taking into deep consideration the weakness of the human mind, and the obscurity of the Holy Scriptures, the pride of reason, and the incomprehensibility of the sacred mysteries; never could

man *of himself* attain an unerring knowledge of revealed doctrines, nor yet any prudent conviction that his faith or religion was right. However, in the 16th century, this infallible tribunal or authority, was for the first time impugned. I ought to add, an attempt was made to impugn it, for, when we examine the several inconsistent and contradictory creeds of the Protestant Churches, we find that they are not opposed to all authority in the proper acceptation of the term. The Established Church arrogates to itself the authority, not only of deciding matters of faith, but, moreover, of compelling its ministers to swear, that they "*ex animo*" believe them; and still several of its own learned members, as Paley, Balguy, and Blackburn, acknowledge that it is utterly impossible to understand them. So also, with respect to Dissenting congregations, each one claims to itself the right of not only expounding the Divine Word, but also of declaring what is to be believed. In a word, Protestantism, under every form, arrogates to itself that same authority, which it condemns in the Catholic Church as tyrannical, and as opposed to gospel liberty; it seeks shelter "under the miserable ruins of the very rampart which it is its great boast to have destroyed." There is, however, a notable difference between Catholic and Protestant authority. Protestants admit, that they stand to a fallible guide, whilst Catholics, relying on the strong promises of Christ, maintain, that they are guided by an infallible authority, and in support of this, adduce the following scriptural authorities—

Matt. 16, v. 18.—(See page 327).

Catholic Version.

Matt. 18.

20 For where there are

Protestant Version.

Matt. 18.

20 For where two or three

Catholic Version.

two or three gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.

Matt. 28, v. 18—29,—(See page 370); and Luke 10, v. 16.
(See page 371.)

John 14.

16 And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever.

17 The Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him: but you shall know him; because he shall abide with you, and shall be in you.

John 16.

13 But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all truth. For he shall not speak of himself; but what things soever he shall hear, he shall speak, and the things that are to come he shall shew you.

Acts 15.

28 For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay no farther burden upon you than these necessary things.

Protestant Version.

are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.

John 14.

16 And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever;

17 *Even* the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.

John 16.

13 Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, *that* shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.

Acts 15.

28 For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things.

Catholic Version.

1 Tim. 3.

14 These things I write to thee,...

15 ...That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

Protestant Version.

1 Tim. 3.

14 These things write I unto thee,...

15 ...That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

When we duly reflect on the nature of these promises, we see the remarkable difference between the foundation of the Synagogue, and the establishment of the Christian Church.

The Synagogue was not founded on such strong pledges of divine assistance ; besides, it was only constituted for a temporary duration. The Christian Church is raised upon the solemn assurances of the Son of the Living God, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and this, so long as it is to be in duration—till the consummation of the world. But, though the Synagogue or Jewish Church was not distinguished by such solemn promises, still it never erred. Its sentence on doctrinal questions, pronounced in judicial form, was infallible. For, surely the Almighty God, be it said with reverence to His most Holy name, would have never commanded his people under pain of death, to submit to the judgment of an authority capable of leading them into error of doctrine by a false decision. Until the condemnation of Christ by the Sanhedrim, we will find no error in the official judgment of the High Priest when “ the question was concerning the law, the commandment, the ceremonies, the justification.”

(Paral. ii. xix. 10.) Even at the birth of Christ, we find this Council still giving the infallible interpretation of the prophecies regarding the place of his nativity (Matt. 2, v. 4). Later still, when the miracles of Christ had already proclaimed, that the Synagogue had accomplished the object of its institution, and when the Council was assembled to oppose those miracles by the last effort of dying authority, the inspired historian tells us—

Catholic Version.

John, 11.

49 But one of them named Caiphas, being the high-priest that year, said to them: You know nothing.

50 Neither do you consider that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.

51 And this he spoke not of himself: but being the high-priest of that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation.

Protestant Version.

John, 11.

49 And one of them, *named* Caiaphas, being the high-priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all.

50 Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.

51 And this spake he not of himself: but being the high-priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation.

Nor did the High Priest err in this declaration. Was it not expedient? Even in *this* instance God did not regard the wickedness of the man, as to overrule the inerrability of the office. He compelled the "High Priest of that year" to pronounce an infallible sentence. But it was the last. Before the assembling of another Council, the miracles and doctrine of Jesus Christ had proved, that the

authority of the Synagogue was superseded by that of Him to whom "was given all power in Heaven and in earth." (Matt. 28, 18.) Here, then, let me ask, if the Almighty God never abandoned the Synagogue—never permitted it to fall into error until after the condemnation of Christ, is it possible that he has permitted that Church to err, which was established by his only Son, Christ Jesus, and to which he has pledged himself, in so solemn a manner? Let the above mentioned promises be duly considered, and then let the question be answered, "how a church, *thus* characterized, could become the seat of error, the source of corruption the school of Idolatry?" Under these premises, if we divide, now, the great body of Christians in this Kingdom into three classes, Catholics; Members of the Church of England; and Dissenters, we find different Rules of faith adopted by them.

Catholics hold, "That the holy Scripture, or the written word of God, is a rule of faith and obedience, but not the sole or only rule. 2. That besides the written, there is an unwritten word, handed down by tradition from Christ and his Apostles; that these two, namely, the written and unwritten word of God, or Scripture and Apostolical traditions, form the entire rule of faith. But, 3. That no individual, however learned, has a right to interpret the holy Scriptures agreeably to his own private opinion, contrary to the understanding, or explanation of the Catholic or Universal Church."

The Church of England professes for its rule of faith the Holy Bible, or the written word of God, without tradition, without apocrypha or comment, in which, in the 6th of the Thirty-nine Articles, she tells us, are contained all things necessary to salvation; but she claims, according to the 20th of the same Articles, the authority or privilege of deciding in

Controversies of Faith ; insists upon her own interpretation, nay visits the recusant with spiritual and temporal punishments. Indeed, some Protestant Divines, speaking of this Article, assert, that the Church of England claims and exercises only an authority of testimony in matters of faith ; but by no means an *absolute* authority. Assuredly, this is an ingenious distinction. But, admitting for a moment, that the authority which she claims is only one of testimony, does that Church exercise, I ask, this authority exclusively as respects testimony ? I hesitate not to assert—I defy contradiction, that she does more ; she punishes, and has frequently punished men very severely, even by the infliction of pains and penalties, for not submitting their consciences to her, for not believing as she believes. To this I must also add, that she denies to her members the right of private judgment ; for, if in place of two or three ceremonies, she had originally two or three hundred ; if instead of Thirty-nine Articles she had one hundred besides, those who acknowledge the Articles, as all clergymen of the Establishment are supposed to do, should meekly submit to her spiritual jurisdiction. I admit, it will be said, that the latter part of the Article runs thus, “ that the Church may not ordain any thing contrary to God’s word,” and thus every difficulty is obviated. But I answer, that so far from obviating the difficulty, it puts it in a stronger light ; for a question may naturally arise, whether a doctrine said to be contained in the Holy Scriptures, be really contained in them ? Men may differ in opinion with respect to particular doctrines, whether they can be proved by the Sacred Writings, or whether they cannot ? Now such controversy must either remain undecided, or there must be some judge of controversy to determine the dispute. On this subject, says the 20th Article, “ The Church hath authority

in controversies of faith." Otherwise, if every private person can judge of the Church of England's decision in matters of faith, and reject it if it appears to him contrary to God's word, the Church's authority is thereby destroyed. For, we would have an authority to decree—to decide, but to which no one is bound to submit; or an authority, and no authority. But this unmeaning claim never was the design of the Article; the Church of England does claim a real authority in matters of faith, she has exercised it, in decreeing the Thirty-nine Articles; and this does not rest on my authority, it is deduced from Dr. Marsh in his "Comparative View," an authority to which every member of the Church of England must bow with deference. Hence, any endeavour to reconcile the 20th Article with the right of private judgment, is "merely an attempt to evade the question at issue."

For this reason Le Maistre, speaking of the practice of making the Clergy of the Establishment swear to the Thirty-nine Articles, makes happily the following observations—

"The Church of England is the only association in the world, that has declared itself null, and ridiculous, in the very act which constitutes it. In this act, it has solemnly declared, that thirty-nine Articles, neither more nor less, are necessary for salvation; that to belong to this church, men must, moreover, swear to them. Now one of these very Articles declares solemnly, that God in forming his Church, left no infallibility on the earth; that all Churches have fallen into error, beginning with that of Rome; and that they have been grossly deceived, both in relation to doctrines and to morals; so that no one of them possesses the right to prescribe what men should believe: and that the Scriptures alone are the sole rule of faith. Therefore the case is, that the Church of England declares to its members

that it has a right to command; but they also have a right not to obey. So that, in the very same moment; with the very same pen; with the same ink; and upon the same paper, it declares the dogma; and declares that it has not any right to declare it. I hope, that in the endless catalogue of human inconsistencies, this will always hold one of the first places."

Finally, Dissenters acknowledge no other *sole* and *only* rule of faith but the Bible, and the Bible interpreted by each one, even the humblest among them: for they regard any attempt to expound the Holy Scriptures in opposition to private judgment, as a gross violation of Gospel liberty. How far they are consistent with the principles broached by the first Reformers may be clearly seen, when we remember, that this was the great principle the Church of England *first* adopted, to palliate, or justify her separation from the Church of Rome; but, unhappily for her, it is a principle which, in the opinions of her best, and most learned divines, is tearing her to pieces, limb by limb, and hour by hour. No wonder, then, that she should adopt, or devise creeds, articles, homilies, and canons, to guide, if possible, the exercise of that judgment in others, which she had claimed for herself as a right to follow without restraint, and which was her only claim to be looked upon as the true Church.

I shall now proceed, under the divine assistance, to examine the merits of these respective rules of faith; but I deem it necessary to premise a few necessary preliminaries.

With the learned Waterworth the Bible is a book or rather a collection of books written by men, some of whose names or lives are known and some unknown,* it is, *then*, the

* Yes, the writers of some portion of the unconnected books of the Scriptures are known, the origin of others is doubtful; whilst some have been penned by many whose lives were far from saintly.

production of a variety of pens. The writers were of different nations, although for the most part Jews by birth; they lived at different periods, extending, probably, over 2,000 years. They wrote in Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Greek, beginning with the creation of the world; though they narrate a vast diversity of events, still they confine themselves principally to the history of some people, and to the description of their religion. With regard to the first five books of the Old Testament—the Pentateuch, Moses is their author (see page 363). After the time of Moses, several prophets and inspired writers composed, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, either the history of their own times, prophetic writings, or psalms appropriated to the praise and service of the Almighty. Like these books of the Old Testament, the writings of the New are thought to have appeared at different and distant periods. But little is known as to the precise time when these records were first made public. There is scarcely one of the sacred books which has not been assigned to different periods by the profoundest inquirers, and in some cases this difference extends even to centuries. Again, we are almost as ignorant of the direct object, which each author had in view in writing his respective work; but this, at least, is certain, that not one word of the New Testament was written during the life of Christ, and it is of importance to observe, that there is no proof that any of the writers wrote in virtue of a commission from his fellow Apostles, or in consequence of any fixed plan agreed on between them.* St.

* In fact, with the exception of a narration, alluded to by the author of the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul (whether by that term are to be understood either more or less than the 14 Epistles which have been preserved), mentioned by St. Peter, there is scarcely an allusion in the New Testament, even in the latest of the sacred writings, to the existence of any written document whatever, as proceeding from the Apostles, or Disciples of Christ.

Matthew and St. John were eye-witnesses of the leading matters they relate in their own gospels ; St. Luke and St. Mark derive their narratives from testimony. It is supposed that the Acts of the Apostles is from the pen of St. Luke, though of this we have no satisfactory evidence. Of the Epistles, five only are directed to Christians in general, six are written to individuals, and the remaining ten to converts to the faith in various and distant regions ; as to those in Italy, Palestine, and Corinth, men who had probably little or no knowledge of each other, though professing the same religion, and so far as we are aware, totally unacquainted with any but the writings addressed to them. It is also of great importance to know, that according to the best founded calculations the earliest of the Gospels, that of St. Matthew, did not appear till about thirty years after our Saviour's death. Indeed it is also almost universally acknowledged, that several years elapsed after that event before this or any other of the sacred writings appeared. Of the Epistles, that of St. Paul to the Thessalonians is judged to be the first in date, and is supposed to have been written in 49 ; whilst the Epistles of St. John are considered the latest of the Canonical Books, and are ascribed to about the year 97 ; his Gospel is said to have been written one year previous.

Finally, all writers agree that, with the exception of St. Matthew's Gospel, the sacred writings of the New Testament were originally written in Greek. The Fathers speak almost unanimously of St. Matthew's Gospel, as having been originally composed in Hebrew, or rather in Syro-Chaldaic ; if their opinion be true, we have nothing but a translation of this important history of Christ. Many modern critics argue in favour of a Greek original. Thus, therefore, the Bible is a series of unconnected tracts, historical, prophetic, and doctrinal, written at different and at

distant periods, called forth by accidental circumstances, neither their authors nor their dates always known with perfect certainty, composed in a variety of languages, and in a greater variety of style; presenting, in a word, on these and on many other points, the same uncertainty that surrounds all human productions, which would not in the least surprize me if the Bible was not of a higher and more sacred origin, but an uncertainty, which can with difficulty be reconciled with the supposition that it was looked upon, either by those who wrote it, or by those to whom it was delivered, as the sole and only rule of faith; but of this in the sequel. Now to the Canons of the Scriptures, held by the Catholic, and Protestant Church—the Church of England.

By the term *canon*, is meant either a standard, or rule, which we should follow; or a catalogue, or list of certain things defined. In our case, it therefore means the catalogue, or list of writings of the Old and New Testament thought to be inspired. Those books are called *canonical*, which each Church has thought proper to admit into its catalogue as *inspired*. Of these writings, some are named *proto-canonical*, in which class are comprised those books, which are not known to have been ever excluded from the sacred canon; whilst others, whose authority has been doubted of, or denied, are termed *deutero-canonical*. A writing, which has been, or is admitted as canonical by some, but which is rejected by others as having no claim to that character, is by the latter called *apocryphal*: whilst other writings, which wicked or foolish men have attempted to foist upon the world, as the productions of Apostolical, or Evangelical writers, are called *spurious*. Again, as among the different sects that dissent from the Church of England, there are different Bibles, so it follows that their Canons are different. The Lutheran Canon differs from the Calvinist,

—both from that received by the Established Church; finally, this from the one admitted by the great body of Christians — the members of the Catholic Church. It is therefore, of the greatest importance to come at the knowledge of the authorized catalogue, or canon of the sacred writings; indeed I am of opinion, that this is most important, since it is the most practical of the great questions, that are made regarding the Scripture, namely, their authenticity, inspiration, and canonicity. For, surely, it is of little, or no practical value to know in the abstract, that certain books were composed by Prophets, and inspired writers under the Old Law, and by Apostles, during the Apostolic age, under the New, and that those books were written under the due influence of the Spirit of God, until we learn what books in particular are to be received in that character. I shall now subjoin the Canon of Scripture held by the Catholic Church, and that by the Church of England :—

BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

*Catholic Canon.**Protestant Canon.*

Genesis	Genesis.
Exodus	Exodus.
Leviticus	Leviticus.
Numbers	Numbers.
Deuteronomy	Deuteronomy.
Josue	Joshua.
Judges	Judges.
Ruth	Ruth.
I Kings	I Samuel.
II Kings	II Samuel.
III Kings	I Kings.
IV Kings	II Kings.
I Paralipomenon ...	I Chronicles.
II Paralipomenon ...	II Chronicles.

*Catholic Canon.**Protestant Canon.*

1st Book of Esdras ...	Ezra.
2nd, or Nehemias ...	Nehemiah.
Tobias	
Judith	
Ester	Esther.
Job	Job.
Psalms	Psalms.
Proverbs	Proverbs.
Ecclesiastes	Ecclesiastes.
Canticles	Song of Solomon.
Wisdom	
Ecclesiasticus	
Isaias	Isaiah.
Jeremias	Jeremiah
Lamentations of Jeremias	Lamentations.
Baruch	
Ezekiel	Ezekiel.
Daniel	Daniel.
Osee	Hosea.
Joel... ..	Joel.
Amos	Amos.
Abdias	Obadiah.
Jonas	Jonah.
Micheas	Micah.
Nahum	Nahum.
Habacuc	Habukkuk.
Sophonias	Zephaniah.
Aggeus	Haggai.
Zacharias.	Zachariah.
Malachias	Malachi.
I Machabees	
I Machabees	

BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

<i>Catholic Canon.</i>	<i>Protestant Canon.</i>
St. Matthew	Matthew.
St. Mark	Mark.
St. Luke	Luke.
St. John	John.
The Acts of the Apostles	The Acts of the Apostles.
Romans	The Epistle to the Romans.
I Corinthians	I Corinthians.
II Corinthians	II Corinthians.
Galatians... ..	Galatians.
Ephesians	Ephesians.
Philippians	Philippians.
Colossians	Colossians.
I Thessalonians	I Thessalonians.
II Thessalonians	II Thessalonians.
I Timothy	I Timothy.
II Timothy	II Timothy.
Titus	Titus.
Philemon... ..	Philemon.
Hebrews	To the Hebrews.
St. James	Epistle of James.
I St. Peter	I Peter.
II St. Peter	II Peter.
I St. John	I John.
II St. John	II John.
III St. John	III John.
St. Jude	Jude.
The Apocalypse	Revelation.

The reader, I suppose, is most anxious to know when and by what authority certain books, and these only, were

and are admitted in the list of inspired writings by the Catholic Church; and when and by what authority certain books, and these only are regarded as Canonical Scriptures by the Church of England. To answer these questions, I deem it necessary to premise with respect to the Books of the Old Testament.—

1. There is no information in the writings of the Old Law with respect to the origin, and formation of the Jewish Canon of Scripture except, that before the division of the tribes, the Canon seems to have been composed solely of the five books of Moses.

2. Whilst a uniform agreement is found by history to have existed among the Jews as to the number of books, which composed their Canon, we are ignorant of the means by which that uniformity was produced.

3. There is no evidence to shew, that either the High Priest, or the Sanhedrim, or Esdras, issued any decree on this subject, and thus we are consequently reduced to suppose, that the Canon of the Old Law was formed by the gradual introduction of the successive writings of the sacred penmen, on the authority of a uniform tradition, into the increasing list of the Holy Records.

4. Finally, we have no reason to conclude, that besides the twenty-two books admitted by the Jews, other writings had not a claim to be inserted into the same catalogue, though this did not actually take place, in Palestine at least, during the few years that intervened between the introduction of the last of those Scriptures into the Canon, and the total abolition or fulfilment of the Jewish Law.*

* I am aware that many learned men have taught, that to Esdras, and not to a uniform tradition, we are to look for the formation of the Jewish Canon, and that as he was divinely inspired, so we may rely securely on his judgment. But not to notice that is begging the

Taking these things into consideration, I ask, then, of every liberal-minded Protestant, since there exists no question, to admit his inspiration, without other proof than that contained in the very volume which he has written, or the inconclusiveness of that proof, even admitting every word which is favourable to his character as an inspired writer, it may be easily shewn, that the theory itself will not stand the test of examination. To the proof, it is asserted, then, that after the Babylonish Captivity, the said books were restored by Esdras. Now, on this subject, there are two theories. The first supposes, that during the troubled and distressed state of the nation, under captivity, all the sacred books were lost, and that they were dictated by Esdras, who was divinely inspired during the space of forty days for the arduous and important task. The second hypothesis has it, that Esdras collected the dispersed writings, compared them together, and corrected them where they seemed to have been impaired. With regard to the first supposition, it rests on no other authority than a solitary passage in an Apocryphal, or perhaps spurious writing, namely, in the 4th Book of Esdras.

2. The account may be false, since it can be proved, that until the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Machab. 1, 59-60) no attempt was ever made to destroy the sacred writings. 3. It is not difficult to cite positive evidence from the sacred writings of the preservation of the books of Moses, throughout the whole of the Jewish history, and, in particular during their captivity; thus, we find, 2 Esdras, 8 chap., that after the captivity, the people being gathered together, the law was explained to them by Esdras, and in several places the law of Moses is already spoken of as if in existence. Passing now to the second hypothesis, before it can be granted that the Jewish Canon was formed by Esdras, it must be proved, that all the books which compose that Canon were really written before his death. Now this cannot be shewn. For, in the first place, there is no clear evidence, that this book called after his name was written by him. It is generally allowed, at least, the so-called 2nd Book of Esdras was not composed by him, for there are facts mentioned in that work, which must be dated long after the death of Esdras. Thus, we read of Seddoa as High Priest, and of Darius (2 Esdras, 12, v. 22), generally believed to be Darius Codomantus, as king of Persia; both of whom lived at least a hundred years after Esdras. We meet also with Sanaballat, the

timony before Christ from which it can be ascertained with any degree of certainty, what were the books which composed the Jewish Canon; on whose authority has he received some books, and rejected others? A Protestant may, perhaps, say, that he stands to the authority of the High Priests for the Canonicity of the books of the Old Testament. But where is any scriptural authority for this? Is it not possible also, in this hypothesis, that these men may have been deceived? Or, that they admitted into their sacred catalogue books, which were not really inspired; or rejected others, which had a just claim to that character? Or, why grant such authority to the Jewish High Priests, and not to the Christian Catholic Church? Let him also

Horonite, that is of Hononaim, a city of Moat, he who built the temple on Mount Garizim, and who is, with reason, supposed to have flourished in the time of Alexander. Thus, then, I conclude that there is no sufficient reason to believe, that the Canon of the old Scriptures was completed by Esdras. I admit that it is said, that many of the Fathers embraced the opinion, that Esdras formed the Jewish Canon. But how strange, when Protestants argue against Catholics, they see nothing in the Fathers but interpretations, forgeries, unjustifiable opinions, and such like, but when they wish to prove, that the Scriptures are authentic and genuine against the unbeliever, the Fathers are canonized at once as perfect and admirable. But let it be remembered, we regard the authority of the Fathers as of witnesses, and as such their authority is truly valuable. When they testify, that a particular belief and practice prevailed in their days, there can be no doubt, that their testimony is true, and that such in reality was the belief and practice of their age. But, this testimony they deliver as witnesses, not as reasoners. On questions, however, respecting which they deliver their own speculative opinions, their authority goes for very little; attention must then be paid to the force of their arguments, and not to the weight of their names; and if we adopt their opinions, it will not be because they held them, but because we fancy that they have proved them; not because, as Catholics, we respect the Fathers, but because, as reasoners, we are convinced by their statements.

consider, the instant he says that he stands to a uniform tradition, he virtually abjures one of the fundamental principles of his religion, for, at once he establishes the indefectibility of tradition. But will he do this ?

Proceeding now to the Canon of Scripture adopted by the Catholic Church, drawn up in the 3rd Council of Carthage, as St. Augustine and Pope Innocent 1. Epist. to Exup. c. 7, testify, I find, that at the period of the so-called Reformation, all Christendom concurred in receiving this Canon, which then, equally as at this day, she admits and holds. Besides, I find that on this subject there is little or no difference between the Latin and Greek Churches. The latter acknowledges all the writings of the former, but, in addition, respects, as Canonical, the 3rd Book of Esdras, which is considered by the Catholic as Apocryphal. Yes, it is a truth, that she always received the same books as canonical (with the addition above-mentioned); and when invited to join the Protestants, her pastors returned this answer from their Council at Jerusalem, under the Patriarch Dosithenes, in 1670: "We judge all these canonical, and declare them to be Holy Scriptures, because an ancient custom, or rather the Catholic Church, delivered them to us."

The orthodox Armenian adopts the Canon of the Catholic Church. The Syrian, the Nestorian,* and other Eastern sects, whilst they receive all the primary writings of the Old Law, together with those which are rejected by the Jews and Protestants, have placed amongst the Apocrypha several of the Deutero—Canonical books of the New Testament, which, by both the Catholic and Protestant Churches, have been admitted into the Canon. Thus, at

* They reject the four deutero—Canonical Catholic Epistles. See Asseman S. 2. Bib. Orient. p. 499.

the period of the Reformation, the whole Christian body was unanimous in favour of the Catholic Canon of the books of the Old Law and of the New, and if there was a dissentient voice, it was raised in opposition only to certain writings of the New Testament. On the separation of the Church of England from Rome, then it was that we find many of the sacred writings flung aside as either Apocryphal, or spurious by some of those modern Apostles;* and

* That Luther put by the Epistle of St. James, as redolent of good works, with the nickname of an epistle of straw; and proclaimed the Holy Apostle a madman, "Jacobus delirat," are facts with which every one is acquainted. With the licentious denunciations of this self-conceited man against other sacred writings, the general reader may not be so well acquainted. To such, therefore, that a just estimate of the spirit of this reformer may be formed, I offer the following hasty sketch of those opinions which I find in a recent publication (Edin. Review, No. 121, p. 228): "The Books of Kings are more worthy of credit than the Books of the Chronicles. Job spake not, therefore, as it stands written in his book, but hath had such cogitations. It is a sheer *argumentum fabulæ*. This book (Ecclesiastes) ought to have been more full; there is too much of broken matter in it; it has neither boots nor spurs, but rides only in socks, as myself when in the cloister. Solomon, therefore, hath not written this book, which hath been made in the days of the Maccabees by Sirach. It is like a Talmud compiled from many books, in Egypt, at the desire of King Ptolemy Energetes. So also have the Proverbs of Solomon been collected by others. The Book of Esther I toss into the Elbe. I am such an enemy to the Book of Esther that I would it did not exist, for it Judaizes too much, and hath in it a great deal of heathenish naughtiness. Isaiah hath borrowed his art and knowledge from the Psalter. The history of Jonah is so monstrous, that it is absolutely incredible. That the Epistle to the Hebrews is not by St. Paul, nor by any Apostle at all, is shewn from chap. 2, v. 3. It is by an excellently learned man, a disciple of the Apostles. It should be no stumbling block, if there be found in it a mixture of wood, straw, hay. The Epistle of James I account the writing of no Apostle. It is an epistle of straw. The Epistle of Jude is a copy of St. Peter's and allegeth stories, which

no wonder, when the Reformation gave unbounded license to human opinion, which has ever attempted, with as much

have no plea in Scripture. In the Revelation of John much is wanting to let me deem it apostolical. I can discover no trace that it is established by the Spirit."

Even the above, horrible as it is, is but an imperfect statement of the blasphemer's licentiousness. "It is a false opinion," says he, in his preface to the New Testament, "and to be abolished, that there are four Gospels; I have said that John's Gospel is the only fair, true, and excellent Gospel, and is to be preferred by far to the other three; so much so, that the very Epistles of Paul and Peter far surpass the three Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke."* "You may more rightly call the Epistles of Paul a Gospel than those things which Matthew, Mark, and Luke have written."†

The impious example of Luther was not lost on his followers, or on the leaders of other parties. "Calvin and Beza‡ denounced the Book of Revelations as unintelligible, and prohibited the pastors of Geneva from all attempt at interpretation; for which they were applauded by Joseph Scaliger and Cassaubon.§ Scaliger, who also rejected the Epistle of St. James, did not believe the writing to be the production of St. John, and allowed only two chapters to be comprehensible." "The most learned and intelligent of Protestant divines have almost all doubted, or denied, the canonicity of the Revelations."||

Semler, called by some, even in this country, the immortal, laid down the usual basis, "that canonical books must be of divine authority, and the mark of a divine origin was to be the utility of the work, or its tendency to promote virtue. He decided, that the Christian was not bound to receive a single Book of the Old Testament as of divine origin; for he declared that man could receive no moral improvement from them. The historical books of the New Testament were only

* Luth. in 2 Rom. Nov. Test. Ed. 1.

† In Ennarat. in Epist. Petr. Tom. 3 Wittem.

‡ Edin. Review, No. 121, p. 228.

§ Scaliger's words are "Calvinus sapuit quia non scripsit in Apocalypsim."

|| Edin. Review, p. 127, p. 128.

unbridled recklessness, to reject books from the sacred volume as to discard specific doctrines. But to come at once to the knowledge of these appalling facts, I beg to call attention to the celebrated Article (the 6th of the thirty-nine*) of the Church of England on this point. "Holy

valuable for the weaker brother; and even the others are only to be valued by the stronger-minded Christian till he has made himself master of the ideas they contain.* The Book of Revelations he denounced as the work of a lunatic; and his biographer, Eichorn, though he reprehends the expression, states, with all calmness, that the Apocalypse is a drama, representing the downfall of Paganism and Judaism! And these are thy Gods, oh! Protestantism! These are the men who honour the Bible, and who, after wasting their lives in the study of its pages, end by rejecting its inspiration, and proclaiming the holy penmen lunatics and dramatists.†

Since the days of Semler, theories have succeeded each other in never ceasing variety; now the Scriptures are in part inspired and in part not; to-morrow "inspiration is rejected on some strange physical and psychological grounds; then it is pronounced repugnant to reason, irreconcilable with the freedom of the writers; next, is assumed the hypothesis of a deception, practised by the Apostles from good motives, a pious fraud in short."‡

* Under the spiritual headship of the boy Edward, it was found impossible to agree on any fixed catalogue of sacred writings, and forty-two Articles of Religion were published without any enumeration of the holy records. Under the female vicar of Christ's congregation some of the Prelates whom the virgin Elizabeth had declared duly consecrated—all canonical impediments notwithstanding—after reducing, no doubt by virtue of the same divine power and direction, the multifarious Articles of Edward to the present orthodox number thirty-nine, proclaimed the catalogue of writings, which were in future to be looked upon as canonical, under severe penalties, by the members of the Established Church. Had

* Rose, "State of Protestantism in Germany," p. 49—51.

† Most of the great rationalist writers are, or have been, Professors in the German Universities.

‡ Rose, &c.

Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation : so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church."

Well, then, in the first place we are told "that the Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, so that," &c. Now, is this the fact? Or are there not articles of faith which the members of the Established Church—as well as Protestants in general—admit, which are not contained in the Bible? Protestants admit as an article of their belief, the obligation of keeping holy the Sunday; now, where in any page of the sacred volume is there any proof or attestation of such obligation? The truth is, the obligation is wholly and exclusively founded upon the authority of tradition. The Church of England, as also many Dissenting congregations, believe in the validity and necessity of infant baptism; and in what text of the Bible is this contained? It rests solely upon tradition; hence, some Protestant sects reject it. It is an article of the Protestant's faith, that the Bible is a divinely inspired book, and this of all other articles of his faith is the most vitally im-

Had the framers of the Articles contented themselves with pronouncing certain books canonical, and rejecting others in force of that authority which they, with suicidal folly, proclaimed the Church to possess "in controversies of faith," and abstained from assigning any reason for their choice, they would have acted wisely, but in stating the motives of their preference, they have exposed their judgment to be impugned, and have clearly convicted themselves of the grossest inconsistency, or the most palpable ignorance.

portant. Now, by what argument from the Scriptures can he prove this? To prove its inspiration, as it is nowhere to be found in the Holy Writings, appeal must be made from the Bible itself to some other testimony—to the authority of tradition. Again, the Protestant believes such and such books to be canonical and no others, and where does the Bible establish this important point? He has no authority for it but tradition, and take this away, he has no proof to establish the divinity of the Bible,—aye, or even to establish the divinity of the Christian religion. Besides these points, how can they tell whether polygamy, which was allowed under the Jewish dispensation (1 Sam. 25, v. 43, &c.) is not still in force among Christians? Or whether we may lawfully swear in judgment? (Matt. 5, v. 34.) Or whether we may lawfully fight in war? (Matt. 5, v. 39.) Whether we may adopt legal measures for the recovery of goods, &c.? (Matt. 5, v. 40.) Or whether the washing of feet is a Gospel precept? Or, finally; whether we are not still bound to observe the precept of the Apostles to certain Gentile converts, to abstain from blood and things strangled? (Acts 15, v. 29.) Besides were not all the necessary points of religion *taught* and believed before any part of the New Testament was written, and were to be conveyed to after ages, although they had never been written, and this by command of Christ himself, who never wrote, nor commanded the Apostles to *write*, but to *teach*? However, we Catholics willingly admit, that all the articles of the Christian faith may be said to be evidently contained in a general sense in the Scriptures, for, there is no article of faith which is not conveyed to us, either by evident and particular texts of Scripture, or by texts not sufficiently clear, but explained by Apostolical traditions, to which the Scripture itself bears testimony—

Catholic Version.

Deut. 32.

7 Remember the days of old, think upon every generation: ask thy father, and he will declare to thee, thy elders and they will tell thee.

Job, 8.

8 inquire of the former generation, and search diligently into the memory of the fathers:

10 And they shall teach thee:

Psalm 77.

3 How great things have we heard and known, and our fathers have told us.

John, 16.

12 I have yet many things to say to you: but you cannot bear them now.

Acts, 1.

3 To whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion, by many proofs, for forty days appearing to them, and speaking of the kingdom of God.

1 Cor. 11.

2 Now, I praise you, brethren, that in all things you

Protestant Version.

Deut. 32.

7 Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations: ask thy father, and he will shew thee; thy elders, and they will tell thee.

Job, 8.

8 inquire, I pray thee, of the former age, and prepare thyself to the search of their fathers:

10 Shall not they teach thee,

Psalm 78.

3 Which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us.

John, 16.

12 I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.

Acts, 1.

3 To whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

1 Cor. 11.

2 Now I praise you brethren, that ye remember

Catholic Version.

are mindful of me : and keep my ordinances as I have delivered them to you.

34 and the rest I will set in order, when I come.

2 Thess. 2.

14 Therefore, brethren, stand fast : and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle.

1 Tim. 6.

20 O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding the profane novelties of words, and oppositions of knowledge falsely so called.

2 Tim. 1.

13 Hold the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me in faith, and in the love which is in Christ Jesus.

Titus, 1.

9 Embracing that faithful word which is according to doctrine, that he may be able to exhort in sound doctrine, and to convince the gainsayers.

Protestant Version.

me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered *them* to you.

34 and the rest will I set in order when I come.

2 Thess. 2.

15 Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.

1 Tim. 6.

20 O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane *and* vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called.

2 Tim. 1.

13 Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.

Titus, 1.

9 Holding fast the faithful word as he had been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.

Catholic Version.

3 John, 1.

13 I had many things to write unto thee; but I would not by ink and pen write to thee.

Protestant Version.

3 John, 1.

13 I had many things to write, but I will not with ink and pen write unto thee.

In the next place, we are told—"in the name," &c.; but how erroneous this is, will be seen when we reflect, that until the 4th century, at soonest, doubts respecting certain books were almost universal. Even at this present day, the Protestant Churches do not agree among themselves respecting the sacred canon. The Church of England admits *now* into its canons certain books which at the earlier periods of the Reformation it rejected. Again, with reference to those which she rejects, as Apocrypha, we have unquestionable evidence of their canonicity from the writings of the early Fathers of the Church. For their authorities for the Book of Tobias, see Vol. I. p. 332; for Maccabees, *Ibid*, p. 333; for Ecclesiasticus, Vol. II. p. 9.

THE BOOK OF JUDITH.

3rd Century—Clement of Alexandria, lib. iv. *Stromat.*

Origen, tom. iii. in *Joannem*.

Tertullian, lib. de *Monogamia*, c. 17.

Julius Africanus, lib. i. de part. *Divina Legis*.

4th Century—St. Ambrose, lib. iii. de *Officiis*, et lib. de *Viduis*.

St. Jerom, *Præf. in Judith*, et *Epist. ad Furiam*.

St. Athanasius, in Synop. (attributed to St. Athanasius.)

5th Century—St. Augustin, lib. ii. Doct. Christ. cap. 8.

THE BOOK OF WISDOM.

1st Century—St. Clement, Epist. ad Corinth. cap. 3 et 28.

2nd Century—St. Irenæus, lib. iv. adv. Hæreses, cap. 75.

3rd Century—Clement Alex. lib. ii. Pedag. cap. 8; lib. ii. cap. 1; et Stromatum, lib. vi. p. 787.

Origen, in Ev. Joan. t. xiii. xx. xxviii. xxxii.

St. Cyprian, lib. de Habitu Virg. Serm. de Mortal. cap. 8; et Testim. lib. xv. adv. Judæos, cap. 14.

4th Century—St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. ix. n. 2 et 16, xii. n. 5, xv. n. 18, xvi. n. 19.

St. Jerom, in Hieremiam, cap. 19.

Lactantius, lib. iv. de Vera Sap. cap. 16.

5th Century—St. Augustin, lib. i. de Prædestin. cap. 14.

St. Cyril of Alexandria, lib. ii. in Julianum.

THE BOOK OF BARUCH

is either quoted separately, or as a part of Jeremias, by—

3rd Century—Clement Alex. lib. Pædag. cap. 10, lib. ii. cap. 3.

St. Cyprian, Testim. lib. ii. adv. Judæos, cap. 6.

4th Century—St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. ii. n. 17, xi. n. 15.

Eusebius, lib. vi. Demonst. cap. 19.

St. Basil, lib. iv. in Eunomium.

St. Hillary, Præf. Com. in Psalm.

St. Ambrose, Ser. xviii. in Ps. cxviii. lib. i. de Fide, cap. 2.

St. Chrysostom, in Orat. quod Christus sit
Deus, contra gentes.

5th Century—St. Cyril of Alexandria, lib. x. in Julian.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL

is continually cited by the holy Fathers, without any exception, against the portions rejected by the Church of England. But the History of Susanna is especially attested by—

3rd Century—Origen, Epist. ad Jul. Africanum.

Tertullian, lib. de Corona Militis.

St. Cyprian, Ser. de Orat. Dominica, et pluribus aliis locis.

4th Century—St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. xvi. n. 31.

St. Athanasius, in Synop. (attributed to him.)

St. Basil, lib. de Sp. Sancto, cap. 30.

Ruffinus, lib. ii. adv. Hieron.

5th Century—St. Augustin, lib. de Præd. SS. cap. 14 ; lib. ii. Doct. Christ. cap. 8 ; et xviii. de Civitate Dei.

THE BOOK OF ESTHER.

“By the Councils of Laodicea and Carthage, this book was declared Canonical, and by most of the ancient Fathers esteemed as divine Scripture ; only two or three before the said councils doubted of its authority. And though St. Hierom in his time found not certain parts thereof in the Hebrew, yet in the Greek he found all the 16 chapters contained in 10 ; and it is not improbable that these parcels were sometimes in the Hebrew as divers whole books, which are now lost. But whether they ever were so or not, the Church of Christ accounts the whole book of infallible authority, as well these parts as the rest, in her public office.” (Ward’s Errata.)

Proceeding now to the translations of the Bible, the reader will be able to form from the subjoined statements his judgment of them; he will then find no difficulty in believing with Catholics whether by the circulation of false translations, pronounced confidently as the dictations of the Holy Ghost, that the *Reformers* succeeded so triumphantly, in seducing men from the parent Church, in destroying the unity of faith, and in disturbing the harmony of social life. To the proof: Is it not a fact that Luther admitted that he added to the text, and gave his individual authority alone, as a justification of this daring impiety? // "I know well," says he, "that this word alone, (which he added to St. Paul, 'For we account a man to be justified by faith' alone. Rom. iii.) is not found in the text of St. Paul; but should a Papist annoy you upon it, tell him at once, without hesitation, that Dr. Martin Luther would have it so, and that a Papist and an ass are synonymous." (Tom. 5, Jena Edit. p. 141, 144.)

When Luther put out his translation of the Scriptures, did not Zuinglius, his brother Reformer, thus speak of it: "Luther was a foul corrupter and horrible falsifier of God's word; one who followed the Marcionites and Arians, that razed out such places of Holy Writ as were against him? 'Thou dost (says he to Luther) corrupt the word of God: thou art seen to be a manifest and common corrupter and perverter of the Holy Scriptures. How much are we ashamed of thee, we who have hitherto esteemed thee beyond all measure, and proved thee to be such a man?'" (Lib. de Sacr. T. 3, ad Luth.)

Nay, as Luther had the impiety to add the word *alone* to the Scripture, in order to support his doctrine of justification by faith alone, did not Zuinglius, following his example, by putting "signifies" for "it is," thus impiously defend his figurative presence? (Zu: to 2, ad Lut.) Is not

Melancthon's translation condemned as impure and unfaithful by his brother Reformers? Does not Molinaeus charge Beza in his translation with actually changing the text, of which he gives several instances; and did not Castalio, a learned Calvinist (as Osiander says) and skilful in the languages, write a whole book against the corruptions of Beza's version, and say he will not note them all, for that would require too large a volume? (In Test. Parts 20, 30, 40, 64, 65, 66, 74, 99. et Parts 8, 13, 14, 21, 23.) On the other side, does not Beza condemn Castalio's translation as sacrilegious, wicked, and Ethnical? (In Respon. et Respon. Castal. in Test. 1556, in Pref. &c.) Was not the Protestant Bible in Henry the Eighth's days, in 1626, by Tindal, or Tyndall, so corrupt that the whole of it, with the exception, it is said, of one copy, was bought up and burnt by Tostal, Bishop of London, and Sir Thomas More? (Horne int. p. 108.) The character of the English Protestant translation until the year 1660 is thus described by De Israeli: "Our English Bibles were suffered to be so corrupted, that no books ever swarmed with such innumerable errata (errors). These errata unquestionably were, in a great part, voluntary omissions, interpolated passages and meanings reformed and forged for certain purposes." Mr. John Wesley (in his New Testament, London, 1790,) tells us in the preface, that "in this edition the translation is brought as near as possible to the original; yet the alterations are few and seemingly small, but they may be of considerable importance." The Vice-chancellor of England, in the matter of Lady Howley's charity, 17th December, 1833, published in London, 1834, in his judgment on the case, declared that the "improved version of the New Testament by the Unitarians, fetters the understanding of the reader, by imposing their creed in the shape of a translation;" he also gave many texts, infamously and impiously

mistranslated, to favour the doctrine which rejects Christ's divinity. (See pp. 34 to 40.) The Irish Society, in November, 1822, passed the following resolution condemnatory of the Irish Protestant translation: Resolved—“That after a full inquiry, the members of this Society feel satisfied that material and very numerous errors exist in the version of the New Testament edited by the British and Foreign Bible Society.” Mr. Platt tells us, that thirty-five variations were discovered in the first ten pages, of which seven were considered to be material. The Hon. and Rev. Mr. Percival (Reasons for not being a Member of the Bible Society) says, that this proportion in a Testament of 460 pages, gives 1,400 variations and 280 material errors in a single volume.

The *Monthly London Review* for February, 1833, in speaking of the pamphlet of Thomas Curtis, of Grove-house, Islington, on his discoveries of the falsification of the Bible, says:—“In this comparatively brief pamphlet we find the exposition of one of the most singular deceptions to which the world has yet been exposed. The imposition is nothing short of a downright falsification of the text of Scripture. Need we add a syllable more to rouse the attention of the thinking community?” The Reviewer then proceeds to state the means by which Mr. Curtis was led to the discovery of the falsification of the sacred text.—1st. “Mr. Curtis's attention was called to the subject of errors in the Bible by the accidental discovery of various discrepancies, which occurred in the copies which were read in his family. He found it a good method of securing attention amongst them, to cause each in his family and of his pupils, to read a verse or two in succession, and scarcely passed a single day without his witnessing, between the text in the modern university Bibles, and in those which had been a long time in his possession, a very alarming amount of variance.”

2ndly. "Mr. Curtis had very strong reasons to be discontented with the plan of publication on which the Scriptures had been settled by government. He says that the office of printing the Bible was given as a *bonne bouche* to Mr. Reeves, a barrister, and he not being acquainted with the necessary art, actually farmed out to the highest bidder, at a certain rate per annum, his right to the printing of God's word. The printers, whom Mr. Curtis personally knew, were quite a second order in their trade, who employed their own workmen and stationer." 3rdly. "Mr. Curtis obtained the knowledge of another singular fact, which threw still more light on the infamous system of printing the holy Scriptures which had so long prevailed. About twenty years ago, an intelligent reader at one of the printing offices where the Bible was in a course of printing, took the trouble of drawing up a specification of a number of gross errors, which he found in the very copy that had been selected by the proper authorities as the standard of correctness to which he was to adhere. The errors pointed out by the penetrating reader amounted to no less than seven hundred and thirty one, and these occurred in the various chapters from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Jeremiah." The Reviewer then gives some of these errors. We find in the same Review, page 220, "that in April, 1832, a memorial was addressed on the subject to the Vice-Chancellors of the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and the other delegates of the Clarendon press. It was signed by the following gentlemen:—

J. BENNETT, D. D.	J. FLETCHER, D. D.
J. BLACKBURN.	E. HENDERSON.
GEORGE COLLISON.	J. P. SMITH, D. D.
THOMAS CURTIS.	J. TOWNLEY, D. D.
F. A. COX, L. L. D.	R. WINTER, D. D.

“The names attached to this memorial are too respectable not to communicate a great degree of importance to any statement to which they are affixed. This memorial states ‘that the modern Bibles issued from the press of the University of Oxford, abounded with deviations from the authorized version of King James 1.—That though some of those errors were merely typographical, yet of those that were intentional the number was of a serious amount: that in the book of Genesis there were upwards of eight hundred errors; in the Psalms six hundred; in the gospel of St. Matthew four hundred and sixteen, and in about the fourth part of the Bible, an aggregate of two thousand nine hundred and thirty-one.’”

In the *Christian Journal* for July, 1833, published in Glasgow, entitled “Review—Bible Monopoly,” in which omissions, additions, substitutions of the Bibles to 1830, are pointed out, we read that the Reviewers, after stating that whilst the most beautiful and accurate editions of the classics and other works were published in Britain during the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, copies of the Bible were in circulation so erroneous as to make the Christian shudder when he thinks of them—and that one impression was so very incorrect, that it was said to have been secretly sent out of the country. Now, when such cannot be alleged of the Catholic Church, may it not be said of her, that she has invariably, and most scrupulously preserved the Bible?

Having, in the mean time, treated of many important points connected with the Holy Writings, and in particular with their Canonicity, I have now to call the attention of my reader to two others equally interesting, the Authenticity and Divine Inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures. With respect to the first point very much depends: for, if the various books of the Holy Writings were not written by

those whose names they bear, should even their names have been lost, or if the sacred records did not appear about the period to which they are assigned, and to which the events recorded point, much of their value is destroyed. They can be no longer considered the productions of men competent to describe the important transactions which are related. They may after all be spurious and supposititious writings. To a Protestant, who makes the Bible his sole and only rule of faith, this question is of the most vital interest. He should consider, that if the Bible be not genuine, the doctrine which it contains cannot be admitted as the uncorrupted doctrines of Christ, and, consequently, his only proof of the divinity of the Christian Religion falls to the ground. Now, on what principle is this authenticity to be established? I know but two ways, either by the testimony of the Scriptures themselves, or by some external testimony; and if by the latter, either by individual testimony or by the evidence of individuals, as a body liable to err, or as a body regarded as an infallible living and speaking authority. To commence with the Scriptures themselves, though I admit that notwithstanding the many undoubted difficulties which they present, and the numerous apparent contradictions they contain, there is yet a degree of evidence for their authenticity to be found in the books themselves: still this is not enough—this is not sufficient to incline me to believe that they are really genuine and authentic; I repeat it, this evidence is not so satisfactory, as that I may feel myself justified in saying that the Gospel of St. John is the authentic writing of this Apostle. The internal evidence does not establish that the work is really genuine. It follows, then, that we must look for the authenticity of the Sacred Writings in an external testimony—a testimony totally independent of the Scriptures. Now, this testimony must be either of individuals, or of indivi-

duals regarded as a body. The first supposes an actual examination of the individual witnesses who depose in favour of the authenticity of each book, and of this the vast majority of mankind are incapable. How is it possible that the great bulk of mankind can quietly turn over the vast volumes of the Fathers, balance their testimonies, doubt with some, or reject with others, and finally judge between them? This is a task not at all suited to most men. Well, then, I must look for another testimony of individuals in a body—an infallible living and speaking authority on whom I may rely with safety on this important point; for of a body liable to err it is useless to treat.

Now, what is this authority but the one established by Christ himself,—the Apostles, and their lawful successors? The Apostles were the depositaries of his doctrines, not the authors of them; they delivered what they received, but did not invent; they testified “to what they had seen and heard.” But they were not the only witnesses; they also who derived their faith from them became depositaries, and not only they, the Bishops, and Pope, who are regarded as their direct successors, but even each parent was interested in preserving the sacred deposit. Sincerity was all that was required in each one to be a faithful witness; and a resolution to teach that only to others which he himself had seen and heard; or which he had been taught, and practised during the whole course of his life. In this manner the first generation of believers delivered what they had received to the second, and the second to the third, and that to its next successor, down to the present period. Thus, therefore, to the testimony of tradition must we look for the authenticity of the Holy Writings, a tradition based and grounded upon the unerring authority of the Catholic Church, from whence the Church of England received the Scriptures, and without whose testimony she could not have possessed God’s

word. In this point, she may say with St. Augustin, "I would not believe the Gospel, if the authority of the Church did not induce me to do so."* Next to the Authenticity of the Scriptures, is the question of their Inspiration. If the Scriptures are inspired, they are the word of God, if not, they are but the word of man. If the word of man, they may deceive us, since, notwithstanding the most perfect sincerity and the most intimate acquaintance with the subjects of which they treat, the writers may have been deceived, if not in the facts which they relate, at least in their deductions from them. This question of their inspiration is one of the greatest importance. But how am I to believe their inspiration? That the Apostles wrote certain books and tracts might indeed be an object of sense. They who wrote them whilst the Apostles dictated, or they who saw the Apostles pen them, or who received them from their hands might bear testimony to this fact. The authenticity of the Scriptures is a matter of human cognizance, but the inspiration is of a different nature. The former is an object of sense, the latter is a divine and spiritual agency, of which no human observation can take cognizance. On what authority, then, are we to admit the authenticity of the Bible? Are we to seek for it in the Scriptures themselves? But, independently that this would be a fruitless labour, where does the Scripture assert its inspiration? This is nowhere mentioned. Are we to believe this inspiration, because the writers were Apostles? If so, why reject the writings of some Apostles, and admit others? Or, why admit the writings of Mark and Luke, who were not Apostles? It may be said, each Apostle was infallible. But where is the proof of their infallibility? With the exception of St. Peter, there is no evidence in the Bible, that any promise of this nature was made to any

* S. August Contra. Epis. Fund.

but the Apostolic body. But, even granting the infallibility of each one of the Apostles, how are we to act with respect to the Gospels of Mark and Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles? Let me even suppose that Mark attests the inspiration of Luke, and Matthew that of Mark, and Paul of Matthew, who will attest the inspiration of Paul? By arguing thus, we only remove the difficulty from one to another, but do not solve the question. Hence, were I to find it even in the Bible, why should I believe it, unless I had an inspired testimony to enable me to give credit to the next—and here, again, what is this inspirèd testimony? Well, then, the Bible does not prove its own inspiration, how then can I contend that it is the only rule of faith? I am therefore reduced to this dilemma, either to deny the authority of the Scripture, and to consider it a mere human production, or to reject the distinctive principle of the Reformation, that the Bible is the sole rule of faith. It may be said, that the Spirit of God bears testimony to the hearts of some, that the Bible is the word of God. But where in the Scripture is this divine assurance given? This is but a mere sophism. Again, if the spirit bears testimony, &c., how comes it to pass that there have been so many doubts and perplexities on this subject? In the golden ages of the Christian religion many writings were not only rejected, which we now believe to be inspired, but several were regarded as the word of God, which later ages have condemned as human compositions; now does the Spirit of God lead men to contradictory conclusions? Again, if the Spirit leads men to know the inspiration of the Sacred Writings, how comes it to pass that Catholics believe in the inspiration of some books rejected by Lutherans, and Calvinists repudiate as apocryphal, books looked upon as inspired by both? There must be, then, other

authority for believing in the inspiration of the Holy Writings; and what is that great authority but the testimony of God's holy Church, established and grounded on a saving faith and hope before a word of the New Testament was written? Therefore on tradition depends the inspiration of the written word;—reject tradition, or the authority of the Church, and you destroy the Scriptures.

Waving, however, all these difficulties, and regarding the Bible as inspired, proceeding now to discuss the merits of the several rules of faith laid down in the preceding pages: with respect to the second, I at once boldly and fearlessly deny the right which the Church of England claims to herself of deciding in controversies of faith. In my own defence, I ask, first, what justifies her separation from Rome? 2. Where are the marks by which she may be discovered to be the true Church of Christ? With respect to the first, I beg to be informed whether the Catholic Church, as it is now, was *such* when she separated from us, or not? If it were the same, since our principles, as I have proved, are scriptural, I demand a just and sufficient motive for separation? If it were not the same, I ask to be shown the difference? With respect to the second point, I beg answers to the following questions. Is the Church of England one in doctrine, worship, and government? Is she Catholic or Universal, both as to place, time, and persons? that is, does she consist of the most numerous body of Christians? Is she more or less diffused wherever Christianity prevails? Has she visibly existed ever since the time of the Apostles? Is she holy in her founders, in the means which she employs to conduct men to Heaven, in the purity of her doctrines, and in the lives of many of her members, confirmed by divine attestations, miracles? Finally, is she Apostolical, do her Bishops succeed in an uninterrupted succession from the

Apostles? Even should they show a title to valid ordination, have they lawful mission? These are awful questions, and still they must be satisfactorily answered before I admit her to have a right to be called the true Church of Christ—having authority to decide in controversies of faith. Every well-meaning Church-of-England man knows, that when a pious Pope would not agree that Henry VIIIth should put away his lawful wife, and, in open defiance of the most sacred laws of the Bible, take another, the first attempt was made to separate from Rome—yes, I boldly and fearlessly say it, because a pious Pontiff would not (because he could not) accede to gratify a lascivious prince, the first stone of revolt was laid. Is this enough to justify the separation? What had the irregular, wanton desires of Henry VIIIth to do with the external salvation of so many who have gone away from the true religion, owing to his nefarious conduct? Again, with respect to the marks of the true Church, do not the jarring doctrines professed by her various members, the different fragments into which they are frittered, and the very names of parties into which they are divided and subdivided, destroy on the part of the Church of England, her title to unity? Before the fifteenth century, where was the name of Protestant to be found? Let an impartial Church-of-England man, standing only to his own great principle of examining every thing, answer this question. Again, let him draw a comparison between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, and tell whether the latter is a body of persons equal in number to the members of the former, or where will he find but one hundred of Protestants believing one and the same doctrines? Should he even grant his Church Catholicity, he must deny her unity, and if he grants the latter he must deny the former. Who consecrated the first Pro-

testant bishop? Even suppose he was validly consecrated, of which I have the strongest doubts, I ask, have the bishops of the Church of England lawful jurisdiction? These things are required in every minister of the Gospel, and without them no man can say he is sent as such by Christ. Besides, where is the sanctity of life in the founders of Protestantism? Has she not long since discarded the number of the Sacraments? Reduced the most precious of all to a mere nothing—to a bit of bread and a drop of wine? Again, were the saints of the new law, who were instrumental in the conversion of nations, Protestants? Where are the miracles performed by Protestant saints to prove either their own mission, or their own personal sanctity?

But supposing even that they can shew forth to the world Protestants powerful in deed and word; suppose their Bishops possess valid ordination, and lawful jurisdiction, are they then competent to decide in Controversies of Faith? No, I boldly answer, and my reason is this, they themselves tell me they are fallible, and they prove it by the fact, for Bishops are opposed to Bishops, Archdeacons to Archdeacons, and Professors of Theology to Professors of Theology—look at Oxford. Such a church, then, cannot have a right to decide in Controversies of Faith—to interpret the word of God; and in this I am borne out by the great respectable body of persons who differ from it. Proceeding now to discuss the merits of the third rule of faith, I have no hesitation in saying, that this rule, namely, “individual reason is sufficient to interpret the word of God, and that every man of himself, can, and ought to form for himself from it alone, his own creed” is opposed to common sense, and to the experience of mankind in general; is impracticable and absurd in the extreme; is replete with infidelity; is repugnant to the spirit of religion in general, and to that

of Christianity in particular; is equally so to the method instituted by Divine Providence for the religious instruction of man; finally, highly derogatory to the nature of Christ's mission, to his divine institutions, and dictates. First, it is opposed to common sense; things of the most ordinary nature are above the reach of our weak reason, and if in matters so humble, reason declares its own insufficiency and weakness, who will assert that it is competent, or sufficient to investigate matters of a more transcendent nature? Secondly, in religion, as well as in nature, the wisdom of God demands order. Now, in the order of nature there is but one sun that illumines the entire earthly globe; equally so should there be but one visible sun of authority to enlighten the path of man towards the Heavenly Jerusalem; admit, however, the principle of private judgment, and you ask of God to create so many religious suns with contradictory lights for every fanatic in the universe. Thirdly, in every age, and at all times, all errors, however absurd and monstrous, aye, and pernicious in their tendency, have originated from this principle in question. Fourthly, man guided by it alone, can never come to any certainty of the truth. He must in great questions meet the serious difficulties proposed, let us say, by Atheists or Deists; examine all creeds; bring to the test of his private reason whatever has been written for or against the vital principle of religion; most minutely examine and decide upon the important questions connected with the Sacred Writings, and ultimately conclude, that so many are in error, and of consequence, he alone right; and is this a task for the poor and unlettered mechanic or peasant? Fifthly, it is replete with infidelity; one powerful example will evince the truth of this observation: suppose a man in the twentieth year of his age is presented with a copy of the sacred volume,

and it is said to him, here is the word of God, from this you are to learn your articles of faith; well, then, either he can make an act of faith in the inspired dictates of the book, or he can not? If it be admitted that he can, it must of course be upon authority, for he has not as yet examined, but *this* destroys the principle of private judgment; or if he cannot, he is at that period of his life an infidel, an unbeliever, sitting in darkness, and in the shadow of death. Sixthly, it is opposed to the nature of faith. Faith is the firmest assent of the mind to any revealed truth. "Believe, nothing doubting," is the language of the Apostle. The mind of man, to give formal assent to revealed truths, requires an infallible motive. If the foundation be weak, the superstructure must necessarily vacillate. How, therefore, will the uncertain glimmerings of puerile judgment, interpreting the Bible, give us that security which Christian Faith requires, since he who has no other ground for his belief, than his own individual reason, must always doubt, and never firmly believe? Seventhly, it is opposed to the spirit of religion in general. The spirit of religion is obedience and love. There can be no obedience where every man is judge of his own faith, and of his own morality; no love where there is no unity; no unity where subordination is from principle impossible. Eighthly, it is also repugnant to the spirit of Christianity in particular. The spirit of Christianity in particular is humility: the blessed Jesus humbled himself by taking on him the form of a slave, becoming obedient even unto the death of the cross; now the principle of private judgment is founded not on humility, but on pride, and on a pride similar to that which hurled a satan from the highest Heavens to the lowest depths of perdition, and an Adam and Eve from a terrestrial paradise to a world of woe, wretchedness, and misery; consequently, it is repugnant to the spirit of Christianity in

particular. Ninthly, it is opposed to the nature of Christ's mission. The blessed Jesus was a legislator ; no one who has read a single page in the Bible will attempt to deny this position : well, then, either he has established a tribunal without appeal, as the interpreter of that law which he has given us, or he has left every individual to be its arbiter and interpreter ; if the latter case, he has violated the common sense of all ages, and he has shown himself inferior in wisdom to the beings of his own making, who have never, when they acted as legislators, enacted laws without appointing judges to preside over, superintend, and interpret them. But who will assert this of Him, who is the wisdom of the Eternal Father ? Tenthly, Christ was a universal legislator ; he came not to reveal the heavenly truths to the rich alone, but to the poor. But in our case the poor would be unable to come at the knowledge of religious truth by means of their private judgment, since unlettered as they generally are, they are unable to dispute about the true meaning of God's law, and they daily behold many among the rich ones of this life, bewildered by the sophistry and craftiness of cunning men. Lastly, Christ was a testator : he made a will, and this will he calls the New Testament in his blood. Now, if prudent men making their wills appoint executors to interpret and administer the same, shall we say that the blessed Jesus was less prudent than the work of his own hand, and that he has left his will like an apple of discord among his followers, without establishing a ministry to superintend and expound it ? For these, and a thousand other similar reasons I must condemn the third rule of faith,

Now, to the first, the Catholic—or true rule of Faith. The Catholic Church believes, Jesus Christ established the Christian Religion : she also teaches, that he chose from among his followers, twelve persons to whom he entrusted

the propagation of it ; these persons, he distinctly foretold were to be witnesses unto him in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermost parts of the earth. These he also commanded to go forth in his name to teach all nations ; and to teach them to observe all things whatsoever he commanded them, promising to be with them all days, even till the consummation of the world. We see he commands them to teach, no mention is made of writing, and he promises to assist them not for a time, or a specified number of years, but during the period of their own natural lives, and on their departure from this world, the same assistance is promised to their lawful and legitimate successors. The Catholic Church also believes, standing to indisputable texts of the Bible admitted by all Protestants, that the Apostles did, in virtue of their commission, go forth preaching and teaching, and that by their preaching and teaching they established the Christian Religion ; that before the first book of the New Testament was written, many nations had embraced Christianity, and many from among them had departed life in a saving faith and hope. And when we call to mind, that at the period in which the Apostles lived printing was not then, nor for many centuries later invented, nor books consequently so common as now, even those that were in existence were copied by the pen at great labour and cost, we must conclude, that the method of converting nations by teaching, and not by writing, was the only one that sufficiently answered,—no other, in the infallible decrees of Heaven, could be wiser, or better adapted to the wants of man. Here, we cannot but also admire the goodness of our beloved Redeemer in regard to the many poor members of the Christian Religion ; to them the Gospel was first announced. Now, if it had not been by preaching, how could they, ignorant as they generally are of human literature and science,

acquire a knowledge of the divine truths of Religion? In the mean time, the Holy Writings came into existence, and the persons to whom they were directed, or for whom they were written, could, without much difficulty, perceive that it was by an authority divinely instituted and divinely assisted they were to be associated with religion, and that the moment they were to deviate from this authority, established by the Son of the living God, the deposit of faith would be in danger. But, as the gates of hell were not to prevail against the Church, so, this could not happen, and though many have in after ages departed from the true faith, still the sacred deposit has always remained inviolable. They could also perceive, that it was by the teaching of persons appointed by this authority, that nations were converted to the knowledge of the religion of Jesus Christ, and by it are kept closely cemented together even to this present day. During the first four centuries, by consulting Ecclesiastical history, we find, that it was not known with certainty what were the canonical writings, and who the inspired writers; it was only when a general peace was given to the Church, that the authority established by Jesus Christ, and represented by the Bishops, with the Pope at their head, assembled in Council, declared, which were the Sacred Scriptures, or made known what writings were to be regarded as such. Thus, therefore, the Catholic believes, that his rule of faith is not only the written but also the unwritten word, the former explained, and the latter made known to him by the Church, established by Jesus Christ, a Church, one in doctrine, one in worship, one in government: holy in doctrine, holy in the means of sanctity, the most efficacious of which are the Sacraments; holy in its fruits—to it belonged innumerable persons of both sexes, powerful in deed and word,—Catholic or universal, consisting of the most numerous body of Christians, more or

less diffused wherever Christianity prevails, and visibly existing since the time of the Apostles; finally, Apostolical in her Pastors, who succeed, by an uninterrupted series, the Apostles in Doctrine, Jurisdiction, Orders, and Mission—this Church is no other than the Church of Rome, which, amidst the boiling tempests of infidelity, heresy, and irreligion, like Noah's ark, braves the furious storm, and steering a direct and steady course, glides with safety and security into the port of eternal salvation.

SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF THE DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST, AND OF THE HOLY GHOST.

Prophecies regarding the future Messiah.—Gen. iii. 15; xii. 3; xviii. 18; xxii. 17; xxvi. 4; xxviii. 14; xlix. 10. Numbers, xxiv. 17. Deut. xviii. 15—19; &c.

Prophetic Testimonies.—Isai. vii. 14; viii. 13—15; ix. 6; xi. 1—3; xxviii. 5, 16; xxxv. 3—5; xl. 3—5, 9, 10, 11; xlv. 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 25; lii. 7; liii. 13, &c. Jerem. xxiii. 5, 6; xxxiii. 15, 16. Ezekiel, xxxiv. 23, 24, 29. Daniel, vii. 13, 14; ix. 24, 27. Osea, i. 6, 7; xi. 1. Joel, ii. 28. Amos, ix. 11. Abdias, i. 8. Micheas, v. 2; vii. 7. Habacuc, iii. 13, 18. Aggeus, ii. 6—9. Zacharias, ii. 10, 11; iii. 8; vi. 12; ix. 9; xi. 12, 13; xii. 10; xiii. 6, 7. Malachias, iii. 1; &c.

Testimonies immediately antecedent to his Birth.—Matt. i. 20—25. Luke, i. 15, 17, 31, 41—43, 76, 78, 79; ii. 8—14; iii. 16, 17. John, i. &c. the whole chapter; iii. 27—36; &c.

Testimonies during his abode upon earth.—Matt. iii. 16, 17; xvii. 5; xvi. 16, 20; ii. 11; xiv. 33. Matt. viii. 29; xxvii. 54. Mark, iii. 12. Luke, iv. 41. John, i. 49; iii. 16; vi. 70; xi. 27; xvi. 30; &c.

His own Testimony.—Matt. xxii. 41—45; xi. 27; xvii. 25, 26; xii. 8; xviii. 19, 20; xxvi. 53. John, ii. 16, 19; iv. 26; ix. 37; iii. 13; vi. 38, 41, 48, 50, 63; viii. 23, 38, 42; xiii. 3; xv. 15; xvi. & xvii. *passim*; viii. 56—59; x. 18; &c.

I consider it unnecessary to adduce the evidence of miracles. I beg of the reader to peruse the following with attention:—

God the Father said—	Jesus said—
Be light made—	See, to the blind.
Let there be a firmament—	Peace, be still, to the raging wind, and seas.
Let the waters, &c., be gathered, &c.	Be straight, to the crooked.
Let the earth bring forth fruit, &c.	Come forth, to Lazarus.
Let there be lights made in, &c.	Be stretched out, to the withered hand.
Let the waters bring forth, &c.	Be clean, to the leprous.
Let us make man, &c.	Arise, to the dead.

His Testimony at the close of life, and after his Resurrection.—Matt., xxvi. 63—66. Mark, xiv. 61—64. Luke, xxii. 66—67. John, xix. 7. Matt. xxviii. 18—20.

Testimonies of the Apostles, and particularly of St. Paul after his Ascension.—Acts, vii. 55—57—59; i. 24; ii. 24, 25, 33; iii. 14, 15; x. 36. 1 Pet. iii. 22. 2 Pet. i. 1, 11, 16, 17; ii. 1; iii. 18. Acts, viii. 37. James, ii. 1. Jude, iv. 24, 25. Acts, ix. 5; xx. 21—28. Rom. i. 3, 4; ix. 5; viii. 29, 32. 1 Cor. ii. 8; xv. 47; xvi. 22. Ephes. iv. 9, 10. 2 Cor. v. 18—21; viii. 9. Gal. iv. 4, 5. Philip, ii. 5—11; iii. 20—21. Col. i. 13—17, 19; ii. 3, 9. 1 Timothy, iii. 16. 2 Timothy iv. 7—8. Heb. i. &c.; ii. 9—16; iii. 1—6. iv. 12—16; xii. 24—26; xiii. 8.

Divinity of the Holy Ghost.—Innumerable are the places of the Old Testament, in which mention is made of the Holy Spirit; I shall merely confine myself to a few of the *new*.—Matt. i. 18. Mark, i. 8. Luke, i. 15. John, 1. 32. Acts, i. 2. Rom. i. 4. 1 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Cor. i. 22. Gal. iii. 2. Ephes. i. 13. Philip, i. 19. 1 Thess. i. 5. 2 Thess. ii. 12. 1 Tim. iii. 16. 2 Tim. i. 7. Titus, iii. 5. Heb. ii. 4. 1 Peter, i. 2. 2 Peter, i. 21. 1 John, iv. 0. Jude, 19; &c.

To conclude, having, kind Protestant reader, submitted the Scriptural proofs for the points controverted between Protestants and Catholics, I consider it superfluous to enforce the necessity of *believing* them. “*Without faith it is impossible,*” says the Apostle, “*to have access to God.*” Let

me, therefore, exhort you to come by the grace of God to the knowledge of this *One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Faith*. Lose not sight of the substance of the Introductory Letter to Vol. I. In this great undertaking you may have to suffer much, “*for the wisdom of the world is folly with Almighty God;*” “*Jesus himself was to the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Gentiles foolishness.*” Proceed, however, manfully in your inquiry; and *when convinced*, in spite of every obstacle, embrace this true religion. Then, as a member of the Church of Christ, let your faith be *active*, and practically illustrate in your moral conduct its purity and influence; never forgetting that Catholics, as spectacles to God, angels, and men, are required to worship their Maker in *spirit* and in *truth*—to give joy to angels by evidence of fidelity—afford an example to men by sincerity in the faith that worketh by charity—and thus render their vocation and election sure.

MAY GOD ALMIGHTY GRANT UNTO YOU THE GRACE OF A SPEEDY CONVERSION—TO US ALL THE GRACE OF PERSEVERANCE IN GOOD. FIAT, FIAT.

END OF VOL. II. AND OF THE LECTURES.







