876
252 Sermon
pam. 1471, 12/26, 9

ROME,

The Rev. Dr. Hawley

THE BIBLE AND THE REPUBLIC.

with the regards

D. C. Wilds

MR. JAY'S REPLY

TO THE STRICTURES OF THE REV. M. W. NEWMAN

—ON—

MR. JAY'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE BIBLE SOCIETY

OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY, NEW YORK.

REPUBLISHED FROM THE "MT. KISCO WEEKLY."

MT. KISCO, N. Y.:
PRESS OF "THE WEEKLY."
1879.

ROME

THE BIBLE AND THE REPUBLIC

MR JAYS REPLY

TO THE STRICTURES OF THE REV M W NEWMAN

MR JAYS ADDRESS BEFORE THE BIBLE SOCIETY

OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY NEW YORK

REPUBLISHED FROM THE N Y OBSERVER

NEW YORK N Y
PRESS OF THE WEEKLY
1870

ROME,

THE BIBLE AND THE REPUBLIC.

MR. JAY'S REPLY

TO THE STRICTURES OF THE REV. M. W. NEWMAN

—ON—

MR. JAY'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE BIBLE SOCIETY

OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY, NEW YORK.

REPUBLISHED FROM THE "MT. KISCO WEEKLY."

MT. KISCO, N. Y.:
PRESS OF "THE WEEKLY."
1879.

SPEC
CAPAM

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1879, by JOHN JAY, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington.

ROME, THE BIBLE AND THE REPUBLIC.

SIR :—I regret that I was unable to reply immediately to the letter published by you November 20 of the Revd. Mr. Newman, pastor of the Roman Catholic Church at Mt. Kisco, on my address before the Westchester County Bible Society on "the Bible and the Republic," a letter which I observe that he hopes may be answered "not by assertions merely but by solid arguments."

I accept with pleasure his assurance that "he had written not desiring to offend for an instant;" and "that if any objections were found, then truth must be blamed and not the preacher." I equally disclaim all desire to offend my neighbors of his faith in the town of Bedford, among whom was included in his earlier years His Eminence Cardinal McCloskey; or the members generally of that communion, among whom I number valued friends on both sides of the Atlantic.

They are not responsible for the ancient crimes of the Roman Court, nor for the modern dogmas added to its faith in 1854 and 1870 on the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin and the infallibility of the Pope. Recognizing the moral worth and loyal sympathy with our institutions which are to be found amoung our Roman Catholic citizens, I believe that so far from intelligently approving and sustaining every act and dogma of the papacy, there are thousands who in their hearts are ready to follow and better the example of Father Newman, when in accord with reason, religion and humanity he stigmatizes as a crime to be viewed with horror the St. Bartholomew massacre, although that massacre, as will presently be shown on Roman Catholic authority, was extended during two months at the solicitation of Pope Gregory XIII., and was commemorated by that pontiff in paintings and by a medal, as a triumph of the Church of Rome.

Our citizens who do not belong to the Roman Catholic Church are quite agreed that wherever there exists a loyal devotion to the constitutional principles and the institutions of our Republic, with no design to pervert or destroy them, or to introduce dogmas and practices contrary to good morals like those, for instance, of the Mormons, there is in such case neither right nor reason, in arraying class against class, on account of a difference in their faith.

THE CHURCH OF ROME,

however, does little to encourage mutual harmony and good will in continuing the yearly cursing by the Pope with bell, book and candle; a curse which is said to be read also in every Roman church in America on the Thursday before Easter, excommunicating and anathematizing "all Hussites, Wickliffites, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians and other apostates from the faith, and all other heretics by whatever name they are called, or of what sect they may be." Whatever fitness, undiscoverable by the rest of christendom, Rome may find in blending with the sacred memories of holy-week such wholesale cursing of those who rest their faith upon the Bible, it has a tendency to arouse the hate and inflame the passions of the less reflective class of Roman Catholics in America, against those whom they are thus taught to curse

as the enemies of the Pope. This effect was shown in past ages in massacres like that of St. Bartholomew's, and recently in the almost incredible savagery exhibited in the New York riots of 1863; and which, but for the speedy suppression of that attempt at rebellion, threatened to repeat its bloody scenes in our rural districts.

Even the late Pope Pius IX, who had a high reputation for amicability, was accustomed to apply to his opponents rather ungentle epithets; some of which have been noted by Mr. Gladstone. (Christian World, XXVI, p. 101). Among them are found "wolves," "perfidious thieves," "dropsical liars," "ministers of hell," "demons incarnate" and "stinking corpses."

In Father Newman's strictures on Bible societies there may be observed with satisfaction a more moderate tone than has sometimes marked the assaults made upon them from papal quarters.

It is true that, speaking for his church, Father Newman intimates grave charges against Bible societies, when after remarking "that the Catholic Church (meaning the Roman Catholic Church) is not opposed to the genuine and orthodox edition of the Scriptures," he says, "but she forbids the perusal of any mutilated copies and dishonest versions of the Bible, from a corrupt text, like those circulated by the Bible societies; and condemns the cant and hypocrisy or superstition and idolatry of it which meet us at every step." These expressions, however significant of the feelings and motives by which they would seem to have been prompted, are yet gentle when compared with those of Pope Pius VII., who denounced Bible societies as "a pestilence;" or of a newspaper in Ireland which referred to a Bible society as "a hell inspired junta of incarnate fiends;" or of the kindred remark in Madeiria that "the Bible was a book from hell, and should be burnt with the hands that handle it."

The opposition of the Roman Church to the reading of the Bible is an old story of persecutions that have marked with torture and blood and flames the history of the papacy; not as Father Newman's language might lead some to suppose, for the crime of reading the Bible in versions adjudged heretical, but for the crime of reading the Bible in versions approved by the Church herself. To read that version without special permission is expressly forbidden; and when in 1731 Quesnel, a Roman Catholic, maintained that "the reading of the Holy Scriptures is for everybody," Pope Clement XI., in the bull "Unigenitus," denounced his sentiments as "false, shocking, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious rash, seditious, impious and blasphemous." Rome insists not only that none shall read the Bible without her permission, but that they shall then accept her interpretation of it.

THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

Whatever correction of the text may be preparing by the commission of revision of King James' Bible published by the Bible Society, that translation which Rome has stigmatized as a false, heretical book, to be classed among profane and infidel productions, and to be read only on peril of damnation, is based, as we are reminded by Dr. J. J. Smith in his suggestive book on "The impending conflict between Romanism and Protestantism in the United States," (G. Goodenough, 122 Nassau St., New York, 1871,) upon the translations of Wickliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale and Matthew; and Bishop Leddes, also a Romanist, is quoted as having said, "It is of all versions the most excellent for accuracy, fidelity, and the strictest letter of the text."

In reply to the remark about "the cant, hypocrisy, superstition and idola-

try" of the Bible,—a sneer that might have come from the Atheists of the French Revolution who dragged the Bible at the tail of an ass;—perhaps no more appropriate reply could be offered than the striking words attributed to a Roman Catholic convert—his name should be one of note—who, lamenting the general use of the Bible as a strong barrier to the success of popery, said: "Who will not say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on the ear like music that can never be forgotten; like the sound of church bells which the convert hardly knows how to forego. Its felicities often seem to be things rather than words. It is a part of the National mind, and the anchor of National seriousness. The memory of the dead passes with it; the potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses; the power of all the griefs and trials of man are hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best merits, and all there is about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him forever out of his English Bible. It is his sacred thing which doubt has never dimmed and controversy never soiled. In the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant with one spark of religiousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible."

The memory and instincts of the eloquent writer did not deceive him, and Rome is right in her conviction that it is the Bible scattered through Christian homes which constitutes the perennial source of unity and life for the members of the universal Catholic Church, however separated by land or sea, by articles or creeds, by liturgies, rubrics or forms of government, who, despite the anathemas of Rome, cling to the Bible and the Redemption which it reveals with a faith steadfast as that of their Fathers, refusing to turn from the Saviour of world to worship the virgin or to deify the Pope.

Within the last month the world has seen the most eminent members of churches transplanted to America from England and the Continent, gathering with affectionate regard around the great Dean of Westminster, representing the ancient church of England. A little later it saw the rector of old Trinity, the pastors of the Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist and Congregational churches in New York, assembling in honor of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the foundation at New Amsterdam of the Reformed Church of Holland. In those two gatherings Rome might have seen the unity and the Catholicity of Churches, that stand not on the varying dogmas of papal infallibility, but on the word of God revealed in the Bible.

PAPAL OPPOSITION TO THE BIBLE.

The constant and deep concern exhibited by the Church of Rome at the successful efforts of Bible societies is both interesting and suggestive. It is a recognition of the power of the Bible movement, and a tribute to the wisdom of the plan of distributing the Bible without note or comment; of giving Divine truth without admixture of human error. Then, again, this fear and hatred of Bible Societies on the part of the Court of Rome, whether expressed in bulls by the Pope at the Vatican, or by his appointed agents in America, show that in our day, of all powers temporal and spiritual, imperial, political and religious which Rome dreads, that which it dreads the most is the Bible—the Bible rendered in the vernacular, and given freely to the people, that they may "search the Scriptures." Rome knows well that a people who read the Bible are not likely to accept her syllabus and her dogmas, or to use the pray-

er to the virgin in the new Brevarium, *tu es spes unica peccatorum* (thou art the only hope of sinners;) or to believe in the infallibility of the Pope and adore him as "Our Lord God." "*Noster Dominus Deus papa*," "*Venite adoremus suntum papun.*" The Bible, which Father Newman calls a grand and sacred book, seems to be the divine weapon from which Rome shrinks as from Ithuriel's spear, knowing that "no falsehood can endure touch of celestial temper."

In 1816 Pope Pius VII., in an Encyclical letter against Bible Societies, said: "We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device by which the foundation of religion (meaning, of course, the Roman Catholic religion) are undermined"; and His Holiness then denounced it as "this pestilence," and spoke of the wickedness of "this nefarious scheme."

In 1820 Leo XII. denounced Bible Societies as "strolling with effrontery through the world. The word is suggestive. The "effrontery" of distributing the Bible! Pius VIII. followed with a circular letter in 1829, and Gregory XVI. with a bull in 1844 against Bible Societies and the Christian Alliance in New York, which closed with this declaration: "Moreover, we confirm and renew the decrees recited above, delivered in former times by Apostolic authority against the *publication, distribution, reading* and *possession of* books of the Holy Scriptures."

No further or higher proof can be needed of the entire exactness of my statement that Rome's olden opposition to the reading of the Scriptures was still continued.

In reply to Father Newman's argument on the Scriptures and tradition from what he calls "a Catholic (meaning a Roman Catholic) standpoint," I may refer to the articles on these subjects (the 6th and 34th) of the Church of England, which represent clearly the views held by that and other branches of the Church, which have protested against the errors into which they say the Roman branch hath fallen.

They allow, although Father Newman seems unaware of it, due weight to "traditions which be not repugnant to the word of God," and they declare: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatever 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."

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

This article alone marks the irreconciliable difference between the faith that rests upon the Bible and that which hangs on the alleged infallibility of the Pope. Father Newman, after quoting a passage from my address, in which he remarks that I questioned "the supremacy, immutability and infallibility of the Catholic Church," devoted a column to this subject, with the remark "we will prove from the Bible that he is mistaken."

I might, perhaps, without impropriety, ask to be excused from touching on these questions inasmuch as my address, recalling the traditions of the Republic and the part born by the Bible in forming the National character, could hardly be regarded as inviting a theological discussion. I had said, "I beg leave, *as a layman*, to suggest further, that all who value pure morals, sound education, good government or National honor, whatever their creed, or however broad, independent or eccentric their belief, can consistently join in this work, as one that will contribute to the safety and welfare of the Republic." The points which I discussed were not those of doctrine; the chief men I quoted were not theologians, but rather

statesmen and publicists like Chatham and Burke, Bacon and Locke, Milton and Franklin. When I referred to the Church of Rome it was in connection with her effort to suppress the Bible in America, seconded by infidels and Atheists, and with an incidental reference to the historic fact of her burning of Protestants and the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, to which I will devote a separate letter. But courtesy may, perhaps, seem to demand that I should not pass without notice Father Newman's larger view of the outlines of his Church. Some of those views are closely connected with the question of pure morals, sound education, good government and National honor, as influenced by the Bible on the one hand and byRome on the other; and while wishing to avoid a theologic argument and to treat the subject "with judicial calm and historic freedom," I will beg leave frankly to suggest in your next number some of the difficulties presented by Father Newman's letter, to men who however devoted to their respective Churches, rest their faith upon the Bible.

SIR :—In closing my first letter I remarked that I would frankly suggest some of the difficulties presented by Father Newman's argument, where after observing that Mr. Jay questioned "the supremacy, immutability and infallibility of the Catholic Church," he added "we will prove from the Bible that he is mistaken."

I propose as a layman, looking at the broad outlines of the subject in its relation to the Bible, and in its bearings on the Republic, to indicate a few points in the Roman pretentions which strike the minds of plain people who use the common sense which God has given them, and who are not prepared to exchange their devotion to American principles, freedom of conscience and of thought, the right of speech and of the press, for unquestioning submission to the dogmas that involve a blind allegiance to a foreign Prince, even though that Prince is His Holiness the Pope of Rome.

The most thoughtful of the people of whom I speak hold probably with the Church of England, that they cannot accept as necessary to salvation anything that may not be read in the Bible, or that may not be proved thereby. Others of them, perhaps, acknowledging in their entirety neither creeds nor articles, may be ready to examine any formula of faith which appeals to their hearts and consciences, without offending their common sense or violating the truth of history. It may be well to recall in advance two or three points connected with Father Newman's argument.

The one is the claim of Rome, alluded to in the letter of Pope Pius IX. to the Emperor of Russia in 1873, that all baptized persons of whatever denomination belong to the Pope whether they like it or not. Another is that the Pope holds that the people and the government of the United States, like the rest of the world, are all subject to his power. A third is that whenever the infallibility of the Roman CatholicChurch is spoken of, that infallibility which was formerly attributed to Bishops assembled in councils is now attributed by the new dogma of 1870 solely to the Pope when speaking *ex cathedra* regarding matters of faith or morals. The Pope alone can determine the extent of his infallibility, but it includes, according to Archbishop Manning, "politics as a branch of ethics."

The world does not yet appreciate the full bearing of this dogma, which applies equally to all Popes, past, present and to come, upon freedom of conscience, of thought, of speech and of action; upon the government of the Republic and the rights of the people. Indeed, many Roman Catholics have not yet begun to

understand that all persons are required to believe in papal infallibility, past and present, under pain of damnation.

Those who wish to understand the extent to which this dogma of infallibility displaces bishops and councils, and makes the Pope the absolute ruler of the church, may consult with advantage the comments on the "Vatican council and its definitions," by Archbishop Manning on the one hand and Mr. Gladstone on the other, and a recent work by Dr. Ewer on Catholicity.

A large part of Father Newman's first letter consists of the customary presentment of the Roman dogmas of supremacy, infallibility and immutability, coupled with scriptural texts which are assumed to confirm them.

We accept the texts, but we are unable to accept the Roman interpretation; and when Father Newman, after the manner of his Church, says that he has proven his position, he simply assumes as proven the very points that are in dispute. For instance, he says that "the Catholic Church"—and by this the reverend Father means only the *Roman* Catholic Church, excluding all the other branches of the Catholic Church—the Eastern Church, which has sternly refused to recognize the usurpations, the heresies and the corruptions of Rome, and whose venerable patriarchs refused to accept the Pope's invitation to the late council; excluding the ancient Church of England, excluding all of the Reformed Churches of the continent and of America:—he says "the Catholic Church is immutable and infallible since it is founded on a rock. * * It is infallible in matters of faith and morals. * * * It must be so because it is appointed by God to teach us, and we are commanded to listen, so that God has, we may say, made himself responsible for its teaching. It must be infallible, because otherwise it would be no authority at all in matters of faith. It would clearly be impossible to have a firm faith in teachings which we believed might perhaps be untrue."

In this last sentence, after dogmatic assertion that God is responsible for the teaching of the Church which is now the teaching of the Pope—an assertion which, if regarded by Rome as the height of piety, is rejected by all the other branches of the Church as more than akin to blasphemy — comes a proposition on which, fortunately, a "solid argument" can be based; for we both admit the impossibility of having a firm faith in teachings which we know to be untrue. Now take for example the well-known decree in the case of Galileo.

GALILEO AND PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

The Church, under Pope Urban VIII., declared that Galileo's announcement that the sun is immovable was "an absurd position, false in philosophy and absolutely heretical because it is expressly contrary to Scripture" (I Da Costa's narrative, The Inquisition at Lisbon, Lond, 1871.)

This was an "infallible decree," approved by an "infallible Pope" uttering *ex cathedra* the voice of the Church, and based upon an "infallible interpretation" of the Scriptures." The teachings of that decree wer made a matter of faith, and whoever refused to believe them was anathematized as heretical. According to Father Newman, who repeats the formulas of his Church, that decree "must have been infallible," because the Church was appointed to teach, and we are commanded to listen; and God himself was responsible for that teaching, because God had promised to be with his Church to the end of the world. But, in spite of Rome's assurances and its columns of texts, do we not believe and know, and do not Father Newman and all intelligent Romanists and Jesuits believe

and know, as certainly as the accursed heretics themselves, that that "infallible" teaching was untrue? Did not the Roman Church herself acknowledge that she had erred, when, after placing on the *Index Expurgatorius* as wicked and heretical the volumes of Galileo, Copernicus and Kepler on the revolution of the Heavenly bodies, she subsequently allowed them to be read? Was not that a practical confession of her fallibility, when she condemned Galileo to imprisonment, and made him swear never to teach again the earth's motion and the sun's immovability, for the reason that they were contrary to Scripture?

Now, if Urban, as we all believe and know, erred in his interpretation of the Scriptures, is it right to say that God was responsible for Urban's error? Will it be suggested that God did not understand the Bible which he had inspired, or the solar system which he had created, and that it was God who, by the voice of the Pope, condemned all who refused to believe that the sun revolved around the earth? Now, if the teaching of the Church promulgated by Pope Urban in that case was unsound; if his interpretation of Scripture was untrue; if both his teaching and his interpretation were in contradiction to God's word and works; if the Pope showed himself not wise and infallible, but ignorant and foolish to a degree, and if, adding arrogance to his ignorance and folly, he attempted to palm them off upon the world as the infallible wisdom of the Omniscient God, and assumed to consign to the tortures of the Inquisition here, and to the torments of hell hereafter, all who should believe that the earth revolved around the sun, simply because he interpreted Scripture as making the sun revolve around the earth,—how can we have a firm faith in the infallibility of Pope Urban, or of any other Pope who in like manner has assumed to impose upon the world interpretations of Scripture and tests of faith declaring that they were inspired by Heaven, and anathematizing, as in the case of Galileo, all who refused to accept their shallow pretences for the truth of science and the word of God!

The absurdity of the blundering about the simplest features of the solar system, and its logical effect in exploding the claim of infallibility, have not been overlooked by astute Romanists.

The apology has been attempted for the error of that decree, that the Church had gone a little out of her course in making a decree on the subject of scientific truth, to which the divine promise of infallibility did not extend. But the Church of Rome does not admit this. On the contrary, Pius IX., in a letter to the Bishop of Munich, said, and this corresponds with the syllabus, "It is incumbent upon every philosopher who wishes to be a son of the Church, as well as upon philosophy itself, never to utter anything contrary to those things which the Church teaches, and to retract everything which the Church censures."

The 23d article of the syllabus condemns also those who hold that the Roman pontiffs have committed errors in defining matters of faith and morals; so that by the decree of Urban those who believe that the earth revolves around the sun are damned, and by the syllabus those who say that Urban erred in that decree are also to be damned. Urban stands today, under the dogma, an infallible Pope, and if infallible how could he proclaim so great an error?

INFALLIBLE POPES DENOUNCING EACH OTHER.

The case of Galileo, while a peculiarly striking refutation of the Roman assumption of papal infallibility, against which the rest of christendom protests, as un-

true and blasphemous, does not stand alone; and cases abound where teachings of infallible Popes have been condemned by councils and by themselves; and have been approved and reversed by their successors, until the varied utterances and decrees of Popes and councils constituted a grand muddle in which each contradictory proposition was equally infallible with the rest.

One of those infallible pontiffs in the sixth century, Pope Vigilius, had refused to adopt an edict of the Emperor Justinian condemning three heretical chapters that were then current; and for that refusal the 5th Æcumenical council of Constantinople, which had small belief in "papal infallibility," condemned and exiled the Holy Father. A brief exile opened the eyes of Vigilius, who, we are told, assented to the decrees of the council, retracting what he had written and avowing that he had been deceived by the acts of the devil.

A subsequent Pope, John XII., who in 963 was summoned before a council held in the presence of the Emperor Otho, seems to have derived his inspiration also from the same source. "He was accused of ordaining Bishops for money; of having abused several women; * of having converted the pontificial palace into a sink of debauchery; of having put out the eyes of his spiritual parent Benedict; of having killed John, a Cardinal sub-deacon, by castration, and having drunk wine to the health of the devil." (Bp. Hopkins' End of controversy controverted," vol. 1, p. 80, quoting Fleury, tom. 12, 124.)

The council deposed this "Holy Father," and elected Leo VIII. as his successor; but three months afterwards John XII. entered Rome again; drove out Leo; cut off the hand of one of his accusers, and the tongue, the nose, and the two fingers of another; and immediately assembled a council consisting of the same men who had deposed him, and who now deposed his successor; so John reigned again as an infallible Pope for a few months until, says Bp. Hopkins, "while he was pursuing his favorite pleasures at night with a married woman, he received a violent blow on the temple, of which he died eight days after."

These particulars are not gathered from those whom Rome deems heretical authors, but from the *Histoire Ecclesiastique* of the Abbe Fleury, one of the ablest and most candid historians of the Roman Church. That work shows from the testimony taken that Cardinal Cajetan, afterwards Pope Boniface, was a downright Atheist. He denied that there was any other life than the present; he said that the world had no beginning and would have no end; that the soul died with the body; and that there was no heaven or hell; he seemed to believe in nothing, not even in the devil, whose arts had been acknowledged by one of his predecessors, and whose health had been drunk by another.

I will refrain from soiling your paper and disturbing your readers by particular allusions to the loose morals and unpleasant scandals that marked the lives of many of the Popes, and which demoralized by their example all orders in the Church, until Pope Paul III. in 1536 complained in a bull to reform the city and the court of Rome, of twenty-five abuses, one of which concerned "the disorders committed in many convents of nuns conducted by monks."

The report of the commission showed that mankind had never beheld a dissoluteness equal to that which reigned in Rome (I Bp. Hopkins' End of controversy, 223; Fleury, tom 28, 149-59.) Nor is it necessary to pursue at length the constant cases in the history of the Roman Church where Popes and councils

have been arrayed against each other, two infallibles condemning as heretical the doctrines of the other.

Was there not an edict of Pope Constantius II., which was condemned by Pope Martin I. and approved by John IV. and Maxinius, and subsequently condemned by the council of Constantinople in 680?

Are we not told that at the sixth council the Church anathematized Pope Honorius, and condemed as impious certain dogmas which they found in his letter to Sergius?

Rome, which for centuries has professed to believe in the contemporary councils which held the teachings of those Popes heretical and instigated by the devil, has now by the council of 1870 pronounced those same Popes infallible and inspired by God.

Then was it not Pius II who in 1463, finding a former bull which he had issued inconvenient, published another in which he retracted his former opinions, attributing them to his youth and inexperience, and ordering the faithful to reject them as "unsound and dangerous?" (Fleury cont. 23, tom 192; Hopkins 188.)

In this last bu l Pope Pius II. spoke *ex cathedra*, aud therefore by the dogma with infallible truth, when he attributed his former teachings to his youth, as his predecessor already quoted had with equal infallibility traced his own conduct to the instigation of the devil.

Thus, instead of a Romanist being able to believe with certainty when he finds how the Popes have spoken, he would seem to be subjected to much doubt and confusion, since Popes themselves acknowledge that their inspiration may be not from above but from below, or merely the impulse of youth, ignorance and folly.

If such be the dilemma in which Romanists find themselves, however ready they may be to believe anything that has been uttered by the Holy Fathers, if they can only determine which of their opposing utterances they are to regard as infallible and which they are to shun as inspired by the evil one; is it surprising that Christians who believe in the Bible decline to accept the dogma of papal infallibility? Can Father Newman or any other intelligent Romanist expect Americans who reverence the Bible and value American institutions, and who know from history the lives of the pontiffs to whom they are asked to pay the homage due only unto God—can he really expect that such men, the descendants often of the brave martyrs who amid persecution and torture died rather than renounce their faith in the Bible, will discontinue their work of distributing broadcast that Book at the arrogant summons of the Pope of Rome, however backed by the anathemas and curses of which so plentiful a supply seems always ready at the Vatican! Was it not Faber or some other eminent pervert from the English Church who said that Rome could never hope to convert the mass of the English Protestants till it adopted the English Bible?

And when one who has studied the Bible with the trustful and loving reverence that to Father Newman seems like "cant and hypocrisy or superstition and idolatry," first reads one of the bulls hurled by the Bishop of Rome at Bible Societies, denouncing them as a "pest" and a "pestilence," would it it be strange if a Bible distributor thus startled should almost exclaim with Hamlet:

"Angels and ministers of grace defend us!
Art thou a spirit of health, or goblin damn'd,
Bring with thee airs from heaven or blasts from hell!"

The American people may well ask themselves where the "papal infallibility" will end, when it begins by proscrib-

ing the Bible and threatening with hell all who dare read it and refuse to surrender it. Father Newman in explaining the position of Rome toward the Bible, omitted to quote the rule of the Index which decrees :—"But if any person shall have the presumption to read or possess it (the Bible) without such permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary."

SIR :

It would be interesting to learn from Father Newman or from His Eminence the Cardinal McClosky, whether the Irish members of their flock, whose devotion to the Church is so conspicuous, accept the dogma of papal infallibility in the one significant act of the papacy which has most concerned the destiny of Ireland during the last seven hundred years.

THE PAPAL GRANT OF IRELAND.

In 1152, the supremacy of the See of Rome was acknowledged by the Synod of the Irish clergy under the presidency of Cardinal Papilion, the Pope's legatee; and in 1156, Nicholas Breakspear, an Englishman who two years before (1154) had become Pope Adrian IV., granted the crown of Ireland to Henry II., King of England. That grant seems to be an extremely difficult one for the champions of Rome to remember since the adoption of the dogma of papal infallibility. Father Burke, in replying to Mr. Froude, had so entirely forgotten that interesting fact in Irish history, that he declared with solemn earnestness that Pope Adrian never issued any such document.

We may sympathize, if we please, with Father Burke on the regrettable weakness of his memory which disabled him from retaining the slightest recollection of a transaction so profoundly important to him, whether as Irishman or Romanist. Our sympathies will presently be required in yet fuller measure for an equally extraordinary forgetfulness on the part of equally zealous champions of papal infallibility, of the most decided and conspicuous measures taken by the infallible Gregory XIII. to identify the Church and his pontificate forever with the St. Bartholomew massacre, as an act glorious and holy, and deserving the most splendid and enduring commemoration.

But in both cases, fortunately for the truth of history,—of which as Dr. Holmes significantly says in closing his review of the diplomatic injustice done to Motley, "History never forgets and never forgives,"—the proof of the grant of Pope Adrian IV., and of its confirmation by Pope Alexander III. in 1175, have compelled its recognition by the highest Roman Catholic authorities and dignitaries both in Europe and America. [See note to The Papacy and the Civil Power, by R. W. Thompson,—now Secretary of the Navy.]

While the infallibility dogma was still pending at Rome, Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, wrote to the Archbishop Dupanloup, of France that, "Our citizens of Irish nativity, who are the majority and chief support of the Catholic Church in the United States, will have much difficulty in admitting that Pope Adrian IV., who was an Englishman, was infallible when he gave Ireland to Henry II. King of England."

"Until now," added the Archbishop, "we have been permitted to say that the Catholic Church had nothing to do with these transactions, and that it is not responsible for all the Popes have done or may do."

Do our Irish fellow citizens now look upon the transfer of Ireland to the English King as an act inspired by God, and for which they are to bless the memory of the Pope who did it? If they do would it not be a happy illustration,

for the Roman Church to exhibit the faith of their chief supporters in America in the infallibility dogma, to celebrate that disposition of Ireland by His Holiness Nicholas Breakspear, Adrian IV., the only Englishman who ever sat upon the throne of St. Peters, and who rendered his reign memorable by presenting the sovereignty of Ireland to the English King, receiving in exchange a "tribute of Peter's pence."

What strife and blood and pain and sorrow might have been saved through seven centuries, had the Roman priests believed themselves and taught the people to believe, that that transfer to the Plantaganet was the act of God through the Holy Father, who in the exercise of his right to dispose of Kingdoms and people, had in his infallable wisdom added to his revenue, by subjecting them to what they have irreverently called the yoke of the Saxon.

Archbishop Purcell had reason for his regrets that the Roman Church was by a new dogma assuming a responsibility for all which the Popes have done, no matter how great the crimes and guilt or the folly. As Satan remarked,—and how thoroughly he and his work on that principle,—"all that a man hath will he give for his life" (Job II. 4), and if he is once brought to believe that a priest or a Pope can pardon his sins or condemn him to hell, there are few beliefs at which he will bolt, few crimes—as St. Bartholomew can testify—which he will not commit at the bidding of one who he thinks controls his salvation.

But even in such cases there may be some faint limit to credulity, when the dogma which he is ordered to accept, touches too nearly the traditions of a race and the sympathies begotten by love of country. The Right Reverend prelate of Cincinnati rightly believed that the devotion of the Irish to their green island, and their gratitude to those who have died in the defence of the sovereignty and the independence of its people, will not readily yield to the newly adopted dogma which demands them to honor the infallibility of the English Pope who granted Ireland to the English. The name of Nicholas Breakspear will not in our day at least displace in the Irish heart the memory of Robert Emmett.

Father Newman will of course understand that in suggesting as I have done some of the historic reasons which to the great Christian world would be conclusive against the dogma of infallibility, even if it were not found contrary to the letter and spirit of the Bible, I am aware that under the accepted definition of the dogma no Romanist is permitted even to consider the bearing of historic facts on this article of his belief, or to weigh their testimony however convincing and conclusive.

Archbishop Manning, after alluding to the cases of Honorius and Virgilius, says: "The true and conclusive answer to the objection (of history) consists not in a detailed refutation of alleged difficulties, but in a principle of faith, namely: that whenever any doctrine is contained in the Divine tradition of the Church, all difficulties from human history are excluded." (The Vatican Council and its Definitions: London, 1870, p. 119.)

We know something of the protests which have called forth from learned and devout Romanists the world over, and from some of their ablest bishops in America, and it certainly gives us new reason to thank God that we are not obliged to believe the bulls of the Pope in defiance of the Bible and the truth of history.

SIR:—Father Newman announces in your last number that he will soon give solid reasons why Bible Societies are regarded by the Roman pontiffs as a pestilence. One solid reason was embodied in the remark of a Roman Catholic writer, that "the Bible is the potent weapon of the Protestant power." Without waiting for the additional reasons which Father Newman may intend to offer, courtesy to the reverend gentleman, and perhaps other considerations of propriety, seem to justify an immediate response to his request for my authorities for three or four quotations, some of which he intimates are forgeries. Should such prove to be the case, we shall all of course be obliged to Father Newman for exposing the forgery and disclosing the truth.

Since Father Newman has shown a disposition to convert us to the Church of Rome, he cannot be surprised that we desire to know something of its dogmas; especially as we are constantly reminded that so soon as Rome shall obtain in the United States the supremacy which she hopes soon to accomplish, no more liberty of education, of worship, or of government will be permitted in our Republic than the Pope now permits in Ecuador and Nicaragua.

The Concordat with Ecuador, for example, provides that the Catholic (meaning the Roman) religion is the religion of the State; and that, consequently, the practice of any other mode of worship is forbidden in the Republic. That any book forbidden by a Bishop is confiscated by the government, and that the government will lend the Bishops its powerful aid in putting down any one who attempts to lead the faithful into the paths of error.

In Nicaragua so recently as Jan. 1, 1870, Cardinal Antonelli, on behalf of Pius IX., wrote to the Bishop of Nicaragua: "We have lately been informed here that an attempt has been made to change the order of things heretofore existing in that Republic by publishing programmes in which are enunciated 'Freedom of education and worship.' Both these principles are not only contrary to the laws of God and of the Church, but are in contradiction to the Concordat," &c.

The papal announcement that "Freedom of education and worship" are contrary to the laws of the Church of Rome, and the resolve of the Roman Court to prevent them in Nicaragua, would alone sufficiently explain the curses poured upon those who have the "effrontery" to circulate the Bible which of old inspired our ancestors to resist to the death the efforts of Rome to trample out in the old world freedom of education and worship, and which alone of all the volumes ever written can so enlighten the understanding, strengthen the will and purify the heart, that with the Bible in every house, the attempt to destroy freedom of education and worship in this American Republic will be a task impossible.

Father Newman ridicules as "absurd" a claim to unity on the part of those branches of the Christian Church which hold with the Church of England, in her 6th article, to "the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for salvation," since they differ on lesser points and on liturgies, rubrics and forms of government. But their common belief in the Bible as the revealed word of God constitutes a bond of union, the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, whose strength and power Rome knows and fears; and hence her desperate attempts to arrest Bible distribution; for the Court of Rome has learned from her own history that a people imbued with the spirit of the Bible will never consent to surrender to the Pope the freedom of education and worship, nor permit him to dictate to the

American government as he has dictated to Spain and Mexico. It cannot be denied that the Romanists have had some reason for boasting of the influence they have exerted in our politics, and of the skill with which, wielding so large a vote, they have received in return enormous grants of public moneys. More than forty years ago Archbishop Hughes exultingly said after referring to Rome as the Church Militant, "Catholic doctrines, practices, history, and connections with government have become living and present facts, entering largely into the political movements of the day, and controling in part, if not governing the organization, of parties and platforms. This is what cannot be said of any other religion." (Quoted in Am. & For. Christian Union VIII., .)

This interference with our politics, peculiar as the Bishop suggested to the Roman religion, seems to be progressing with more boldness than ever on the part of the Papal Court, and they boast at Rome that New York is already controled by the Pope—a remark of which our taxpayers who have visited Rome may be reminded as they note in our city the blending of dirt, misgovernment and confiscation.

The recent attempts to arrest Bible Societies as "a pestilence," to overthrow our common school system, to tax the people for Romish schools where children will be bent like the twig, moulded in the confessional, educated as subjects of the Pope, owing to him their chief allegiance, instructed according to St. Alphonso when the truth need not be spoken, when oaths need not be kept, when the laws need not be obeyed, and taught to regard all Protestants as accursed--these attempts so boldly made, surely justify our desire to know, as far as may be known from Roman Catholic authority and authentic history, the exact truth in regard to the faith and practices of the Roman Court during the past of Europe, which it proposes to engraft on the future of America.

Father Newman at least will not complain of our anxiety to be correctly instructed on the dogmas of his Church, and in particular on those which concern the preservation of our national freedom, and which, if we reject, we are to be damned. He has himself invited us to the Roman faith in a friendly controversy that pleasantly contrasts with the modes of persuasion to which hundreds of thousands in days which, God be thanked, are gone forever, were invited by the suave messengers of the holy office.

THE OLD EASTER CURSE.

With this apology—if apology be needed—for seeking exact information, and entirely agreeing with Father Newman's expression, that "it is a holy and useful work at all times to endeavor to dispel the mists of error by the sun of truth," I come to the *first* of Father Newman's questions, in reference to the curse which I remarked "*was said* to be read in every Roman Church," &c. I took it from Dr. I. I. Smith's "Impending Conflict," p. 287, where the author said, "The following is read in every Roman Church on Thursday before Easter: 'In the name of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the authority of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own, we excommunicate and anathematize all Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Unitarians, and other apostates from the faith, and all other heretics by whatsoever name they may be called or of whatsoever sect they may be, and all their adherents, receivers, favorers, and generally any defenders of theirs, as also Schismatics, and those who withdraw themselves or recede obstinately from the

obedience to me the Roman Pontiff.'"

The curse, it seems, was contained in the Bull in *Cœna Domini*, which has been called an extremely *ex cathedra* decision, since it owed its origin to Gregory XI. in 1572, Gregory XII. in 1411, Pius V. in 1568, and was finally produced by Urban VIII. in 1627. It appears to have been annually read in Rome on Maunday Thursday for 200 years, until it was objected to by sovereigns and states, as encroaching on their independence, in the imposition of taxes, the exercise of judicial authority, and the punishment of the crimes of clerics by threatening with excommunication those who perform such parts without special papal permission. (The Pope and the Council, by James, 1870, page 315.)

ROME'S BLOODY PERSECUTIONS.

Referring to my remark that my valued friends of the Roman communion were "not responsible for the ancient crimes of the Roman Court," Father Newman remarks, "Why don't the learned writer mention some of those bloody persecutions? Tell us when and where they took place, and not be asserting generalities. * * * We should like to hear what crimes were those and when they were committed."

Although I venture to doubt the pleasure which it will afford Father Newman to hear the list, and caring not to discuss the crimes of other days, excepting so far as they may illustrate our dangers in the present, I will briefly say that among the principal crimes to which reference was made was the Massacre of the Waldenses in the thirteenth and later centuries; of the Vaudois of Provence in 1545; of the Huguenots in France in 1572; of the Protestants in Ireland in 1641; the Dragonnades of the seventeenth century which drove from France half a million of her noblest citizens—a blow to the intelligence, manufactures, commerce and wealth of that great country; and the Inquisition from the 14th to the 19th century, cursing alike the Old World and the New with its dark, remorseless tyranny; its *auto da fes;* its black-robed familiars acting in secret; its gloomy prisons; its ingenious tortures; its robes of infamy: the gag, the rack, the pulley, the weights, the screw, the water and the fire;—that "holy office," as it was called, which, according to Mr. Lothrop Motley, the historian, whom Father Newman has already quoted, "made the savages of India and America shudder at the name of Christianity." Among all these crimes—one that Father Newman himself pronounces a crime, claiming in this to follow certain alleged Bulls of Gregory XIII. for which I shall presently ask his authority—the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, towers in its bad preeminence a crime unapproachable in its deliberate and prolonged wickedness, cowardice, cruelty and horror.

THE ADORATION OF THE POPE.

4th & 5th.—Father Newman next desires the authority of for the Latin phrase of homage to the Pope: "*Venite adoremus sanctum papam*" (come let us adore the Holy Pope), and also the passage in the prayer to the Virgin: "*Tu es spes unica peccatorum*" (Thou art the only hope of sinners.)

To the suggestion that members of Christian Churches, other than the Church of Rome, "refuse to turn from the worship of the Saviour of the world to worship the Virgin or deify the Pope." Mr. Newman replies as if in this approving their course: "Very correct indeed; they are perfectly right in doing so"; and then asks, "but whom have they refused? Not the Roman Catholic Church certainly, for it never invited people to do so."

The charge of forgery as an easy answer to troublesome facts seems to be

a choice and cherished weapon with the trained advocates of the Society of Jesus; and its appearance now to disprove the adoration of the Pope and the prayer to the Blessed Virgin as the only hope of sinners, recalls the curious fact that, but the other day, the doctrine of papal infallibility was denounced by Romanists as "a Protestant invention."

To-day we are assured that it is not a modern dogma, but "one of the old ones which had always been believed by the faithful."

The Roman Catholic Bishop Clifford, of Clifton, and Archbishop Errington, are said to have boldly stated in the council that the English Catholics had gained their political rights on the repeated assurance, and on the express condition, that the doctrine of Papal infallibility should not be taught and received in the English Church.

In this country as late as 1862, Dr. Bronson in his review (April, 1862, p. 161), in a paper headed "The Church not a Despotism," said: "Infallibility is the privilege of no individual, not even of the Pope"; and the controversial catechism approved by English Roman Catholic Bishops and highly praised by Arch-Bishop Manning's "Tablet," was noted by the Pall Mall as giving this question and answer:

Q. Are not Catholics bound to believe that the Pope is in himself infallible? A. "This is a *Protestant invention*, and is no article of Catholic belief. No Papal decision can bind under pain of heresy unless received and proscribed by the enacting body, the Bishops of the Church."

This time, it seems, the forgeries concern the adoration of the Pope and the prayer to the Virgin; and despite the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Papal infallibility, we are assured by Father Newman that we who protest against the errors of Rome, as in the 22d Article of the Church of England, as "grounded on no warrant of Scripture but rather repugnant to the word of God," are quite right in refusing to turn from the Saviour of the world to worship the Virgin or to deify the Pope.

The Latin invitation to adore the Pope I quoted from a discourse in French of the Rev. M. Chiniquy, formerly of Illinois, for some twenty-five years a priest in the Roman Catholic Church. That reverend and learned Father, in exposing like the old Catholics of Switzerland, Germany and France, the errors which they had abandoned, gave a description of the ceremony at St. Peter's, Rome, after the election of a Pope, and which he said "the Romanists, not the Protestants," called the "adoration of the Pope."

"He is borne," said Father Chiniquy, "on the shoulders of six men; he has upon his head a triple crown of gold sparkling with precious stones; upon his shoulders a cloak covered with diamonds. * * * Where do they carry him? They carry him to the altar of his God; * * there a Cardinal at the sound of the trumpets pronounces these words: '*Venite adoremus sanctum papam*' (come let us adore the Holy Pope.) At these words the multitude fall upon their knees and adore that man. They call him in the Church of Rome the Very Holy Father; they say that he is the infallible source of light and truth. It is towards him that all regards should incline as being the luminary of the world. It is he alone with whom God communicates directly; it is he alone who has the Holy Spirit without measure; it is he alone who can speak in the name of God, and when he speaks all should keep silence. No one has a right to resist him, no one has the right to escape from his domination." Can Father Newman find any forgery or falsehood in that account?

MEDIATION OF THE VIRGIN.

Touching the prayer to the Blessed Virgin, which Father Newman also regards as a forgery, demanding the edition, the date and the page of the Breviary, with a rather threatening intimation that if I do not name them, "Catholics (meaning Romanists) may consider themselves grossly maligned and offended," I quoted from another discourse of Father Chiniquy, entitled "The Church of Rome as it is," dated Kankakee, Ill., Nov. 29, 1869. That Reverend Father said that it was contained in "the supplement to the *Breviarium* containing the new office of Mary Immaculate, at page 158, lines 7th and 8th:" "*Accipe quod offerimus, redona quod rogamus, excusa quod timemus:* QUIA TU ES SPES UNICA PECCATORUM! *Per te speramus veniam delictorum et in te beatissima nostrorum est expectatis præmiorum. Sancta Maria succurre miseris,*" &c. ("Receive what we offer, give what we ask, excuse what we fear. *Thou art the only hope of sinners.* Through thee we hope for the pardon of our sins, and in thee, Most Blessed, is the expectation of our reward. Holy Mary, succor the wretched," &c.)

Though Father Chiniquy may have been excommunicated and consigned to perdition, will it be pretended that that prayer and the supplement to which he referred were Protestant inventions? If that petition is a forgery—and the Church of Rome holds that it is a sin to address the Blessed Virgin as the only hope of sinners—was it also a forgery the encyclical letter of Gregory XVI. in 1832, "*Mirare Vos*," in which he said, "Let us raise our eyes and hands to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, who ALONE destroys heresies, who is OUR GREATEST HOPE—yea, the entire ground of our hope" (quoted in Church Dictionary, by Rev. Walter Farquer Hook, D. D.—London, 1852.) Was it a forgery the petition quoted by Dr. Hook from the "Crown of the Blessed Virgin," "*command* your most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that He deign to raise our minds?"

Does not the Roman *Breviarum* contain, as is stated, the words: "*Gaude, Virgo Maria, cunctas hæreses* SOLA *interemisti universo mundo*"—"Rejoice, Virgin Mary, for thou *alone* hast destroyed the heresies in the whole world." ("The Glories of Mary," translated from the Italian of St. Alphonsus Liquori, and published by Edward Dunnegan & Bro., New York, 1855.) Is that a forgery? with its numerous authorities to show (p. 18) that all graces are dispensed by the hand of Mary *alone*, and that all who are saved are saved *solely* by means of the divine Mother; "that no one can be saved except through" Mary (p. 189); that she is the mother of God, omnipotent to save sinners (202); that God has placed not only under the patronage, but also under the dominion of Mary. "*Sub Dominatione ac potestate*" (p. 203)—"A sinner cannot be saved except by means of the Holy Virgin" (256). "He who neglects the service of Mary shall die in sin."

Does not Rome hold with St. Ildefonsus that Mary is the most true mediatrix between God and man? "*Dei atque hominum verissima mediatrix*" (p. 170.)

The Bible, on the other hand, says that "there is one God and one mediator between God and man—the man Christ Jesus (I. Tim., ii, 5)—and that whoever believeth in the Lord Jesus shall be saved.

Touching the deification of the Pope, I observe a pertinent passage in Mr. Gladstone's review of the discourses of Pius IX.—and speaking of Mr. Gladstone I cannot forbear saying that

the Roman Catholics owe him a great debt of gratitude for his efforts during thirty years to secure for them civil justice in England; and now that, without changing his convictions, he has exposed with such admirable temper and marvelous skill the true meaning of the infallibility dogma, especially in its bearing upon civil allegiance, the abuse heaped upon him is the highest tribute to the unanswerable force of his facts and arguments.

Mr. Gladstone shows that the reporter of the speeches, Don Pasquale, evidently with the papal approval, pronounces the speeches inspired, divine; calls the Pope the portentous father of the Nations (p. 11); "the living Christ" "the voice of God"; he is the God that condemns" (p. 17). (Gladstone's speeches of Pope Pius IX., New York, 1875, p. 6).

ROME EDUCATES FOR THE PAST.

Certainly, in reference both to the Virgin and the Pope, there is a difference of view between the Roman Church and the Christian Churches that rest their faith upon the Bible, which goes to explain why Rome regards Bible Societies as "a pestilence," and why those who hold to the Bible as the word of life object to the introduction into our system of Roman Catholic education. In fact, the most intelligent Roman Catholics of our land, men like Dr. Brownson, who are accustomed to mark the admirable results of our common school system, where the Bible is appreciated and cherished, cannot shut their eyes to the fact that for this age and this Republic, Roman Catholic education is singularly unfitted.

"The cause," wrote Dr. Brownson, "of the failure of what we call Catholic education is in our judgment the fact that we educate not for the present or the future but for the past." (Quoted by Dr. Smith, Impending Conflict, 63).

That philosophic judgment, from perhaps the ablest champion of Rome that America has produced, deserves the attention not only of the legislators who will be urged, year after year, to appropriate money for Roman schools, but of every Roman Catholic father and mother in our land who desire their children to have an education that will fit them, not for the past, but for the present and the future, that they may have an equal chance with their neighbors to achieve success in life.

Dr. Brownson, who was an American before he was a Romanist, and who retained many of his American characteristics, said again: "That foreignism which Catholics bring with them and perpetuate in their foreign colony, is un-Catholic and antagonistic to the American idea, and has done more injury to our American idea of civilization than the Catholicity they also bring has done good." (Brownson's Review, April, 1868, p. 168.)

Here, for instance, is a specimen of the tone in which the "Foreign Colony," as Brownson calls it, offers to America the principles which have brought Spain and Mexico to their present condition.

"Catholic principles alone can save the Republic. * * If Catholicity fails, civilization will fail; New York will be as Carthage, Baltimore as Hippo, America as Africa." (Freemans' Journal, quoted by the Am. & For. Christian Union, VIII., 334).

However devoted and earnest a Romanist Father Newman may be in his efforts for the accomplishment of the domination of the Pope in our Republic, with power to suppress all other religions as heresies, and to enforce the doctrines of the syllabus, he has been too acute and intelligent an observer since he came to America to suppose that that result can ever be accomplished while we preserve the integrity of our common

schools and keep the Bible in the hands of the people; and Father Newman can hardly have failed to note, during his residence in our Republic, the honest patriotism of American citizens and their intelligent love of country; and if he will study the history of the Republic to which he has come, and trace the antecedents of the early colonists, he can hardly fail to understand the reasons why the Roman "foreignism" imported from Europe, where for ages the Pope has assumed to rule Nations and governments with coercive power, to depose sovereigns, and absolve subjects from their allegiance, disturbs even American Roman Catholics as at war with the independence and dignity of the Republic, and with their personal honor as American citizens, bound to maintain the National Constitution, and yet claimed as the subjects of a foreign prince, obliged absolutely to obey the Pope even at the sacrifice of their country. The very oaths of the Cardinals and Bishops of the Roman religion have for Americans a foreign and unchristian sound, very different from the glad tidings "Peace on earth and good will towards men."

Each Roman Cardinal, we are told, takes an oath that he will give to the Pope and his successors any assistance in retaining, defending and recovering the Roman papacy and the regalia of St. Peter with all his might and endeavor; that he will resist unto blood all persons whatever who shall attempt anything against them, and that he will seek out and oppose, persecute and fight against heretics and schismatics against our Lord the Pope. (25. Christian World, 24.)

The Bishops, too, are required to swear they will persecute and wage war against all whom Rome calls heretics. (Bishop Wadsworth, of Lincoln, 2 New Testament, pages 254 & 5, note.)

If these oaths are not like the Papal infallibility, "a Protestant invention," it would look as if Rome anticipated some exceptions, in the future as in the past, to the rule declared by Father Newman, that "the Catholic Church achieves her triumphs not by violence but by gentleness and patience;" and the Roman Court is right if it thinks that its Cardinals and Bishops will have to resist unto blood before His Holiness can treat our Republic as he does our neighbor the Republic of Mexico.

Take, for instance, the allocution of Pius IX., Dec. 15, 1856, in regard to certain Mexican laws: "We condemn, disallow, and declare absolutely null and of no effect, all the decrees above mentioned, and all the acts which the civil power in Mexico has done in contempt of the ecclesiastical authority and of the Apostolic See," &c.

Father Newman may perhaps reply that the Pope makes a difference between our Republic and that of Mexico and the lesser States; and that he never treats with disrespect the American government or the American people: although even this would be a rather rash reminder of the fact which tended to demoralize many of our Roman Catholic citizens, and to increase the difficulty of our task and the waste of life and treasure, that Pius IX., while still a temporal sovereign, was the only sovereign in Europe who recognized the Southern Confederacy when our national integrity hung upon the issue of the war, receiving with honor the rebel envoys and commending their chief as the "illustrious and honored President" of the Slave Confederacy that pretended to have risen on the ruins of the Republic. He addressed to Mr. Jefferson Davis the memorable Latin letter which concluded: "Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, the 3d day of December, 1863, and of our pontificate 18th.—

Pius IX."

After expressing his pleasure that Mr. Davis was animated by the same desire of peace which the Pope had inculcated on the Archbishop John Mary, of New Orleans, and the Archbishop John, of New York, Pius IX. prayed God "that the other people of America and their rulers" (these were the terms in which he referred to the American people and their government founded by Washington) would "adopt resolutely the part of peace," which meant the part of surrender and national disintegration.

The fidelity with which a great number of our Roman Catholic officers and men continued to fight for the whole country, in disregard of that powerful voice from the Vatican and the instruction to the Archbishop John Hughes, fully justified the testimony which I have always cheerfully borne to "the loyal sympathy with our institutions which is to be found among our Roman Catholic citizens." But the history of Rome, the doctrines of the syllabus and the dogma of infallibility, reviving and consecrating the extreme acts and utterances of the most extreme Popes who are held never to have exceeded their power, forbid the idea that the sovereign pontiff or the members of his court can entertain any loyal sympathy with our institutions, to prevent them from exercising if they could once possess the power throughout this Republic, the policy which Rome has exercised in what she calls Catholic countries, under the rules laid down by Boniface VIII. in *Unam Sanctam*, that the whole world is subject to the Pope, even in temporal and political matters, (letter from Rome on the Council, by Quirinus —New York, 1860—636); that it is lawful for the Popes to depose Emperors and absolve subjects from their allegiance, as declared by Gregory VII., Alexander III., Innocent III., and others of the sovereign pontiffs.

These are some of the dogmas which the most enlightened Roman Catholics of America are by no means prepared to approve.

The letters from Rome on the Council, by Quirinus" (p. 108), said that the American bishops "ask how they are going to live under the free constitution of their Republic, and maintain their position of equality with their fellow citizens, after committing themselves to the principles attached to papal infallibility: such as religious persecution and the coercive power of the Church, the claim of Catholicism to exclusive mastery in the State, the Pope's right to dispense from oaths, the subjection of the civil power to the supreme dominion," &c.

In a letter during the same winter (p. 504), it was said, "the two prelates (Archbishops Kenrick, of St. Louis, and Purcell, of Cincinnati), add that American Catholics have very special reasons for disliking the definition for the notion that the Pope had a right to depose monarchs, dispense oaths of allegiance and give away countries and nations at his will (referring, perhaps, to Adrian, Ireland and Henry II.), is equally strange to Protestants and Catholics in their country."

One reason, perhaps, for the vague ideas prevailing even among educated American Romanists on these essential points, is the reserve which from motives of expediency has been imposed on the Roman Catholic teachers in expressing in England and the United States the doctrines which are openly proclaimed in Spain. The Tablet, for instance, which is said to reflect the teachings of Cardinal Manning, says, "For example, in a country like this, where toleration of religion is an established political principle, and when in point of fact the followers of other religions taken

together far outnumber the faithful, were it even possible, it would not only be an impudence of which the Church is incapable, but it would be the *height of madness* to attempt to give other expression of her intolerance than that of words, and those words, too, the gentlest and most charitable.

"But the case is very different in such a country as Spain. That people have been Catholic ever since they believed: the sovereign, government, people, all Catholic."

The rules prescribed by St. Alphonso de Liguori (confirmed by Gregory in 1839) for giving false evidence under oath, or violating the truth or a promise —some thirty cases being specified where this is allowable to devout Romanists—afford every variety of apology for denying in words the gentlest and the most charitable, any statement however true which would be to this advantage of religion or to the common detriment, by hindering some blessed plan of the Pope or Jesuit Fathers. (Moral Theology of the Church of Rome, by the Rev. Fred. Merrick, with an Introduction by the Rev. (now Bishop) Cleveland Coxe, Baltimore).

Father Newman has quoted with enthusiasm the historian Macauley on the longevity of the Church of Rome; and his observant view of her later aims and results is equally deserving of thoughtful consideration in contrasting the effect of Romanism with that of the Bible, and illustrating the sort of civilization which Rome offers for our acceptance: "But during the last three centuries to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her object. Throughout christendom whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have under her rule been sunk in poverty, in political servitude and in intellectual torpor: while Protestant countries once proverbial for sterility and barbarism have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what four hundred years ago they naturally were, shall now compare the country around Rome with that around Edinburgh, will be able to form some opinion as to the tendency of papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degredation, the elevation of Holland in spite of many natural disadvantages to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality; and in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton; in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county; finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails.

"The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert, while the whole Continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprize."

In the face of these facts clear as the sunlight, and teaching the plainest of lessons, Rome pursues from century to century, and from clime to clime, her career of ambition; and she is seeking to establish in America the supremacy of the sovereign pontiff.

We have answered, frankly and fully, Father Newman's several demands for the authority on which I based the statements which he

regards as forgeries, and I will respectfully ask him to state with equal particularity his authority for the statement in his first letter at the close of the sketch of the St. Bartholomew's matter, that "when the whole truth was afterwards disclosed, THE POPE BY HIS WORDS AND HIS BULLS PUBLICLY SHOWED HIS HORROR AT SUCH A CRIME."

I ask his proof for this exact and unqualified assurance on which he accused me of reviving "a rather stale and exploded calumny" against the Roman Church, and with which he declared that "all students of history who are correctly informed know well that the Church is not to blame in that affair." Father Newman will please give the dates and particulars of the bulls in question expressing Gregory's horror of the St. Bartholomew crime. How many such bulls were these? when were they issued and where are they to be found? What historian has quoted them or alluded to them?

These are questions to which, after my ready response to his demands, the reverend and learned gentleman will of course cheerfully and readily answer, especially as his statement seems to be at variance with the statement of writers of the highest authority in his own Church, and to the testimony of Gregory himself, as embodied in the medal representing an angel, armed with a cross and sword, engaged in massacring the fallen and flying Huguenots, which was explained by Roman writers as indicating "a heavenly work accomplished by the divine aid and council."

I shall, of course, not question in the slightest degree the sincerity of Father Newman in placing perfect faith in the authority of the bulls on which he rests the innocence of Gregory; nor will I repeat his suggestion about forgeries, nor intimate that Rome knows the case to be desperate, unless she can suppress the medal and invent a bull.

The story as very recently told by Lord Acton, one of the most eminent of the English champions of the Vatican decrees, in a letter to Mr. Gladstone defending the dogma of infallibility, gives additional interest to Father Newman's statement of Gregory's horror of the crime.

Lord Acton said in illustration of his argument that Mr. Gladstone attached undue importance to the recent decree of infallibility as affecting the character of the Church: "Pius V., the only Pope who has been proclaimed a Saint for many centuries, having deposed Elizabeth, commissioned an assassin to take her life; and his next successor (Gregory XIII.), on learning that the Protestants were being massacred in France, pronounced the action glorious and holy, but comparatively barren of results; and implored the King during two months by his nuncio and his legate, to carry the work on to the bitter end, until every Huguenot had recanted or perished." (The Vatican decrees in their bearing on civil allegiance, by Gladstone--D. Appleton, New York, 1872—p. 84.)

Father Newman will see from Lord Acton's clear statement of the case how much interest will attach to the dates, the occasions and the texts of Gregory's bulls disapproving the massacre. It will be interesting to know the time when he first awakened to the character of the work in which his legate and Cardinal had been engaged. In what terms did he express his horror, and why did he deem it necessary to repeat it in another bull? These and similar questions connected with the medal, and the frescoes of Vasari, ordered by the Pope for the "*Sala Regia*" of the Vatican, to commemorate the massacre as the great glory of his pontificate, will all give to the bulls cited by Father Newman an unusual historic importance.

I beg also to ask him to explain when and where they were discovered, as they seem to have been unknown to the writers on the subject from Joan Palatius, quoted by the famous Jesuit Bonnani, down to Lord Acton in 1872. Even at Rome so late as 1840 the Roman Church seemed to proclaim anew her desire to identify herself with the massacre, and remind the world of her approval of it, by reissuing the Gregory medal with the destroying angel and the divine theory. (Bp. Wadworth of Lincoln, 2 New Testament, in Greek, 25-45, quoting Irish Eccles. Journal No. 13.)

I trust that Father Newman, who has very properly invoked "fair play" in this friendly controversy on points of the gravest interest, political and religious, and who has reminded us that "truth is divine and beautiful," will be as prompt to give the authority for the bulls on which he based his charges of ignorance of history and the revival of an "exploded calumny," as he was to demand my authority for the quotation from a prayer to the Virgin, and an allusion to the adoration of the Pope.

I make the request with perfect courtesy, and awaiting the answer on this point of the learned gentleman, to whose last letter, in its completed form, I propose to make a further reply.

SIR:—On the 8th of February I intermitted my answer to Father Newman's last letter to give that reverend gentleman an opportunity of citing the proofs and particulars of the bulls of Pope Gregory XIII., in which he said that the Pope "publicly showed his horror at such a crime"—the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. In Father Newman's reply, which was continued for successive weeks and concluded on Saturday last, he says "I cannot readily and conveniently obtain the bulls or letters showing the Pope's horror at the deed."

If Father Newman will read the letters of Lord Acton, the eminent Roman Catholic nobleman, to which he refers as having appeared in the London Times of November, 1874, and especially that published Nov. 24th, on the 6th page of that paper, he will find extracts from original letters in French and Italian of the Pope's Nuncio Salviati, and of the Cardinal Orsini. These show that the Pope after being informed by Salviati on the 2d September, that the report that the Massacre of Aug. 24, 1572, had been provoked by the detection of a Protestant conspiracy, was an utter falsehood too ridiculous to be believed: so far from expressing his horror at the Massacre which had occurred, or seeking to prevent its extension, caused the King to be advised by the nuncio of the desire of his holiness "for the great glory of God and the greatest welfare of France to see all the heretics of the Kingdom extirpated"—*tous les heretiques extirpees du royaume*—and he advised that the edict of pacification should be revoked. That advice, announced on the 22d September, was followed by Salviati's writing on the 11th October, that the Holy Father had experienced an infinite joy and great consolation in learning that His Majesty had commanded me to write that he hoped that in a little while France would have no more Huguenots—"*qu elle esperait qu avant pen la France n' aurait plus de Huguenots.*" On the 19th December Cardinal Orsini, who had been despatched as Legate from Rome, congratulated the King on the glory of the Massacre, and "pressed him to renew his promise that not a single Huguenot should be left alive on the soil of France."

Some months later Cardinal Lorraine, harranguing the King in the presence of the assembled clergy of France, declared that he had eclipsed all preceeding mon-

archs, not by the Massacre only, but by the holy deceit with which he had laid his plans.

Lord Acton quotes the Egerton MSS., 2,077, and in the Paris library the Italian MSS., 1,272, and the *Proces Verbaux des Assembles du Clerge*, I Appendix 28, and refers with satisfaction to the fact that among the applauding Cardinals one voice was raised in protest—that of Montalto, who became Sextus V., and who expected the Pope to prohibit rejoicings which would convince the world that the Church was thirsting for blood. But Gregory proceeded to commemorate his part in the Massacre by the medal which represented it as an angelic work, and by the three frescoes which he ordered from Vassari, and of which one certainly may still be seen in the Vatican.

The proofs cited by Lord Acton, added to those previously known, are complete and irresistible: and the Romanists could hardly select an incident in papal history, not even the grant of Ireland to the Crown of England, nor the condemnation of Gallileo, where the attempts to revise history in the interest of papal infallibility, is so thoroughly overcome by the papal records: serving to make more clear and indelible the unpleasant truths which it is now deemed essential to palliate or deny.

It is gratifying to find among the high-toned Roman Catholic laity such a frank, outspoken contempt for the jesuitical treatment of history, and such a manly and scholarly exposure of the historic inventions that are being palmed off upon the ignorant credulity of those, who in regard to historic facts of which the proof is before them, have been taught to close their eyes and shut their ears and discard the reason and judgment with which God has endowed them, on the ground that the Pope is infallible, and they must believe or be damned.

Father Newman's appeal to history and to "solid argument" seems to recognize the fact, at least, that Americans hold to the right of private judgment: and his discussion of some of the topics that are more or less connected with the mission of the Jesuits to this country, has an interest not alone for Americans who question the infallibility and supremacy of the Pope, but for all Roman Catholic laymen who are unprepared to surrender their constitutional rights as citizens, the principle of religious toleration, the power of the State to establish schools, and the great doctrines of civil and religious liberty.

Among the topics with which Father Newman has supplied the place of the Bulls which he could "not readily and conveniently obtain," is the Inquisition, which he eulogizes as "an institution holy in its objects, just in its measures, and beneficial in its results." Touching the chief measure—torture—he lays stress on the point that it observed an unusual "moderation" in torturing its victims, and that it tortured under "medical surveillance."

Lord Acton, at the close of his masterly paper, asked those who differed from him "to ask themselves seriously whether the laws of the Inquision are or are not a scandal and a sorrow to their souls." Whatever might be the answer to this question on the part of the intelligent and right-minded laymen of the Roman Catholic Church in America, it would seem from Father Newman's frank expressions, that the thought of the Inquisition causes no sorrow to the Roman Bishops, priests and Jesuits in our Republic who are bound by no oath as citizens, and who boast with a confidence real or affected that they will soon succeed by their management of our politics in subjecting the American people to the rule of the

Pope. Father Hecker, who once said "in fifteen years we will take this country, and build our institutions over the grave of Protestantism," has since fixed the year 1900 as the time when they think that "Rome will have a majority and be bound to take the country and keep it;" and he predicted also that "there is ere long to be a State religion in this country, and that State religion is to be a Roman Catholic." The Catholic Review (January, 1852) reminded us that "Protestantism of every form has not and never can have any right where Catholicity is trumphant." This view, which is an accord with the history and dogmas of Rome, would seem to be openly held by some of the Roman Bishops in America. Bishop O'Conor, of Pittsburgh, is quoted as saying, "Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into effect, without peril to the Catholic world;" and the Archbishop of St. Louis, is reported to have said, "Catholicity will one day rule America, and religious freedom will be at an end." (The Question of the Hour, by Rev. Dr. C. W. Clark, p. 108.)

Such notifications give interest to the authoritative views expressed by Father Newman in regard to the Inquisition, apart from the curious illustration which they furnish of "that foreignism" which Dr. Brownson said "Catholics bring with them and perpetuate in their foreign colony," and which Brownson pronounced "antagonist to the American idea of civilization." It is an antagonism, which marks the hatred shown by this "foreign colony" which has come to conquer us—towards the Bible in the vernacular, towards our common schools, towards those Christian institutions of our Republic of which Webster said, "Christianity is part of the law of the land. * The generations which have gone before speak to it and proclaim it from the tomb. * * All proclaim that Christianity — general, tolerant Christianity—Christianity independent of sects and parties—that Christianity to which the sword and fagot are unknown—general, tolerant Christianity is the law of the land."

For a mere glance at the Inquisition whose justice and moderation Father Newman commends, let us refer to an historian whom the learned gentleman has himself quoted, Mr. Lothrop Motley, and to his "History of the Dutch Republic." (Vol. I., 322-26.) After showing that under the Dominican Torquemada, during eighteen years, 10,220 persons were burned alive, 97,321 punished with infamy, confiscation of property and perpetual imprisonment, Mr. Motley says in a passage whose length compels abbreviation:

"It was a branch of monks without appeal, having its familiars in every house, diving into the secrets of every fireside. * It condemned not deeds but thoughts. * Its process was reduced to a horrible simplicity. It arrested on suspicion, tortured till confession, and then punished by fire. * * The accuser might be his son, father, or the wife of his bosom. * The prisoner was tried by torture. The rack was the court of justice. * * The torture took place at midnight, in a gloomy dungeon, dimly lighted by torches. The victim, whether man, matron or tender virgin, was stripped naked, and stretched upon the wooden bench. Water. weights, pulleys, screws, all the apparatus by which the sinews could be strained without cracking, the bones crushed without breaking, and the body racked exquisitely without giving up the ghost., were now put into operation. * The period during which torture might be inflicted from day to day was unlimited in duration, and individuals have borne the torture and the

dungeon fifteen years, and have been burned at the stake at last. * The *auto de fe* was a solemn festival. The monarchs, the high functionaries of the land, the reverend clergy, the populace, regarded it as an inspiring and delightful recreation."

The Inquisition at the proper moment delivered the condemned into the hands of the executioner "with an ironical request that he would deal with them tenderly, and without blood-letting or injury. * It was, according to the biographer of Philip the Second, a Heavenly remedy, a guardian angel of Paradise. * No rank, high or humble, was safe from its jurisdiction. * Even death offered no protection. The holy office invaded the prince in his palace, and the beggar in his shroud. The corpses of dead heretics were mutilated and burned. The Inquisition preyed upon carcasses and rifled graves."

To Americans cherishing religious toleration as the most imperative of duties, and liberty of conscience as the most sacred of right, this treatment of persons for no other crime than their belief in the Bible and in God, can hardly be read without a feeling of horror and indignation. To the agents of the Pope in America, with their feelings towards American institutions and American citizens who hold to the Bible and reject the Pope, it conveys, it seems, the idea of "moderation:" and Father Newman's view recalls a remark of the London Times that "The vengence of Rome against heretics is measured only by her power."

Father Newman had assured us in another part of his letter that "if Catholics (meaning Romannists) were the vast majority in this country to-morrow, the same civil and religious liberty would be tolerated and enjoyed." And if that contingency shall hapen—which we are not quite prepared to believe---no doubt the holy office will exhibit in its treatment of American heretics the same "moderation" which it showed in Spain.

With this brief response to Father Newman on the subject of St. Bartholomew and the Inqusition subjects, which deserves to be associated, let us resume the consideration of some points in his earlier letter as published in pamphlet.

If, as I presume, I am indebted to the Reverend Father for a copy of his pamphlet, I beg to acknowledge the courtesy. Touching the question asked in one of my letters, whether an edict of "Pope Constantinus II." was not condemned by the council of Constantinople, I fully admit the correctness of Father Newman's reply, that there was no Pope of that title name.

If we differ as to the infallibility of the Popes, some of whom he admits may have been "vicious" and even "wicked," we are, I think, agreed as to the fallibility of copyists and compositors, however amiable and virtuous. Amid the confusion and antagonisms of Popes and Councils, the Pope to whom my question related seems to have been in some way renamed after the council by which he was condemned. Father Newman, in his first letter, told us that "Admiral Fotiguy" was murdered in his bed on St. Bartholomew's eve. As no such Admiral was known in France, I assumed, without remark, that Father Newman intended to name the great Admiral Gaspard Coligny, to whose pure memory repentant Paris is about to erect a monument. Despite the types, and the trust too often reposed in their infallibility by gentle credulity, "Fotiguy" was not the Admiral, and "Constantinus" was not the Pope.

The attack upon Bible Societies made by Father Newman, in his review of an address which had discussed the relation of the Bible to the Republic, and his in-

vitation to us to join the Church of Rome and acknowledge the supremacy and infallibility now centered in the Pope, has naturally led in this controversy to the question of the position in which the Church of Rome stands to our Republic. Excepting with the view of developing this relation, there would be little reason why a layman of the Protestant Episcopal Church whom Rome esteems a heretic, should discuss with a learned theologian of that communion, the doctrines in which the Church of England and all the Churches of Christendom hold that Rome has erred from the Christian faith. Nor are we careful to answer the abuse, whether Romanistic or Atheistic, which is heaped on Bible Societies by those who treat with irreverence the open Bible in the vernacular; who join with the Popes in denouncing its circulation "as a pestilence, and those who circulate it as enemies of mankind." But when we recall the facts mentioned by Burke, in his great speech on conciliation, that the stream of colonists that had flowed into the American Colonies had been for the greater part composed of dissenters from the establishments of their respective countries, and remember that without the Bible our Republic could not have existed: the invitation extended to us, as American citizens, by Father Newman, who comes to America as an agent of the Roman Court, to abolish Bible Societies and join his Church, at once raises the question how far the policy, ecclesiastical or civil, of the Court of Rome, as developed in its history and its dogmas, are in accordance with its principles of the American Constitution, the rights of American citizens, and the interests, aims, and general welfare of our Republic.

Among the memorable counsels of the Father of his Country which our people remember with affectionate reverence, and which Father Newman can find in "Washington's Farewell Address," was his earnest warning to keep our jealousy constantly awake "against the insidious evils of foreign influence;" and when we consider what at this moment Rome desires and hopes to accomplish in our Republic, this warning comes to us with peculiar solemnity.

It calls up the thought of the distinguishing characteristics of the Republic, which stands to-day the monument of the God-fearing and heroic men whose fathers had fought for the truths of the Bible on the great battle-fields of Europe, and who came to plant in America civil and religious freedom. From them we inherit popular government, resting upon the free exercise by each citizen of his intelligence and his conscience; common schools organized by the State to teach to all the elements of Christian morality; and religious toleration securing to all freedom of education and worship, with no condition excepting that they must not infringe on the liberties of their neighbors, nor teach what might be injurious to morals.

Then there are the fundamental principles:—Separation of Church and State; freedom of speech and of the press, which, combined with education, have made the Republic foremost in intellectual, scientific and philanthropic progress; placing it, in its first century, in the front rank of Christian civilization, surpassing in wealth and power and influence kingdoms that flourished before Columbus and the other American States founded as early as our own, where, under the teaching and sway of Rome, there is neither education, nor industry, nor progress among the people, nor public life, nor life in science, literature or art, but only a sluggish mechanical movement significant of poverty, superstition and decay.

These are the grand and simple features developed by the teachings of the New Testament, which have raised this Republic to so proud a height; which have developed the intelligence of the people and the resources of the country, opening for the humblest the way to comfort, respectability and influence. These are the cherished American features which are to be recalled and appreciated, when we are asked to recognize the claims of Rome to arrest in the Republic the free circulation of the Bible, and to substitute for the teachings of Christ the traditions of the papacy and the *ex-cathedra* utterances of a living Pope.

Father Newman seems to be conscious of the importance attached by Americans to some of these points, such as freedom, loyalty and toleration; for on page 2d he speaks of "this free and glorious country," and declares that "good Catholics could not consistently be anything else but good citizens, as they are bound in conscience to observe the just laws of the State;" and on page 4 he asserts "that the Roman Catholic Church is a warm advocate of toleration."

Before entering upon an examination of these questions, and especially of the question suggested by Father Newman's argument how far the powers claimed by the Popes under the dogma of infallibility are consistent with the allegiance of our Roman Catholic citizens to the Constitution and laws of our Republic, it may be convenient for the avoidance of future misunderstanding, to see precisely what powers are claimed by Rome and what is the change in this regard which the dogma of infallibity seems to have emphasized.

Father Newman not only denies that the dogma was a new dogma, but goes so far as to say, in allusion to the Vatican Council (p. 38): 'If some distinguished Roman Catholics expressed themselves opposed to the infallibility, it must be remembered that they did not protest against the doctrine itself, but the opportuneness of the time for solemnly defining it.' But was there not in the Council a contest so strong, upon the doctrine itself, that it was styled "The battle between the papal and Episcopal principles?" Can it properly be said that the opposition of such Bishops as Kenricks, of St. Louis; Hefels, of Rotterburg; Rauscher, Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna; Maret, of Sura; Darboy, of Paris: Strosmayer, of Bosnia and Sirnium; Schwarzenburg, Cardinal Archbishop of Prague; Dupanloup, of Orleans; and Connolly, of Halifax, was based only on the question of opportuneness? Take for instance the powerful speeches of the Archbishop of Halifax, who is reported to have said: "Thrice have I asked for proof, from Scripture according to authentic interpretation, from tradition and from councils, that the Bishops of the Catholic Church ought to be excluded from the definition of dogmas, but my request has not been complied with. * * The Bishops have no right to renounce the promise of Christ, 'I am with you to the end of the world'; but now they want to reduce us to nullities, to tear the noblest jewel from our pontifical breastplates, to deprive us of the highest prerogatives of our office, and to transform the whole Church, and the Bishops with it, into a rabble of blind men, among whom is one only who can see: so that they must shut their eyes and believe only what he tells them.'" (Dr. Ewer's "Catholicity," p. 244.)

It was either this speech or another of like effect, which the eloquent and eminent Archbishop concluded by saying, "That the proposal laid before the Council was only fit to be put decorously under ground." (The Vatican Council, North British Review, Oct. 1870.)

Or, take the eminent Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, did he not say in his pamphlet, which is described as a marvel of ability, "that there were Bishops in the Council, and himself among them, who have solemnly sworn that at least in England, the Pope possesses no such jurisdiction."

To understand clearly the practical importance of this question, let us refer for a moment to the examination of the Irish Bishops by a Committee of the House of Lords, pending the question of Catholic emancipation, and when there was a suspicion that it might be held in the Irish Church that the Pope had a right to absolve subjects from their allegiance.

"Do you conceive," it was asked, that "it was ever the principle of the Catholic Church that the Pope might *Jure Divino* absolve subjects from their allegiance?" and Dr. Doyle, the famous Irish Bishop answered, "certainly not."

"Are there circumstances," it was asked, "under which the Catholic clergy would not obey a Bull of the Pope?" and Dr. Murray said "most certainly;" and Dr. Doyle said, "But we should oppose him (the Pope) by every means in our power, even in the exercise of our spiritual authority, if he were to meddle with the allegiance which Catholics owe to the King, by preaching the Gospel to the people and teaching them to oppose the Pope. (Lords evidence, p. 192, quoted, 43, Edinburg Review, 151.)

Those Irish Bishops doubtless remembered with pride how bravely the Irish Catholics had fought against the Bull of the English Pope who had granted Ireland to the British Crown, and they seemed prepared to resent any further interference with their political affairs by the Court of Rome under cover of spiritual jurisdiction.

In 1828 the Vicars Apostolic, who with Episcopal authority governed the Roman Catholics of Great Britain, said in the Collective Declaration: "The allegiance which Catholics hold to be due, and are bound to pay to their Sovereign, and to the civil authority of the State, is perfect and undivided. * * * They declare that neither the Pope nor any other prelate or ecclesiastical persons of the Roman Catholic Church * * * have any right to interfere directly, or indirectly, in the civil government * * nor to oppose in any manner the performance of the civil duties which are due to the King."

The same year the Hierarchy of the Roman Communion, in its pastoral address to the clergy and laity of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, dated January 25th, 1826, said, Article II:

"They declare on oath the belief that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither are they required to believe that the Pope is infallible."

When Father Newman declares that papal infallibility has always been an article of faith, his statement is at variance with these solemn and sworn declarations. He can hardly expect us to believe that the Vicars Apostolic and the Irish Hierarchy were all ignorant on the point, and yet if papal infallibility was then the doctrine of the Roman Church, and they knew it to be so, why did they proclaim officially, and solemnly swear there was no such doctrine, and while the world marked the disclaimer and its effect on British legislation Rome seemed to confirm that disclaimer by her silence.

The papal infallibility which Rome now proclaims as a doctrine of the Roman creed, which has been acknowledged by all, always and everywhere, was denounced before God to the British Parliament and the British people by the Irish Hierarchy and the Vicars Apostolic.

To those oaths and protestations by the official representatives of Rome, full

faith and credit was given. Emancipation was granted to the Roman Catholics whose Church repudiated papal infallibility as a Protestant invention, and who were ready to fight against a Pope who should dare to meddle with their allegiance; and to-day the world has a new and practical illustration, which Americans may well consider, of the dogma laid down by the greatest legislators of the mediæval Church and confirmed by the celebrated Council, that allegiance must not be kept with heretical princes. *Cum ei qui Deo fidem non serrat, fides sevanda non sit.*

"Catholic Emancipation" in England having been accomplished, prominence was soon given to papal infallibility, and the divine right of the Pope to direct the temporal authority of all countries; and even before the dogma was proclaimed at Rome, Dr. Manning preached at Kensington a sermon in the Pope's name (quoted by Quirinus, Appendix I, 832, Dr. Schaff's History of the Vatican, Council 72, note I) and said to have been printed in the Tablet of Oct. 9, 1864, in which he said as coming from the Pope's mouth:

"I acknowledge no civic power; I am the subject of no prince; and I claim more than that—I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men: of the peasant that tills the field, and the prince who sits upon the throne; of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, and the *legislature that makes laws for kingdoms.* I am the sole, last, supreme judge, of what is right or wrong."

This startling claim of the Bishop of Rome, against which all Christians protest, accords with the terms "the living Christ," and "the voice of God," applied to Pius IX. by the reporter of his discourses; and the powers now assumed by the Pope recall the prophetic picture drawn by the Apostle of "that man of sin," the "son of perdition who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." (2 Thess. ii: 4.) Such, as Mr. Gladstone calls it, was the stroke of 1870, the legal extinction of right and the enthronement of will in its place. By exempting the Bishop of Rome from error, it "resolves Catholicism into papalism, and the Church into the Pope;" it excludes the exercise of the intellect or the will, and impairs the sense of personal responsibility."

The infallibility of the Popes, as Father Newman remarks, is held to be entirely independent of the soundness of their private opinions or of the purity of their lives.

"Who has not read," says Bishop Hopkins, whose words are more than confirmed by the Abbe Fleury, "of the awful immorality, the licentiousness and degradation of the Roman priests themselves during the ages of darkness which preceded the Reformation; who is so ignorant as not to know that many of their Popes, their Bishops, and even their religious orders were a reproach not only to the Church of Christ but even to humanity." (The History of the Confessional, p. 24.) But despite all this, the official utterances of these Popes on matters of faith and duty are to be held infallible and irreformable, and are to be accepted as the word of God. This dogma, and the 23d article of the syllabus, which declares it error to say that a Roman Pontiff has ever exceeded the limits of his powers or has ever committed errors in defining matters of faith and morals, compel Romanists who accept the new dogma, to defend the official acts and utterances of all the Popes. Hence come the difficulties presented by history,

and the evasive plan which is so faithfully illustrated by the Jesuit Fathers, in denying the accuracy of every historic fact which they may find indefensible or inconvenient, and in pronouncing it, however sustained by the highest Roman authorities, as a "Protestant invention." This difficulty from history was foreseen in the Council by other than the American Bishops: and before referring to some of the cases where Father Newman denies historical facts, as set forth in the records of his own Church, it may be well to quote a passage from the North British Review, which is not only interesting as showing the character of the Romanist party in the Council, which triumphed over the Catholic element, and the reality and extent of the differences which underlie the outward unity of the Roman Catholic Church, and of which, as exhibited in the Council, Lord Acton said,—"The division between the Roman and the Catholic element in the Church, made it hopeless to mediate between them."

The North British says: "The dogmatic commission of the Council proclaim that the existence of tradition has nothing to do with evidence, and that objections taken from history are not valid when contradicted by ecclesiastical decree. Authority must conquor history. The inclination to get rid of evidence was specially associated with the dogma of papal infallibity, because it is necessary that the Popes themselves should not testify against their own claims. * * Their history is not irrelevant to the question of their rights. It could not be disregarded; and the provocation to alter or deny its testimony was so urgent that men of piety and learning became a prey to the temptation and deceit. When it was discovered that the Popes had for centuries condemned Honorius in the confession of faith, Cardinal Bona, the most eminent man in Rome, advised that tho book should be suppressed if the difficulty could not be got over; and it was suppressed accordingly. Men guilty of this kind of fraud would justify it by saying that their religion transcends the wisdom of philosophy, and can not submit to the criticism of history. If any fact manifestly contradicts a dogma, that is a warning to science to revise the evidence. There must be some defect in the materials or in method. Pending its discovery, the true believer is constrained humbly but confidently, to deny the fact."

This view, extraordinary or incredible as it may seem to those unskilled in the teachings of the Roman Court, and especially in its ethics as expounded by Liguori's rule, easy methods of trifling with the truth, and giving false evidence under oath, is confirmed by the authoritative utterances of Archbishop Manning, who after an attempt to answer the unanswerable argument based upon the case of Honorius, announced that "in the divine tradition of the Church" (which includes all that the Popes have said or may say, when they speak *ex-cathedra*, and of this the Pope is the judge,) all "difficulties from human history are excluded."

With these authoritative explanations of the way in which history is to be treated, when it exhibits the folly, the guilt, or the heresies of individual Popes, and their condemnation by Councils and successive Popes, as in the case of Honorius, let us look at the grant of Ireland to the British Crown, by the English Pope Adrian IV., in a bull addressed to King Henry II., which Father Newman does not hesitate to pronounce "an English forgery."

Among the historic difficulties in the way of papal infallibility, few are likely to prove more troublesome in America

than the fact to which Archbishop Purcell so earnestly called attention, while the infallibility council was still sitting, that the English Pope Adrian IV. made a grant of Ireland to the English King Henry II. In accordance with the rule which is said to have been agreed upon in the council, that history when troublesome should be quietly denied, we have had denials that Rome encouraged the Massacre of St. Bartholomew; denials that Rome in the case of Galileo declared that it was a heresy to say that the sun was stationary and the earth movable; and now we are told with equal gravity that Adrian IV. never made the grant of which the venerable Archbishop reminded the council and the world.

Papal bulls, it would seem, are to appear and disappear on the page of history according to the exigency of the case. When the delight of Gregory at the massacre, and his persistent efforts to make it a complete extermination of the Huguenots in France, were commemorated in medals and frescoes, and in the letters of his own nuncio and legate, affording evidence of the truth, direct, absolute, conclusive and overwhelming, we are assured that Rome was innocent of that wicked slaughter; and that Gregory had issued "bulls" to express his horror of the crime; and when these bulls or some proof of them are asked for, they cannot be readily or conveniently produced.

In the case of Adrian and Ireland, no new bull thus far seems to have been invented, but the "bull" which ecclesiastical history ascribed to Adrian, which his successor confirmed, and to which Archbishop Purcell alluded as a recognized fact, is denounced as an "English forgery."

Into whatever mistakes the Archbishop may have fallen in his financial management, the sympathy and regard which have been expressed for him, both within and beyond the bounds of his Church, do not incline us to accept the grave imputation upon the integrity and learning of the venerable prelate, which is suggested by the language of Father Newman—although the reverend gentleman may disavow such an intention—that in alluding to the most significant event in the history of Ireland, he had attempted to deceive the council and arrest the adoption of the dogma of infallibility, by quoting as a papal grant what was in fact an "English forgery." The situation is not the less interesting to American observers as illustrating what Lord Acton's historic controversies had already shown: the conflict which the attempt to reform history in the interest of the infallible dogma, has aroused and must continue to arouse among the intelligent members of the Church of Rome, who revolt alike from the immorality and the folly of attempting by pious fraud to rewrite the annals of the papacy, and to alter at pleasure the irrevocable past.

This must be especially the case in this country where our common schools, enlarging and enlightening the minds and developing the reflective faculties, tend to form that intelligent and independent judgment which is viewed with such profound dissatisfaction by the foreign agents of the Court of Rome. Archbishop Purcell's frank recognition of the great central fact in the history of Ireland can hardly be without effect upon the Irish members of his Church; and we scarcely wonder that the Jesuit and Roman Fathers who are impatient to take the control of our Republic and to "erect (Roman) Catholic institutions upon the grave of Protestantism," should instinctively feel that the Bible and the common school are the great obstacles in their path. Unless these can be gotten rid of, it will be impossible to expect

from American Roman Catholics that blind, unquestioning submission which flows from helpless ignorance, and of which Rome has furnished the world with so sad an exhibition in the Romish countries of Europe and America. We hear much of the force of spiritual authority in the Roman Church in America, especially over its members of foreign birth; and yet as the Jesuit plans against our liberties become more and more developed, and clerical intermeddling with our politics is more pronounced, differences seem likely to increase between Roman Catholics themselves, as in this case between an Archbishop on the one hand, and a reverend Father on the other.

Let us compare the respective statements. The Archbishop wrote to Bishop Dupauloup: "Our citizens of Irish nationality, who are the majority and the chief support of the (Roman) Catholic Church in the United States, will have much difficulty in admitting that Pope Adrian IV., who was an Englishman, was infallible when he gave Ireland to Henry II. of England." "Until now," added the Archbishop, alluding to the great change wrought by the infallibility dogma, "we have been permitted to say that the (Roman) Catholic Church had nothing to do with the transaction, and that it was not responsible for all that the Popes have done or might do."

Father Newman replies that this is only "an opinion" of the distinguished Archbishop of Cincinnati, and declares "the fact that Adrian's bull was no bull at all, but an English forgery;" and that he is "ready to prove from unquestionable authority that Pope Adrian's bull never existed."

But no authority whatever is given by Father Newman, who opposes the charge of forgery to the statement of the Archbishop.

If such a facile, not to say contemptuous treatment of so grave a matter shows no excess of consideration for the Archbishop of Cincinnati, it ignores entirely the fact that the bull of Adrian has an importance in Irish history in some degree similar to that of the Declaration of Independence in our own. There is, it is true, this essential difference between them, that the bull inspired the invasion and conquest by England which destroyed the independence of Ireland and subjected it to English rule; while our Declaration commenced the war with England which freed the united colonies from her rule, and made them an independent nation.

Ask an American to show you the great charter of American freedom, and he points to the Declaration of Independence; ask an Irishman to show you the warrant of the subjugation of his country, and he may point with the Archbishop to the grant of Pope Adrian IV. and the confirmatory brief of Alexander III.

The papal bull and the whole history of the invasion and subjugation of Ireland are of course known to all Irishmen who are familiar with their country's history.

The bull in question, addressed by Adrian IV. to his most beloved son in Christ, Henry II., recites Henry's desire to enter into the island of Ireland, "that you may reduce the people to obedience to law, and to extirpate the nurseries of vice, and that you are willing to pay from each house, yearly, one penny." The value of the penny at that day, is estimated at from two to three shillings sterling at the present time. Adrian proceeded to declare his favorable assent to that pious and laudable design of entering into that island, and "that the people of that land receive you honorably, and reverence you as their lord." Henry was further enjoined to form the nation

to virtuous manners, and to plant the faith, "that you may be entitled to the fullness of eternal reward in God, and obtain a glorious renown on earth throughout all ages."

With this promise from the Pope of a double reward, Henry entered upon his pious work of reducing the Irish, who had been weakened and distracted by civil wars; and the Roman Catholic Bishops, it is said, were the first to acknowledge the English conqueror, bearing the mandate of an English Pope.

Adrian having thus rendered his reign memorable by so great a gift to the Crown of Britain, died in 1159, and his successor, Alexander III., known in history for his excommunication and subsequent pardon of the Emperor Barbarossa, and again for ordaining the espousal of the Adriatic by the Doge of Venice, and who is entitled to everlasting honor for proclaiming that "nature having made no slaves, all men have an equal right to liberty:—"Alexander was extremely gratified by the extension of his dominion over Ireland, and in 1172 issued a brief confirming the bull of Adrian, and expressing the hope "that the barbarous nation would attain, under Henry, to some decency of manners," and wrote in addition three letters on the subject.

I am advised by that eminent scholar, the Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, who will treat fully on this subject in his revised History of Mediæval Christianity, that the bull is given by Matthew Paris in 1155: that the confirmatory letter of Pope Alexander III. to Henry, dated 1172, was published in Ireland, 1175, and printed in Baronius' Annales, the copy being taken from a Codex Vaticanus; see also authorities quoted by Secretary Thompson, in his Papacy and Civil Power, page 410, note 34, showing that the grant is acknowledged by Dr. Lanigan, the Roman Catholic historian of Ireland—and by Lingard in his history of England—referred to without denial by the Jesuit Father Thebaud, in his recent work, 1873, "The Irish Race in the Past and the Present;" and it is stated in Cusack's History of Ireland, that John of Salisbury says in his "Metalogicus," that he obtained the bull from Adrian, and also that it was annexed to a brief addressed by Pope John XXII. (1316–1334) to Edward II.

The explanation heretofore given for the bull, was that Adrian was an Englishman, and in his treatment of Ireland and the Irish, a very fallible Pope. Now that the Irish Roman Catholics are bound to regard Adrian as "infallible," his bull is suddenly discovered to be an English forgery. Pending the sitting of the Council it was treated by a learned Archbishop as an authentic bull, resting on the highest ecclesiastical evidence; and Father Newman, who has been so prompt in his demands for authority, can see that if he has a shred of evidence to prove that the bull accepted as genuine for 700 years, was indeed an English forgery, the production of that evidence is now in order. In giving the "bright discoveries" of which he speaks, will he please explain why, if the bull was a forgery, did Matthew Paris record it in 1155? why did Pope Alexander II. confirm it in 1172? why have the Roman Catholic Irishmen recognized it? why today in England is it made a point by an eminent Romanist, that the Irish fought like heroes against invaders authorized by the Pope.

Father Newman adopts the same policy of denial in regard to the well-known official and solemn condemnation by Pope Urban XIII., of the teachings of Gallileo. The truth of history would be fatal to the dogma of infallibility, and

therefore as the North British puts it, "the true believer is constrained humbly but confidently to deny the fact." Father Newman, following recent writers of his faith, says: "Papal infallibility was not affected by this act of the inquisition, since the Pope was not present at the issuing of the decree." The last pretences and evasions on this point were disposed of in 1867, when Mr. Henri de l'Epinois published in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, a paper entitled "Galilee et l'Inquisition," which contained a series of extracts that he had been permitted to make from the trial record in the archives of the Holy office at Rome. The Latin text of the record, dated June 16, 1663, and a translation, are given in an article on Galilleo and papal Infallibility, by Sidney Taylor, in Macmillan's Magazine for November, 1873, pp. 89–97. They show that Pope Urban VIII. authorized the statement that it was heresy to believe in the motion of the Earth, and the motion of the Sun, and ordered such statement to be published by the congregation of the Holy office."

The language of Lord Acton is yet more definite and significant, for compelled by good faith to admit historic facts—which are proven beyond doubt—he treats it as a blunder, which was ridiculed even by the Roman divines. He said in his letter to Mr. Gladstone: "There have been, and there is still, some exaggeration in the idea men form of the agreement in thought and deed which authority can accomplish. As far as decrees, censures and persecutions could commit the Court of Rome, it was committed to the denial of the Copemican system. Nevertheless * a Spaniard who thought himself bound to adopt the Ptolomaic theory, was laughed at by the Roman divines."

Lord Acton remarked in the same line of argument that when Fenelon's book was condemned, he "publicly accepted the censure as the voice of God," and in private wrote that "Rome was getting religion into peril;" that the Irish fought not only against Henry II. when authorized by Adrian, but "against William III., although the Pope had given him efficient support in his expedition. Even James II., when he could not get a mitre for Petre, reminded Innocent that people could be good Catholics and yet do without Rome. Philip II. was excommunicated, but he despatched his army against Rome with the full concurrence of the Spanish divines."

It has occasionally happened in this friendly controversy that the argument has been interrupted by the necessity imposed by Rome's repeated denials of proving in detail historic facts which Rome herself had made immortal, and even of repelling the charge of ignorance sustained by groundless assertions and imaginary bulls. It has at least served to illustrate the methods to which Rome has been driven by the infallibility dogma, to reform the record of the Popes, until the impression created in turn by each denial is, simply, that while the fact denied is beyond question, it would be a fatal error to admit it; and there is something startling in the anger awakened towards Lord Acton for his simple statement of the truth and his manly repudiation of the pious frauds.

The case of Adrian is found to have all the importance which Archbishop Purcell attributed to it, and although Father Newman is not an American, his active observation and quick intelligence can doubtless gather for him some idea of the feelings with which loyal Americans of whatever creed regard the treatment of the Irish by His Holiness Nicholas Breakspear.

It may be easier, perhaps, than we

imagine for Roman Priests with no ties of family, and who swear allegiance not to their country, native or adopted, but to the Bishops and Pope of Rome, and either to ridicule the bull of Adrian as a forgery, or to represent it as a proof of the paternal care of the Holy Father, that he charged Henry with the management of the Irish, enjoining him to improve their morals, to mend their manners and to collect from them Peter's pence.

Americans, however, with whom devotion to their own country is a matter of religion and of personal honor; who are personally taught to reverence their ancestors who resisted all attempts to destroy their political and religious freedom, and who have not forgotten the warning of Washington against the insidious dangers of foreign influence, can sympathize with that regard for country, and kindred, and national honor, and the memory of their dead heroes, of which Ireland has given us brilliant examples; and which, as Archbishop Purcell rightly feared, would make it hard for the Irish Roman Catholics to admit the infallibility of the Pope, to whom they owed a perpetual humiliation. But beyond our sympathy with the Irish in the papal surrender of their country to their powerful neighbors of Great Britain, the proceeding has for all true Americans of whatever faith a further interest, as exhibiting the character and methods of that paternal policy with which, as we are told, the Roman Court and the Society of Jesuits, turning from the worn countries of Europe, are preparing to embrace in their protection the American Republic.

The papal claims and ends, we are assured, are always immutable and the same; and to learn them we can open at random the history of the papacy. We may learn them from the infallible Boniface VIII. when he told Philip King of France that God had set him over Kings and countries, to tear down and destroy, spoil and scatter, build up and plant; and that the King and all persons owed perfect obedience to the Roman Pontiff, not merely in religious matters but likewise in secular and human affairs. We may learn them from the infallible Gregory when he declared it lawful for the Pope to depose Emperors and absolve subjects from their allegiance to unrighteous rulers, and when he deposed Henry IV. of Germany. We may learn it from Innocent III. when he absolved the subjects of King John and cursed the Magna Charter, and imposed rulers on the Armenians, Bohemians and Bulgarians. We may learn it from Paul III. when he deposed Henry VIII. and absolved his subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and commanded them under pain of excommunication not to obey him nor any officer under him. We may learn it from the sainted Pope Pius V. who excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, and who, as Lord Acton thinks, although Father Newman is of a different opinion, commissioned an assassin to take her life. (See Dr. Smith's Impending Conflict, 222–228, and Lord Acton's letters to the Times.)

Some persons may regard it hardly in accord with courtesy towards a Roman Catholic opponent in a friendly controversy on dividing questions, to dissect with merciless exactness his most confident pretences, and to expose by proofs furnished by Rome herself the groundlessness of the attempt "to reform" ecclesiastical history in the interest of papal infallibility:—that dogma which, but the other day, was denounced in Roman catechisms as a "Protestant invention;" while now we are to be damned unless we will admit that throughout ages it was accepted always, everywhere and by all. Besides the English catechism

already referred to, Overberg's German Katechismus III., Haupstuck F. 349, equally denied that faith in papal infallibility was an article of belief—"*Mussen wir auch glauben das der Papst unfehlbar ist? Nein: dies est Rein Glaubensartikel.*" But it is easy to see that the arguments presented by the advocates of Rome are simply the arguments of the Court, and not of the individual. We are reminded of the remark that the Jesuit must be in the hands of his superior, as a corpse in the hands of the surgeon. We recall the fact that a Reverend Father speaks not of his own volition, and by his own judgment; not in accord with his personal conviction with historic truth, with his sentiments of honor and the promptings of his conscience; that he does not collate and weigh historic evidence, and give you the result of his deliberations; but that he speaks, as it were, by order and by book. His facts, his assertions and his proofs, are all matters of regulation. At the conclusion of his letter, page 37, Father Newman says in a postscript, that "If I have not expressed myself in thorough accordance with the doctrines of the Catholic Church in this letter, I will be the very first to retract any error."

Father Newman will probably not be accused of violating the doctrines of his Church, even in the bold statement about Gregory's bulls, or Galileo's sentence, or Adrian's grant of unhappy Ireland to the English Crown, with a reservation of Peter's pence.

If he has treated history as a nose of wax to be pulled, and flattened, and distorted at pleasure; if he presented as evidence bulls that were myths, and has denounced as a forgery a bull so real that it determined for ages the destiny of the Irish people; if he contends that the Pope Honorius was infallible and innocent of heresy, in the face of the fact that for three centuries successive Popes pronounced on Honorious an "eternal anathema," and Leo II. "eternal damnation," it is simply because his Church had declared that all the Popes, however condemned, by council or by each other, in this world; however punished with eternal damnation for heresy in the next, are, nevertheless, to be now held equally infallible:—their quarrels and anathemas are to be denied as inconsistent with the truth as decreed by Rome, and the difficulties of history are to be discarded as interfering with the serenity of the Divine dogma.

The case of Honorious is one of peculiar interest, as having been thoroughly sifted by Bishops Hefels and Pere Gratry:—the tract of the former is said to have proved the case as conclusively as a mathematical demonstration; and extracts from the decrees in the original Latin are given in Dr. Schaff's History of the Vatican Council in the notes on page 98.

No candid person will pretend that the art of lying should be reckoned in any of our communities as among "the lost arts;" and our political parties might occasionally furnish an expert whose feats recall those of the Jesuits, for whose peculiar skill the languages of Europe had no expression until they adopted their name, and called it jesuitical.

But Rome, without having a monopoly of the art, may safely claim pre-eminence as the only institution in the world calling itself a Christian Church, which makes instruction in lying a part of education, systematizing and refining in methods of equivocation, as for instance in the Moral Theology of St. Alphonso de Liguori, until in place of the Scriptural rule, "let your yea be yea and your nay, nay," may be substituted in every walk and relation of life, a system of falsehood and deception, veiled with

pretence of sincerity and truth.

There would seem to be no truth, no oath, no promise, that may not be avoided by "amphibology," meaning equivocation or mental restriction.

Under this cover a woman may be refused the fulfillment of a promise to marry, however solemnly it was made. Anything under Heaven may be denied; a sworn witness may deceive the judge and the jury, and defeat the rights of suitors and the ends of justice; a wife may cajole her husband, and every man practice upon the credulity of his neighbor; and however odious and contemptible the scheme for sanctioning immorality and crime may be to honorable and truthful Roman Catholics, no Roman Father, however honorable and truthful may be his own instincts, dare address St. Alphonso with his immoral code, as Christ the devil, "Get thee behind me Satan," or warn his people that such doctrines are not only fatal to the rights of property, to the peace and security of society, and to confidence between man and man, but destructive to personal integrity and personal honor. When we examine the moral theology of Rome, as taught authoritatively by de Liguori, can we wonder at the remark of the member of the Austrian Parliament, who said that "it was the Popes who made the atheists."

Persons interested in the controversy opened by Father Newman, on the relation of Rome to the Bible and the Republic—and no controversy more momentous to the American people was ever opened by priest or layman—may with advantage, if they cannot conveniently refer to the work of Liguori, look at the extracts given from it in Mr. Merrick's volume, "The Moral Theology of the Church of Rome," with an introduction by Bishop A. Cleveland Coxe, published by Joseph Robinson, Baltimore. A single passage may be here given as a sample of the facile morality of the whole, and it certainly justifies Shakespeare's remark, "'tis as easy as lying." The saint in illustrating one of several modes, says: "Thus, if a man is asked about something which it is to his interest to conceal, he can answer, '*No, I say*'—that is, *I say the word No.* Caedmar doubts about this, but saving his better counsel, he seems to do so without reason, for the word I say really has two senses: it means to utter, make use of a word, and assent. We here employ it in the sense of utter."

It must not be supposed that the right to mislead a judge or jury is at all limited to the "no, I say." Thirty methods, equally ingenious and equally unscriptural, are supplied for trifling with the truth and giving false evidence under oath: one is by whispering a part of your evidence and giving the rest aloud; let the tongue swear without the mind, or swear what is false for a good cause; or reserve your right not to bind yourself by the oath; or, if you hold the oath as useless, you may disregard your oath and so if you hold it obsolete; or if the circumstances have changed and made it a trivial matter, or if you honestly think it best to disregard it, or if to keep it would injure the rights of a superior, or hurt your character, or do you a damage; or if you have received a dispensation on grounds of the good of the Church, and the consequent advantage of the State.

It is not difficult to understand why the Court of Rome, when teaching such unscriptural doctrines as a part of its moral theology, should dislike to see the open Bible in the hands of the people, a constant and divine witness against jesuitical apologies for lying and for theft. Nor would it be easy to imagine a piece of assurance more characteristic of Rome than that involved in the declaration that the Roman Catholic Church, while sanc-

tioning the doctrines of Liguori, denounces Bible societies "as a pestilence," "because the doctrine of private interpretation which they teach leads souls into heresy, infidelity and immorality."

This slur may well be remembered by all who may be inclined to yield to the demand that the Bible shall be banished from our schools. It gives point to the remark of Tayler Lewis, that "it was impossible to remove that book from the place it had so long held in education, without fixing a stigma upon it, as something in some way dangerous to liberty and the social good."

If any fear the Bible in education, it is feared by those who intend offence to liberty and the social good; who decry our popular institutions with their broad Christian character, free at once from sectarianism and intolerance.

The Bible is the most cherished by those who most value what is best and purest in our social life, and who stand by the great principles of American freedom. If there are any who wish to undo the work of Washington, to debase our people and prepare them for an easy subjugation to foreign influence, superstition and despotism, they will be found among those who demand with the arrogance of the old Inquisition, armed with torture and the stake, that we shall exclude from our schools the Holy Bible, which is the foundation of our political and religious rights, and of our moral, religious and intellectual advancement: "the noblest of the classics, the book of the ages, the word of God."

Father Newman has thrown much light upon the wide difference between the doctrines of Christianity and those of the Jesuits, by exhibiting their denials of historic truths which are indelibly recorded in the Roman annals; for this has naturally brought us to the root of the matter—the doctrine of falsehood as taught by Liguori and endorsed by Rome in elevating him to saintship in place of the duty of truth as taught by Christ. The question is of supreme importance in connection with the school question. It not only helps to explain the repugnance of the Court of Rome to the Bible in our schools, but it presents the issue whether it is consistent with good morals and the public safety to allow the papal doctrine to be introduced in our schools, and to let our boys and girls be taught to practice in social life and in our courts of justice the doctrines of Liguori.

The Catholic World for April, 1871, spoke of the education they required to fit their children "to gain the end for which God created them;" and the sort of education which the Court of Rome adopts to fit them to support the papacy may be seen in the all but incredible depths of ignorance prevailing in the Roman States.

An extract given by Dr. I. I. Smith, page 33, from the report of Prof. Mateucci, Secretary of State for Public Instruction in 1861, gave these significant statistics of the "sort of education" which the Papal Court provides at home for its own people:

"In Lombard and Piedmont (always and in everything the most advanced province of Italy) little more than three persons in one hundred were able to read and write; a few more could spell; but making all allowance possible, ninety persons out of one hundred did not even know their letters nor the arithmetical figures. In central Italy, that is, in the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, the Duchies of Parma, Modena, Lucca, and in the ———, it was much worse; yet they were well off in comparison with Southern Italy, *beginning with Rome down to Sicily; for here not one in one hundred had received any mental training.*"

Compare that system of education with

our own, and it is at once seen why the agents of the papacy charged with the establishment of the papal supremacy in our Republic, feel that their first step must be to place our common schools under the direction of the Roman Court.

"This sort of education," says the Catholic World, "can be given only by the (Roman) Church, or under her direction, and as there is for us (Roman) Catholics, only one Church, there is and can be no proper education for us not given by or under the direction and control of the Roman Catholic Church. * * If they (the American people) leave education to the States separately, (Roman) Catholics in several of them are already a powerful minority, and will soon be strong enough to *force* the State Legislature to give them their proportion of the public schools, supported at the public expense.

The language is plain and bold, and this threat from "the foreign colony," that they will presently be strong enough to force the State Legislatures, is in perfect accord with the fearful boast put into the mouth of Pius IX., by Archbishop Manning, the awful impiety of which makes one who believes in the Bible tremble as one reads the daring words: "I claim to be the Supreme Judge and director of the consciences of men, of the peasant that tills the field * and the *legislatures that make laws for kingdoms;* I am the sole, Supreme Judge, of what is right and wrong."

In regard to our schools, the Jesuit game is now fully exposed; all can see that if American people could be induced to consent to the abandonment of schools to Jesuit control, and the teachings of Jesuit morality, the rising generation would be instructed that they are subjects of the Sovereign Pontiff, and owe obedience to his decrees.

In considering the threat, so often repeated, that Rome *will force* our State Legislatures to abandon their non-sectarian policy and to appropriate a part of the public moneys to the support of Roman Catholic schools, it must be remembered that the Court of Rome not only repudiates the American doctrine that the Church should be separated from the State (Papal syllabus 55), but holds that the Roman Catholic religion should be the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship; and further that the Church may avail herself of *force* * * or of any direct or indirect temporal power.

As to the claims of the Popes of Rome to control our State Legislatures, we have already heard from Archbishop Manning, now a Prince Cardinal, "that His Holiness is the Supreme Judge and director of the consciences, * * and of the legislatures that make laws for kingdoms," a passage by the way which should all be carefully considered, as showing that when we are told that when an American law offends the conscience of a Roman Catholic, it means simply that is opposed to the policy of the Pope of Rome.

We ought not perhaps to feel any surprise at the threat to force the legislatures, after the assurance that the Court of Rome proposes to manage our domestic concerns, and to allow no freedom either of worship or of education.

Its modes of attack have exhibited something of the skill, and all of the audacity which have caused the expulsion of the Jesuits from almost every country in Europe, and against which our country has at last to defend herself. The Catholic Telegraph (quoted in the Christian World, Jan. 1870, p. 17,) said: "The public school system is a social cancer presaging the death of national morality. The sooner it is destroyed the better. It

will be a glorious day for Catholics (meaning Romanists) in this country, when, under the blows of justice and morality, our school system, will be shivered to pieces. Until then, modern paganism will triumph."

The term modern paganism, seems here to mean the Christian civilization of the republic, based on education and the Bible. The Tablet, quoted on the same page, develops the further intention of the Court of Rome, after driving the Bible from our common schools so that they can be denounced as "Godless" and "Atheistic," to claim the management not only of schools specially supported by Roman Catholics, but of all schools in the Republic, on the ground that education is the province of the Church, and that the State has no right to educate its youth. This point is put with exceeding boldness, in defiance of the Constitution and laws of the Republic and the States, and of the traditions and feelings of the people; and it deserves attention, especially on the part of those who have been inclined to yield so far as to dismiss the Bible, thinking that with this concession they would be satisfied. Mr. Horace Greeley, with a wiser judgment and a longer sight, said: "The great body of those who seek to drive the Bible out of our schools, will not be satisfied after they have driven it out, but will insist on breaking up our common school system into sectarian fragments, * * * hence if we give up the Bible we only weaken our common school system * * * while we fail to conciliate its enemies, but only excite them to new and inadmissible exactions." Now listen to the Roman Catholic Tablet: "Education itself is the business of the spiritual society alone, and not of secular society; the instruction of children and youth is included in the sacrament of orders, and the State usurps the functions of education when it turns educator; * * the organization of the schools, their entire internal selection and management, the choice and regulation of studies, and the selection, appointment and dismissal of teachers belong exclusively to the spiritual authority."

Upon this point the issue is clearly made between Rome and the Republic. The foreign colony denies to our several States or to Congress, the right to establish schools, unless they are under the control and government of the Pope and his Episcopal and priestly agents, whom the Court of Rome wishes to emancipate entirely from the jurisdiction of the civil authority. Our doctrine as stated by the learned and venerable Dr. Woolsey is, "that the State, as guardian of rights and for public reasons, may compel parents to send their children to school." It is reported that Roman priests have threatened to withhold absolution from parents who permitted their children to attend schools established by the State, and that the propriety of this course has been approved by one or more Roman Catholic organs.

Father Newman, in reply to my letter, says: "Let him point out if he can, a single actual dogma of the Church which is dangerous to the State." Why ask for a single dogma, when it is so easy to designate so many dogmas in the domain of faith and morals, which the syllabus pronounces it error to deny, and which have been enunciated by the infallible authority of different Popes!

There are dogmas against the liberty of the press, the liberty of conscience and of worship, and the liberty of speech: dogmas which deny to the State the right to determine the civil rights (jura) and province of the Church; that which affirms that the pontiffs have "never usurped the limits of their power," as, for instance, in deposing rulers; in absolving subjects from their alle-

giance; in assailing by force the rights of States, of peoples, and of persons: and that the Church may employ force and temporal power. These are the dogmas that in conflict of laws, civil and ecclesiastical, the ecclesiastical should prevail; that marriage not sacramentally contracted, has no binding force, a dogma which if Rome were to control the Republic, would shake the foundations of American society, disturbing the legitimacy of families, destroying the force of all marriages except those blessed by Roman priests, reducing wives to concubines, and children to bastards. Has Father Newman forgotten these dogmas, or that which indicates that the (Roman) Catholic religion should be held the only religion of the State, striking at the equal religious toleration that exists under our National and State constitutions! The dogma that concerns us at this moment is that which strikes at the sovereign right of the State to direct the education of its children and youth.

How the American people regard that assault upon the common school system may be seen in the fact that when, in December, 1875, Mr. Blaine introduced in the House of Representatives a constitutional amendment prohibiting the States from placing moneys raised for the support of the public schools under the control of any religious sect, it was adopted by a vote of 166 to 5. It was lost in the Senate after an amendment, and the Democratic party at St. Louis, June 28, 1876, declared themselves resolved to maintain the public schools "without partiality or preference for any class, sect or creed, *and without contribution from the Treasury for any one of them.*"

It seems clear, however, that the Roman Catholic Hierarchy have not renounced their hope of obtaining in some manner, by political management, the control of the common schools.

Their threat to *force* our Legislature to maintain Roman Catholic education justifies us in asking what is the principle and object of education by the State in America, and how far is the Roman system, which is to be forced upon our legislatures, in accord with that principle and fitted to accomplish that object.

Dr. Wayland says: "If men choose a Republican form of government, in which the people are acknowledged to be the fountain of all power, they come under the obligations to educate their children intellectually and morally; for without intellectual and moral education such a government cannot exist."

Here we have in brief, as regards their relation to the State, the *raison d' etre* of our common schools—the reason for their existence in the character of our government and the necessity for its preservation that the people should be educated.

It is unnecessary even to recall the outlines of our common school system which has been for years expanding and improving under the careful scrutiny and loving care and the generous appropriations of the State. Our thoughtful citizens, we may say, of all creeds, for they include the most enlightened Roman Catholics, are agreed that our common schools, based now as anciently upon the divine morality of the Bible, with no sectarianism nor intolerance, and fitted to prepare our children to take their place in the van of modern civilization.

Let us see with what sort of education Rome would supply us if we were to abolish, at her bidding, our common schools. On this point we will not quote the opinions of the opponents of that Church and its peculiar dogmas. It will be more fair to quote the opinion of an intelligent and devoted Romanist familiar with the Roman Catholic institutions of this country, and who would be careful to do them no injustice. Dr. Newman expressed his

surprise that Dr. Bronson should be quoted by any advocate of the common schools, in view of his criticism on the system as wanting a religious character; but the fact that Dr. Bronson had no pre-possession in favor of Protestant schools gives the greater force to his views on the character and inefficiency for American life of Roman Catholic education.

The following passage, with italics as here given, is taken from Dr. Smith's "Impending Conflict," p. 63, as quoted from Bronson's Review for Jan., 1862, and its statements are so clear and impressive as to forbid their interruption by passing comments. Dr. Bronson said: "They (Roman Catholic schools) *practically fail to recognize human progress*; and thus to recognize the continuance and successive evolution of the idea in the life of humanity. * * * They *do not educate their pupils to be at home*, and at their ease in their own age and country, *or train them to be living, thinking and energetic men, prepared for the work which actually awaits them, either in Church or State.*" As far as we are able to trace the effect of the most approved (Roman) Catholic education of our day, whether at home or abroad, it tends to *repress* rather than quicken the life of the pupil, to *unfit* rather than prepare him for the active and zealous discharge either of his religious or social duties. They who are educated in *our schools seem misplaced and mistimed in the world, as if born and educated for a world that has ceased to exist.* * * * Comparatively *few* of them (Roman Catholic graduates) take their stand as *scholars* or as men on a level with the Catholics of non-Catholic colleges, and those who do take that stand do it *by throwing aside nearly all they learned from their Alma Mater*, and adopting the ideas and principles, the modes of thought and action, they find in the general civilization of the country in which they live. * * * The cause of the failure of what we call Catholic education is in our judgment in the fact that we educate not *for the present* or the future, but for the *past.* * * * We do not mean that the dogmas are not scrupulously taught in all our schools and colleges, and that the words of the catechism are not duly insisted upon. We concede this, and that gives to our so-called Catholic schools a merit which no others have or can have. It is now behind the times, and *unfits* rather than prepares the student for taking an active part in the work of his own day and generation. There can be no question that what passes for Catholic education *in this or any other country*, has its ideal of perfection in the *past*, and that it resists as un-Catholic, irreligious and opposed to God, the tendencies of modern civilization. * * * The work it gives its subjects or prepares them to perform is not the work of carrying it forward, but that of *resisting it, driving it back*, anathematizing it as at war with the Gospel, and either of neglecting it altogether and taking refuge in the cloister in an exclusive or exaggerated asceticism, always bordering on immorality, or of restoring a former order of civilization, no longer a living order, and which humanity has evidently left behind, and is resolved shall never be restored."

It would be difficult to add to the force of the significant truths so plainly stated by the great American champion of the papacy. He saw the terrible disadvantages to which those children were subjected who were taught in Roman Catholic schools, educated for a past world that no longer exists, unfitted to hold their own as scholars or as men, and fitted not to advance the progress of American civilization, but only to resist and re-

tard it. Forwarned that the Sovereign Pontiff or his foreign colony in this country intends to force the State Legislatures to appropriate moneys from the State treasuries to support Roman Catholic schools, the whole country should understand the character and aims of Roman Catholic education, even when surrounded by the Christian light and civilization of the Republic; and every citizen of whatever faith should appreciate the wrong and injury done to every American child, allowing him, under the pretence of education, to be unfitted for an honorable and successful career as an American citizen, and fitted only for an extinct civilization which humanity has resolved shall never be restored. Into whatever errors Dr. Bronson may have fallen, the youth of succeeding generations may honor and bless his memory for that stern protest as a Roman Catholic against a system of education which handicaps the boys subjected to it in the race of life with exploded dogmas of antiquated ignorance which makes them foreigners in their own land, strangers to American ideas, enemies to American progress, and helpless as scholars or as men, until they throw aside as worthless nearly all they had learned from their institution, misnamed their Alma Mater. The difference is great between the education that befits an American citizen with the rights, duties and dignities of an American sovereign, bound to enlarge the power, the resources and the Christian influences of the Republic, and an education based on the imperfect civilization of the dark ages, which is intended to fit the boy to become the unquestioning and unresisting subject of the Pope of Rome, bound to assist by his vote in overthrowing the liberties of his country, and establishing his supremacy upon the ruins of Republican government, and of political and religious freedom.

The "threat" to force our Legislatures to support Roman Catholic schools imposes upon those bodies the duty of enquiring how far the rules and practices taught by Rome accord with American ideas of morals and manners, as essential to the public welfare.

Apart from the teachings of Rome that justify both lying and theft, false evidence and the breaking of oaths, as illustrated by St. Liguori, whose authority Father Newman will not deny, there is one matter connected with the education of girls, to the dangers of which attention has been gravely called by an eminent Roman Catholic prelate—the late ArchbishopKenrick of Baltimore—in a warning which neither the people nor the Legislature, as the protector of the public morals, can afford to overlook.

"It has always been," says the Tablet, (Nov. 13, 1869,) "a cardinal doctrine of the Catholic Church to incorporate religious instruction with their daily teachings in its schools." And this fact brings before us, as a part of Roman Catholic education, the practice of confession in its relation to the manners and morals of the scholars.

The learned Archbishop, who was twelve years the head of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, thus spoke in his work on Moral Theology, as translated by the Rev. Dr. Edward Beecher, and quoted by Barnum's "Romanism as it is," p. 514:

"We scarcely dare to speak concerning that atrocious crime in which the office of hearing confession is perverted to the ruin of souls by impious men under the influence of their lusts. Would that we could regard it as solely a conception of the mind and as something invented by the enemies of the faith for the purposes of slander. But it is not fit that we should be ignorant of the decrees which the pontiffs have issued to defend the sacredness of this sacrament."

The Archbishop specified nineteen different cases or ways of solicitation by priests in connection with the practice of confession; and such statements by the head of the Catholic Church in America may properly suggest to the Legislature the enquiry, how far confession is practiced in American schools, and how far they are bound to shield American girls from being demoralized, insulted and outraged under cover of the sacrament of confession.

The solemn words of the Archbishop, declaring that this is not "a conception of the mind," nor a "something invented by the enemies of the faith for the purposes of slander," are confirmed by the testimony of other learned writers, and are explained by the character of the questioning to which the female penitents are subjected.

The Rev. Mr. Hart in his "Ecclesiastical Records," Cambridge, 1850, p. 321, remarks: "The many enactments against *Soliciton* (a priest who made the confessional an instrument of seduction), shows the extent of the evil and the inadequacy of the remedy."

Of the questions asked of the penitent little is popularly known in this country, for the reason that their publications here would be, as it has been adjudged in England, illegal under the laws forbidding indecent publications; but the Rev. Mr. Hart gives some idea of their character when he remarks of the manual intended to be placed in the hands of young women before confession, "that it details abominations which it might never have entered into the hearts to conceive," and that "it is not too much to say that by reading a work of this description the mind of a yonng person would be more polluted in half an hour than by all the licentious publications ever issued from the press."

Such instruction could hardly have been framed in this age, even by the courts, whose ancient scandals were perpetuated by Cardinal Antonelli, whose amusements did not interrupt his close relations with the Sovereign Pontiff. They date from those corrupt ages before the Reformation, when no public opinion, enlightened by the Bible, restrained the immorality of the Roman Court when, in the words of Maccauley, the Court was "a scandal to the Christian name; its annals are black with treason, murder and incest; even its most respectable members were utterly unfit to be ministers of religion." Bishop Hopkins, whose learning and conscientiousness constituted him a reliable witness, testified in a passage which has been already quoted, to "the awful immorality, the licentiousness and the degradation of the Roman priesthood" during those dark ages; and doubtless many Roman Catholic priests of our purer age and country share with the venerable Archbishop of Baltimore his horror at the crime which impious men, professing to celebrate a sacrament, perpetrate upon the penitents who looked to them as to God for the forgiveness of their sins.

It is seldom that public attention has been called to the actual dangers of the confessional as presented in the work of the Archbishop by those whose authority is admitted by the Church of Rome. There has been a natural hesitancy to accept without reserve the charges constantly made against her moral theology by priests who have seceded from that communion, and who, as in the case of Father Chiniquy, allege the crime alluded to by Archbishop Kenrick as one of the chief motives for their departure. Despite the character and services of Father Chiniquy, which are said to have won for him great applause and the special notice of his late Holiness, the penance narrative given in his book

("The Priest, the Woman and the Confessional:" Montreal—F. E. Grafton, 1875,) might perhaps be questioned by those who denounce him as an apostate; but the same objection does not hold to his extracts from the Roman Fathers, where any incorrectness in the quotation can be shown; and, according to Father Chiniquy, the Church authorities show the same uneasiness and apprehension shown by Archbishop Kenrick in regard to the behavior of priests at the confessional, by asking each in turn whether they had asked questions on sins against the Sixth Commandment (the seventh of the Decalogue), with the intention of gratifying their evil passions; whether they had not availed themselves of what they heard in the confessional to induce the penitents to commit sin, and whether they had not, during or after confessional, done or said anything "*cum int ntione diabolica has personas seducendi.*"

The Rev. Hobart Seymour in his work on "the Confessional"—London, 1870—shows one reason, perhaps the chief one, why what is called the moral theology of Rome is so little known to the Roman Catholic laity in England and America, is that in England the publication of extracts translated from the Latin to the English is illegal under the laws which prohibit indecent publications."

From this it would appear that the questions put to the female penitents in the privacy of the confessional, which are sometimes put with improper motives and lead to criminal results, are of such a nature that the law would punish their publication as inconsistent with the public morals, and with good manners. The question how the maidenly and womanly modesty of the penitents would permit questions so indecent, is answered by the quotation by Mr. Seymour from Bailly on the Decalogue, of an instruction of which he gives (p. 186–7) both the Latin and a translation referring to "the very great modesty with which a penitent may be suffused at the confession of certain sins," denouncing it as "a motive so vain," and enjoining that "this modesty must be overcome."

Archbishop Kenrick has taught us the fearful extent and the various manners in which that instruction has been obeyed; but even if there were no such proof of resulting crimes, the denunciation of modesty as a vain motive, and the instruction that it must be overcome, shows the abyss that divides the estimate of womanly modesty by the Roman Courts and that entertained by the Christian people of America who see in the modesty of their wives and daughters the purest guarantee for the virtue and happiness of their country.

Whatever dogmas may be introduced to show that every State is subject to the Roman Church; that no State has a right to educate its people; that the clergy of Rome owe neither allegiance nor obedience to the authorities of the State, and are subject only to Canon law, and that the Church has a right to use force and compel the Legislatures to its will, the question, how far the Legislatures should permit the practice of confession in our schools supported or assisted by the State, is one of peculiar importance, and which should have the fairest investigation, in view of the light thrown upon the character and results of the practice by some of the Fathers and dignitaries of the Church; and of the allegation that however respectable the priest, the instructions of the Roman Court leaves them no discretion, but require them to ask abominable and demoralizing questions, and to overcome by tact and persistence the modesty of the penitent. Every conscientious and enlightened Roman Catholic American should wish the

condemnation of the crimes denounced by the Archbishop to continue; and the worthiest members of that communion in our country will rejoice at the restriction of the dangers and crimes of the confessional, if they are indeed such as Archbishop Kenrick represented and deposed.

I beg to apologize to Father Newman for thus abruptly closing my reply to his learned and elaborate letter without time on the eve of my departure for Europe for even a passing glance at various propositions which deserve a complete reply.

One is his suggestion that the papal recognition of Mr. Davis as President of the Southern Confederacy, and the cordial reception of the Envoys by the Sovereign Pontiff, was a mere matter of courtesy, and had no significance as regards the American people and the American government.

History will attribute the course pursued by Pius IX., followed as it was by an influence so injurious to the National cause, to something more than a habit of courtesy.

I have also to apologize to the readers for errors of the press which I have been quite unable to prevent, and to say that if in any case my language may have seemed discourteous to Father Newman, it has been entirely without intention.

Differing widely as we do, and perhaps no greater difference can be found than between an American who believes in his country and her institutions as founded on the Bible, and a representative of Rome who comes to America with the intention of advancing the supremacy of the Pope and the doctrine of the syllabus, there is a regard due to kindliness among neighbors and to fairness of statement and courtesy in argument; and when these exist, however blended with determined convictions, I am inclined to believe that good is to be accomplished by a frank exchange of opinion. even if it be so frank that the parties and the world beyond learn the point at which, in the light of the past, the present and the future, further concession is impossible.

The most enlightened of our Roman Catholic citizens, with whom we lived in harmony from the Revolution to the Rebellion, should be able to see this as clearly as ourselves, and they can assure more recent comers of the readiness of the American people to give to the Roman faith the same tolerance which it gives to others, and of the unwisdom of an attempt by foreign agents to force our Legislatures into giving to the Pope the control of American education. They can assure the Court of Rome that they themselves are not ready as voters to submit themselves to the dictation of the Roman Pontiff, and that the best and safest rule for that Court will be to observe the principle which Americans think a good one for all foreign powers and peoples—"Hands off in American politics."

I am, Sir, faithfully yours,

JOHN JAY.

THE BIBLE AND THE REPUBLIC.

ADDRESS OF MR. JOHN JAY, PRESIDENT, AT THE SIXTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WESTCHESTER COUNTY BIBLE SOCIETY, HELD AT PURDY'S STATION, OCTOBER 8, 1878.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY :—Among the resolutions of the Board of Managers which have been laid before you, was one based upon the report of a special committee appointed to devise a plan for the supplying, during the coming year, every destitute family in Westchester county with a Bible, and every reading person with a Testament.

Some years have passed since the entire county was canvassed and supplied with the Bible. With the changes brought by time, many families are now likely to be without it; and the cheapness with which the American Bible Society supplies the Testament—the price of a pocket edition being only five cents—has induced our managers to add to their next distribution this important feature. They propose not only that each family shall have a Bible, but that each individual shall have a Testament in his own tongue, be it English, French or German, Italian, Dutch or Danish, Spanish or Portuguese, Russian, Polish, Hungarian, Bohemian, or other of the seventy languages and dialects in which the National Society in this its 63d year is circulating the Scriptures.

In such work, whether for a town, a county, a State, or what we should labor to accomplish at the earliest possible period, for this whole nation, we have a right to anticipate, as suggested by the managers, the earnest and cordial co-operation of the clergy and laity of all Christian denominations that rest their faith upon the Bible.

Its distribution, without note or comment, presents, as has been happily said, a common ground of co-operation and a centre of union, without a sacrifice of principles or the surrender of the smallest atom of the respective opinions and practices by which we are distinguished.

I beg leave, as a layman, to suggest further that all persons who value pure morals, sound education, good government and national honor, whatever their creed or however broad, independent or eccentric their belief, can consistently join in this work as one that will contribute to the welfare and safety of the republic.

It is, of course, one thing to give a man a Testament, or to induce him to buy it, and another to secure its perusal. But if there be a chance that, having the Testament, he will not read it, it is certain that he will not read it unless he has it; and we may safely trust that in the vast majority of cases a day will come when, from a desire to know what the book contains, or some good impulse in doubt, or in sorrow to seek therein for light or consolation, the volume will be opened even by the most careless and indifferent. Then the reader, whether young or old, rich or poor, in happiness or in sorrow, will learn to know something of the noblest book that has come down through the ages; the book best fitted to enlighten the understanding and purify the heart. What that book has done for civilization we know from history, we know from our own annals.

"The Bible," said Sir William Jones,

who was familiar with Greek, Roman and Oriental literature—"the Bible, independently of its divine origin, contains more sublimity, purer morality, more impartial history, and finer strains of eloquence, than can be collected from any other book in whatever language it may have been written."

"Wherever the Scriptures are generally read," says Robert Hall, "the standard of morals is raised, the public mind is expanded, a spirit of enquiry excited, and the sphere of intellectual vision inconceivably enlarged."

The indebtedness of this country to the Bible, and its recognition by our government in other days, are things not to be forgotten; and it is well to keep prominently before our people this distinguishing feature of our history. The great body of the original settlers on our newly discovered continent were men whose ancestors had fought for civil and religious freedom on the various battle-fields of the Old World.

They represented the clearest heads and the stoutest hearts that had defied political and papal prosecution.

They brought the noblest blood of all parts of Europe, and in whatever they differed they were alike in this, they brought the Bible.

When, in the last century, an unwise king and a convenient ministry deemed it expedient to raise a revenue in America, the far-sighted statesmen of England, who warned them against the consequences of their folly, recalled the origin of the American colonists and the character and deeds of their heroic ancestors.

Lord Chatham referred to the revolting Americans as a brave, generous and united people, with arms in their hands and courage in their hearts; and he reminded England that they were "the genuine descendants of a valiant and pious ancestry, driven to those deserts by the narrow maxims of a superstitious tyranny."

Burke, in that magnificent effort of his unrivalled genius, the speech on "Conciliation with America," said, "Religion, always a principle of energy in this new people, is no way worn out or impaired: and their mode of expressing it is also one cause of this free spirit.

"The people are Protestant and of that kind which is most adverse to all implicit submission of mind and opinion."

Look next at the action and utterances of our early Congress, whose wisdom commanded the admiration of Europe, and mark in them the influence of the Bible. We are told that a week before Congress was driven from Philadelphia an order was passed for the importation of 20,000 Bibles at the public expense.

On the capture of Burgoyne, Congress ordered a public thanksgiving, and exhorted the people "to consecrate themselves to the service of the Divine Benefactor and to offer their humble supplications that it might please God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, to forgive their sins and prosper the means of religion, for the promotion and enlargement of that kingdom which consists in righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

In 1778, Congress, addressing the people on the cruelties practiced by the enemy, remarked, "notwithstanding the great provocation, we have treated such as fell into our hands with tenderness, and studiously endeavored to alleviate the afflictions of their captivity. This conduct we have pursued so far as to be by them stigmatized with cowardice, and by our friends as folly. But our dependence was not upon man, it was upon Him who hath commanded us to love our enemies and to render good for evil. Do not believe that you have been or can be good merely by your own strength. No;

it is by the assistance of Heaven; and this you must assiduously cultivate by acts which Heaven approves."

And what was the impression made in Europe by this Bible policy of non-retaliation of cruelties in time of war? Listen again to the great Earl of Chatham.

"Those men," he said to the Peers of England, "whom you called cowards, poltroons, runaways and knaves, are become victorious over our veteran troops; and in the midst of victory and the flush of conquest have set ministers an example of moderation and magnanimity well worthy of imitation."

That a change has come over our politics since those days, and that the teachings of the Bible are less conspicuous in our legislative debates, our diplomatic papers, our governmental policy, is a fact that we all feel and know. No successor of Chatham or Burke now holds us up for the admiration of Europe, ranking us above the master states of the world, and declaring that for solidity of reasoning, force of sagacity and wisdom of conclusion, no nation or body of men can stand in preference to the congress at Washington.

Despite the efforts of our Bible societies, considerable as they have been, various causes have combined during the last half century to limit the influence of that bood in forming the character of the American people.

The rapid increase of foreign emigration added new elements to our population. The Romish church, claiming full power over the whole world, both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs, and declaring herself immutable and infallible, has maintained her olden opposition to the reading of the scriptures, although her hostility is exercised with more of caution than she was wont to use when she burnt the Protestants with the Bible hanging about their necks, or when she celebrated with Te Deums the Massacre of the Huguenots on St. Bartholomew's Eve, and perpetuated those scenes in the frescoes of the Vatican, as permanent mementoes from century to century of the unrelenting policy of Rome when she has the power to enforce her dogmas. In England, during the papal rebellion, her representatives demanded "that the people should be forbidden to read the Bible." In our Republic they have demanded with partial success that the Bible should not be read in our public schools; and to-day Rome opposes the circulation of the Bible, and holds that the Holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, produce more harm than good.

In its effort to suppress the Bible in America, the Romish church has been seconded by the Infidels and Atheists in our midst, hailing from all lands; and to the skeptical schools of England, France and Germany, and the parts of Europe where Romish superstition and immorality have landed the people in almost hopeless unbelief, has recently been added the Atheism of modern science which seeks from the noblest works of God to deduce His non-existence. The authors of the new school rejecting the immorality of the soul, broach with seeming pride the theory that they are purely animal in their origin, and that they have been evolved from the lowest grades of the brute creation.

Many seem to have adopted Atheistic views when presented in the name of science from the professor's chair, who would have shuddered at the thought of joining the disreputable disciples of Tom Paine; and when we remember that Grotius began with doubts, and Sir Isaac Newton as an infidel, we may well regard with gentlest charity those who have been led to doubt, and hasten to put into their hands the volume inspired by that

God whom they will soon see and know.

With the neglect of the Bible and the progress of atheism there has come a difference in the national tone which presents a noticeable contrast to the characteristics of the early settlers and of their sagacious descendants the founders of the Republic.

Atheism has been well said to be the plague of society, the corruption of manners, and the undermining of property; and the last point is especially noticeable in a country where good government depends upon the people, and where there is no standing army for the maintenance of law and order.

Whether or not it was wise in the generation which succeeded that of the revolution to abolish the checks and guards with which the fathers of the Republic had surrounded the exercise of the ballot, universal suffrage as it exists is likely to continue.

There is a tradition that Mr. Martin Van Buren, when at first opposing its concession, said that it was a right which, once conceded, could never be recovered except at the point of the sword.

Men who believe this have said: education will save us; the common school will make us not only an intelligent but a virtuous people. But now the Bible has been partly driven from the common school, and thoughtful men begin to talk like Dr. Francis Parkman with a sadness akin to despair of "the failure of universal suffrage."

They say that it tends to banish from our politics, culture, character and ability, and to substitute the votes of men who, beside their intellectual deficiencies, are wanting in a proper sense of moral and political duty.

They complain that a class of voters become the easy tools of priests and demagogues, or both; that under their rule the scheme of republican government, which was intended to secure wise and righteous laws and an economical administration, has been ingeniously perverted to the purposes of personal ambition and official plunder. That misgovernment and fraud, disturbing trade and industry, oppress the poor, encourage discontent, and threaten the foundations of social order. That, while stimulating the principles of the commune, our perverted system, with its maxim "to the victor belong the spoils," supplies the machinery for accomplishing its purpose under the forms of law, and of confiscating at leisure the property of citizens, not only without danger to the perpetrators of arrest and punishment, but with a right to command courts and constables, and all the paraphernalia of thelaw, to execute the scheme by which the astute managers enrich themselves at the expense of their neighbors.

The extent to which this is done is shown in the city of New York, whose municipal misgovernment and gigantic frauds, oppressing alike the rich and the poor, have stimulated corruption throughout the country; and we are reminded of the open boast made a few years since by a papal paper published at Rome, that the court of Rome already controlled the populous city of New York, and would soon control the whole of the great Republic.

Now, in looking for a remedy for the evils and dangers of our country, whether political or social, and however stimulated by Romanism or Atheism, and in seeking how to elevate the public tone, to raise the people to a higher level, to purify the national atmosphere, to restore to our institutions something of their primitive virtue, as the guardians of private rights and the national honor, we must recollect that the governing power rests with the masses, and that there are tens and hundreds of thousands

of these ruling sovereigns, millions indeed of men, women and children to whom christian churches are unknown, and who are in large measure beyond their influence.

"The evil," says a recent writer, "is not to be cured by reading, writing and arithmetic. The public school may cram the brain with all it is capable of containing, and he will be no whit the better citizen for the process;" and the writer justly adds, "the thing needed is to lay the foundation of a sound morality."

Wellington, who had a wide experience of men, is quoted as having said, "educate men without religion and you make them but clever devils."

If we look at the question simply in the light of public morality, where are we to find so sound a code of morality, so powerful an appeal to the deepest feelings of the heart, as in the Bible?

Take the opinions of the greatest statesmen and philosophers of modern times, and they agree in their estimate of the Bible in its elevating influence upon the character of a nation.

"There never was found," said Bacon, "in any age of the world, either religion or law, that did so highly exalt the public good as the Bible."

"In morality, said John Locke, "there are books enough written, both by ancient and modern philosophers, but the morality of the Gospel doth so exceed them all that, to give a man a full knowledge of morality, I shall send him to no other book but the New Testament."

Milton said, "there are no politics like those which the Scriptures teach"; and coming nearer to our own day and our own country, Dr. Franklin said: "a Bible and a newspaper in every house, a good school in every district, all studied and appreciated as they merit, are the principle support of virtue, morality and civil liberty."

This testimony from Franklin, placing the Bible in every house, before the newspaper and before the school, as the chief support of morality and liberty, is the more significant as the opinion of a singularly prudent philosopher, looking simply at the facts by the light of experience, with apparently no personal convictions nor ancestral ties binding him to the Christian faith, although he is said to have remarked on his death-bed, "that it was safest to believe."

Whether the evils that disturb our peace and engender our institutions come chiefly from those who deny that there is above an Almighty Creator and governor of the world, or from those who believe that the Vicegent of God rules at Rome with plenary powers, spiritual and civil, over all peoples and all governments, the reality of those evils is beyond question: and there should be no doubt that the reading of the Testament by the millions of our people, great and small, would purify the intellectual and moral atmosphere of the land.

Centuries before the Christian Era, Plato, the wisest of philosophers, said: "To act justly and wisely you must act according to the will of God." It is God's revealed will which we distribute, teaching that code of morals and religion, which the greatest statesmen of England and America have declared the foundation of society, which connects man with his Maker and holds him to His throne.

As for the result of our good works we need not fear, when we remember the words of Isaiah:

"For as the rain cometh down and the snow from Heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and make it to bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goes forth out of my mouth: It shall not return to me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I send it."

3081868