

arms of France. Fit associations, Freemasonry, and Jacobinism, they went hand in hand through Europe, leaving behind them, a physical and moral desolation, destructive as well of the souls as the bodies of men.

It is no less certain, that to Freemasonry are in a great degree owing the disorders which ravage at this moment unhappy South-America.

But, setting entirely out of view the stringent and unequivocal decrees of the Church, it does not require much ability to understand that any institution—whether its members choose to call themselves "Freemasons," or "Ancient Druids," or "Odd Fellows," as in Europe and America, or, with those brotherhoods in Asia, precisely the same in principle though differing somewhat in practice, they prefer the appellation of the "Sect of the Assassins," as in Arabia, or the "Society of Thugs," as in India,—it does not, we repeat, need much ability to understand that any such institution, bound to secrecy by oaths and bonds of the most inviolable obligation, where the holiest names are desecrated for the worst purpose, cannot be wholesome or useful in any well-regulated state. We in this country know too well that it is to have in our midst an association whose fearful power over its members forces them by a strange infatuation to the commission of every crime, not stopping short of perjury, nor even of murder. Without this dearly-bought experience, it is as clear as the light, that any institution which is a vicious government within a government; which possesses a dark and all-controlling power over the hands and hearts of its members; which besets the path of every man who may dare to denounce its iniquities or disobey its mandates, with a thousand invisible, because unsuspected, foes; which may at any time be used by an ambitious leader to control the majority and sway the state; which sets up for its members a code of morality that only does not recognize, but very frequently destroys, the eternal distinctions between right and wrong; and which is able when it chooses to set at defiance all law both human and divine; cannot be an institution deserving of the support of good men or loyal citizens.

Clearly, the thing will not bear an argument. It is too plain for it. Secret societies are in their principle opposed to all good government, Spiritual and Temporal.—They are an abomination in the sight of the Church, and shut out from her communion; and no matter under what trumpery of titles or tricks of pass-words, or any other of the jugglery in which iniquity shrouds itself, they may prefer to exist, no Catholic can enter them, much less remain in them. Designing and interested persons may quibble and split hairs as they please, but to every man who desires to see the law upheld, justice maintained, and society preserved in a healthy existence, it should be enough to know that none of these great ends can be effected in the face of any predominant secret organization; and, setting this out of sight, it will be sufficient for the Catholic to learn what is the clear and solemn decision of his Church, viz., "First, That no person shall enter

Secret Societies (such as that of the Freemasons) or propagate, cherish, receive, conceal, or be enrolled in them, or to join or be present at their meetings, UNDER PAIN OF EXCOMMUNICATION, *ipso facto*, and to be incurred without any further promulgation, from which NONE CAN BE ABSOLVED, save, *in articulo mortis* (at the point of death) by any other than the Roman Pontiff, for the time being: and Second,—That no person who, even thought repenting of his oath, persists in holding himself out as a member of the Society of Free Masons, whether by communicating with other adherents of the sect, or by attending their meetings OR BY ANY OTHER MEANS WHATEVER, can be lawfully admitted to the sacraments of penance and of the most Holy Eucharist; and even if unlawfully admitted to the Sacrament of Penance, and absolved by a Confessor, THE ABSOLUTION IS NULL AND VOID."

Certainly these ordinances are abundantly plain, so that he who runs may read; and so far from being in abeyance or out of use, they have been re-enacted so late as the year 1838, and are as much in force as any other ordinance of the Church. It will not do, therefore, for Catholics to pretend ignorance hereafter upon the matter.

There can be no doubt that the Ecclesiastical prohibitions apply to all Societies in which members are bound by any oath or solemn pledge of secrecy. The name makes no difference. Both the letter and spirit of the decisions of the Church indicate in the clearest manner, that any Catholic who is a member of any such Society, is *ipso facto*, debarred from the use of the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist, and incurs all the pains and penalties of excommunication. We are confident that no Catholic who estimates as he should do the precious privileges he enjoys in being a member of the Holy Catholic Church and Communion of Saints, will think for a moment of comparing them with any imaginary temporal advantage to be derived from secret Societies; for "WHAT DOETH IT PROFIT A MAN IF HE CAN GAIN THE WHOLE WORLD AND LOSE HIS OWN SOUL?"

PUSEYISM AND THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

What can be the meaning of this great outcry against Puseyism? Are not the intelligent portion of the religious world aware of the fact, that many things which they denounce as Puseyism, are chargeable on the Episcopal church itself? Are not those Episcopalians who join in the anti-Puseyism crusade, aware that their own standards contain much that they themselves denounce as Puseyism? Are not those who talk of secession from the English church on account of these sentiments, aware that, in seceding, they will bring away those same sentiments with them in their prayer book? Are they not aware, that, to get rid of Puseyism, they must cease to be Episcopalians?—presuming, from the language held on this subject in quarters, that it is not properly understood, I propose to bring into view a few considerations, in as brief a manner as the nature of the case will permit.

"First, then, the Apostolical success-

ion. It is the doctrine of the Episcopal church, that no religious society is a church of Christ that has not in it a ministry derived from the Apostles in regular succession. The question then is, does such succession constitute a Christian Church?—If not, where is the evidence that the Episcopal is such a Church? But if it does, the Roman Catholic Church, having in it that succession, is a Church of the Kind; in which event it would follow, that, as the majority of a body is the body itself, that being the majority, it is the Church, and Episcopalians are schismatics in their separation from her, and ought therefore to return to the bosom of their mother, as the Puseyites are inclined to do, and as all consistent Episcopalians must do."—N. Y. Evangelist.

CONVERTS FROM TRACTARIANISM TO POPEY.

To the Editor of the Morning Herald.
January 13th.

SIR—In this morning's Herald there appears a letter signed Bernard Smith, late Rector of Leadenham, stating that a letter which appeared in the Herald a few days ago, signed Bernard Smith, Rector of Leadenham, is a hoax, and the assertion contained in it, that the said gentleman had not become a Roman Catholic, is unfounded. That somebody has been "false, or uttered a falsehood," is clear; but which of these two letters is the genuine document, which the forgery, would not be clear, were it not by this time certain that the real Mr. Bernard Smith has communicated the fact of his conversion to the Bishop of Lincoln, and promised to take an early opportunity of forwarding to his Lordship the formal resignation of his living.

This enables me to present the public with a correct list of the conversions from Tractarianism to Popery which have taken place during the last 16 months.

1. Rev. R. W. Sibthorpe, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.
2. Rev. Bernard Smith, late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.
3. Edward Douglas, Esq., B. A., Gentleman Commoner of Christ Church.
4. Peter le Page Renouf, Esq., Scholar of Pembroke College, Oxford.
5. Johnson Grant, Esq., Commoner of St. John's College, Oxford.
6. Rev. Dr. Wackerbarth.
7. A tradesman in Oxford.
8. A boy at Shrewsbury school.
9. Miss Gladstone.
10. Miss Young.

Miss Gladstone's conversion has been denied, like Miss Smith's: but I have ascertained that it is beyond question.

An Italian priest was in Oxford in October last, and called upon Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey. He has since expressed himself as much gratified to find how widely Romanism was spreading among the young men—to an extent of which he had previously no idea.

Thanking you for the admission of my former letters,

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
AN OXFORD MASTER OF ARTS.

THE PROTESTANT OR NEGATIVE FAITH, REFUTED; AND THE CATHOLIC, OR AFFIRMATIVE FAITH, DEMONSTRATED FROM SCRIPTURE.

(Continued.)

XI.—ON ASSISTANT AND GUARDIAN ANGELS. Protestants, against the clearest possible, and constantly-recurring texts of Scripture, deny that the Angels have any thing to do with us, or we with the Angels. Yet, while they protest against the defensive care, the interceding, inspiring, and directing interposition of the good Angels in our behalf; they allow that we are daily tried, tempted, and seduced by Satan and his fallen host, the wicked Angels. These evil spirits, they own, may attack, and ruin us for ever; but the good Angels must not, cannot interpose to save us. Where is their Scripture for this negative assertion? The very contrary they read in the Sacred Writings—where, addressing man, the divine oracle says: "God has given his Angels charge concerning thee, that they guide thee in all thy ways: they shall bear thee up in their hands, lest, perchance, thou dash thy foot against a stone."—Ps. xc. 11, 12.

They deny in particular that there are Guardian Angels: or that each of us has a good Angel appointed to guard us through this life against the otherwise overpowering attacks of our spiritual enemies,—whom God allows to try our fidelity to him, as in the case of Job, but not to prevail against us further than we choose ourselves. Yet this was always the received doctrine of the true believers,—of the Jews before, and of Jews and Christians, Protestants alone excepted, since our Saviour's time. Did not Jacob on his death bed pray to his Guardian Angel to bless his grandsons, Ephraim and Manasses! "The Angel," said he, "who delivered me from all evils, bless these boys!"—Gen. xlviii. 16. Besides, what Angels did the Saviour speak of, if not of such, when he said "See that you despise not one of these little ones; for I say to you, that THEIR ANGELS IN HEAVEN always see the face of my Father, who is in Heaven."—Matt. xviii. 10. When Peter, miraculously delivered from prison, stood knocking at Mary's door, did not the faithful within suppose it was his Guardian Angel?—Acts, xii. 15. Need we wonder at this subserviency of such glorious spirits to man, when the Eternal Son himself, the God whom all adore, became our fellow-man, and made himself our servant? By his thus taking upon himself our nature, so inferior to that of the Angels, he has rendered it, in this much, superior to that of the Angels, that it is become the very link of kindred between himself and our mortal race. Thus in Satan and his followers he has cast down the mighty and the proud; and raised up, in Adam and his posterity, the weak and abject.

We find also mention made in Scripture of Angels appointed Guardians of nations, states, and empires. Thus, an Angel was sent "to guard the Israelites, and preserve them on their journey, till he had brought them to the place prepared for them. Take heed of him, says Almighty God; and hear his voice, and do not think him one to be contemned, for he will not forgive when thou hast sinned; but if thou wilt hear his voice," &c.—Exod. xxiii. 30.

An Angel reveals to Daniel that the object of his prayer, the return of his people from their captivity, had been delayed by the resistance of the Prince, that is, the Guardian Angel, of Persia,—who doubtless wished, for the good of that country committed to his charge, that the Jews, the worshippers of the true God, might remain longer in it, to spread the light of truth among the idolatrous natives. He tells the prophet that the Angel Michael, whom he calls the Prince of the Jews, came to help him in his contest with the Prince of the Persians,—That he would return and renew the contest,—That, on his going forth, there appeared the Prince, or ruling Angel, of the Greeks coming, but that none, save Michael, assisted him in all his struggles with the Angel of Persia,—Dan. x. 13—all which clearly shows that there are Angels appointed by Almighty God as protecting rulers of the different nations; but that Michael, in particular, is the tutelary prince of the true believers.

As to the ministrings of Angels in man's behalf, need I cite to those, who affect such an intimate acquaintance with the Bible, the numberless instances mentioned in it of angelic intervention in the concerns of our race! The whole sacred volume teems with the descriptions of the ministrations of these blessed spirits betwixt man and his Creator. They are there shown at one time directing, supporting, consoling, and defending the just,—as in the cases of Abraham, Agar, Lot, Isaac, Jacob, and a thousand others; at another, executing God's wrathful judgments on the wicked.

Nor is their mediating ministry less frequently mentioned in the New Testament. The mystery of the Incarnation is announced by an Angel, and its accomplishment in Bethlehem celebrated by exulting choirs of Angels. The spotless purity of the Virgin Mother of God is revealed to Joseph, her chaste guardian spouse, by an Angel. An Angel warns him to fly with his precious charge, the infant Saviour, into Egypt, and again bids him thence return. An Angel warned the Wise Men, who had come from the East to worship the new-born Messiah, not to return to