

between Catholics and Protestants, and there can be no doubt which party corresponds to each of the former disputants. It may be said that zeal for the Sabbath was carried to excess by the Jews, in every one of these instances, far beyond what the most infatuated Sabbatarian nowadays would require. We are not sure of that. We need not go back to the days of wild puritanical fanaticism, for instances of extreme rigor on this subject. We need not travel to old Banbury for the well-known enforcement on feline propensities, of Sabbath observance, by making a solemn example of the cat that presumed to mouse on the Sunday. But we recollect, not many years ago, a case of death from starvation at a large town in the West of England, because the society from which relief was sought, rigidly refused to grant it on the Lord's day. Still more recently, a well-known instance was publicly quoted, of a lady of high rank, who in vain implored conveyance by railway in Scotland, to pay the last offices of affection to a dying relative, though empty mail trains passed to and fro. And we know that a similar refusal was made to a Catholic ecclesiastic of high dignity in the same country, when it was the only means of bearing the last rights of religion to a departing parishioner. Now here is Sabbatical observance preferred to charity; in one instance, though death might be, and was, the consequence. This is carrying the principle to the full Pharisaic standard.—"Come and be healed on week-days." In fact, what would any one of the four who were purposely cured on the Sabbath, have lost by waiting till next morning? After eighteen, and thirty-eight years' infirmity, one day more would not have been a heavy addition; the dropsical patient could still walk, and therefore could not be in any danger; and the withered hand could not be much needed on the Jewish Sabbath. Had our Lord said, in these cases: "to-morrow come and I will heal you, for this is the Sabbath," He would have spoken words with which Exeter Hall would have rung, and given a text to be stereotyped by tract dealers, and engraved for children's copies. But He says exactly the contrary always; and we find the upholders of the Sabbatical superstition, they who pretend to look to our Saviour for everything, carefully overlooking His teaching on the subject, suppressing His words, and raising to the law of fear, and its abolished rigors, nay to its exaggerated traditions among the Jews, for the pattern of their observance.

5. On the other hand, they tax Papists, particularly on the Continent, with being habitual Sabbath breakers. We condemn utterly every violation that is contrary to the laws of the Church; all traffic, public works, shop keeping, and unnecessary business. But we reprove no less the other extreme, which forms the Protestant principle. Rest was not meant to be idleness, and no Christian festival was intended to be gloomy. One cannot fail to be struck by the strong language employed by our Redeemer, when He denounced the rule of Sabbath observance, which our modern reformers have selected.—"Ye hypocrites!" And the charge of this hateful vice is fully justified by what we read in the passages referred to. "The poor disciples pluck some ears of corn, being hungry," and eat them. The Pharisees immediately cry out—"Behold Thy disciple do that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath days."—Matt. xi. 2. And then we find, that "when Jesus went into the house of one of the chief of the Pharisees, on the Sabbath day to eat bread, they watched Him."—Luke xiv. 1. Now, is not this exactly the case with our modern Sabbatarians? They always have one law of observance for the rich, and another for the poor. The one must not pluck an ear of corn on the Sabbath, without the rich man's reprehending him, and then going home to his luxurious dinner with his friends. It used to be proposed to suppress all Sunday cooking in public bakeries, where alone the poor could have a warm meal prepared, on their only day of rest; but no Sir Andrew ever dreamt of shutting off the steam of the boiler, or putting a break on the smoke-jack, of aristocratic kitchens. There is something hypocritically profane in the spectacle, described as taking place on a Sunday at fashionable Scotch kirks, of some twenty carriages at the door, with their human appendages waiting, for devout listeners to a discourse against Sunday travelling! Nor have we ever heard that the eloquent Bonapartes ever whispered a word of reproach to the gentle folks, for their zeal to lay the burthens of the law, only on the already overburthened shoulders of the poor. Depend upon it, he never called them "hypocrites," though that is Scripture.

6. However inconsistent was the Pharisee's theory of having a good dinner himself, while he was horrified at a hungry poor man's rubbing the wheat ears in his hand, to eat them, our dear Lord, who looked to our instruction, did not hesitate to dine with him on that day. And He justified His conduct by the cure of the dropsical man, who possibly presented himself with the connivance of the host; for he, with his friends, were "watching" our Lord before the cure. He did not, however, despise Jewish prejudices merely to this extent. He braved hatred and persecution, for His views and practice regarding the Sabbath. St. Luke tells us, that the Scribes and Pharisees, on account of His healing on the Sabbath day, "were filled with madness; and they talked to one another, what they might do to Jesus."—Luke vi. 11. St. Matthew explains, that this consultation was, "how they might destroy Jesus."—Matt. xii. 14. St. John informs us, that "therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, because He did these things on the Sabbath."—John v. 16. This contempt for the prejudices of the bigot Jews, this braving of their hatred and persecution, for the sake of a principle on such a subject, at once stamps the view of those men with the note of reprobation and wickedness. One so meek as Jesus, who had come to "fulfil all justice," who asserted boldly, and with divine truth, that "not a jot nor tittle of the Law should pass away," who attended to every legal obligation, from His twelfth year to the eve of His death, who would "not bruise the broken reed, nor extinguish the smoking flax," so tender was His thread to be on earth; one, in fine, who was come to purchase the soul of the most cynical Pharisee at as dear a rate as that of His Holy Mother, must have considered that an evil principle, which He crushed so unmercifully seven times, and which to uproot, He braved the fury and hatred of the dominant party in church and state. Hence the Catholic moralist well understands the term *scandalum pharisaicum* as opposed to the *scandalum pusillorum*, the first of which may safely be despised; and the latter, never.

7. Finally our Lord, whose example so clearly sustains the temperate and Christian views of the Catholic Church on this ritual question, lays down principles

conformable to His practice, which form the basis of this Church's conduct. "The Son of Man is the Lord also of the Sabbath; the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." These two aphorisms contain the whole of our doctrine and of our discipline on the subject. He who declared of Himself Lord of the Sabbath, also said to His Apostles—"All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth; as My Father hath sent Me, so I also send you."—Matt. xxviii. 18; John xx. 21. Within the compass of this delegated power came the Sabbath; and the Catholic at once acquiesces in the transfer of its obligations, by the Apostles, to the Sunday. And if the Sabbath was made to serve man, whereas man, was not created to be the slave of the Sabbath,—man's true interests are to be the standard, whereby the Church will ever regulate her precepts respecting it. Moroseness and debauchery are equally alien from her thoughts; nor could the spouse of Christ have devised a mode of spending it, which makes its morning dull, and its evening dissipated. It could not have crammed into it the spiritual duties of the other six days, and so made it an iron yoke. It could not have sanctified it, by excluding from it the performance of even charitable works. It could not have consecrated it to stupidity and sloth, by withdrawing from it all innocent recreation and refreshing cheerfulness. All this would not have been considering or treating the Sabbath as made for man. This can only be the case where it promotes his happiness; where it instructs his mind, applies rightly his intellect, tones his feelings, by a gentle sway, to wholesome kindness, raises his thoughts by a noble and beautiful worship, improves his social and domestic relations by a more virtuous intercourse, invigorates his frame by seasonable repose, mingled with temperate recreation; and, in fine, makes him live one day of every seven of his life, under the chastening discipline of religion, but still more under the sweet influence of God's countenance, felt to be more present, more benign, more radiant than on other days, with an eye more watchful indeed, over evil, but more open to our better deeds. This is the Lord's Day of the New Law; this is the Sunday, on which the glory of the spiritual firmament reigns supreme.

V. We opened our essay with the transactions of our blessed Saviour's infancy, and we will close it with the last actions of His life. We promise to be very concise.

Here, as in the noblest tragedy, action becomes equivalent to suffering, and our Redeemer may be said to do for man, whatever man does against Him. Now, to our minds, there is nothing more decisive of the respective claims of Catholic and Protestant to be the religion of the New Testament, than the manner in which they treat its most solemn portion, that which records the final act of redemption. The very essence of modern Protestantism is to treat this greatest act as a mere abstraction. The mind is concentrated on the sole apprehension of an accomplished atonement, and its instrumentality by death. By a process eminently selfish, the price and its purchase are transferred to the individual soul appropriated by it, and are viewed extraneously to Him whose they really are. There is no contemplation in the Protestant view, it is one of mere self-application. To contrast it with the Catholic idea, and so illustrate both, perhaps a simple parable may be useful.

Let us imagine to ourselves two spendthrifts, for whose debts a loving father has given bond: the day of reckoning comes, and the surety comes willingly to pay the ransom. One son stands by, grateful indeed but cold and calculating. He looks not at the huge sum that is counted out, but is eagerly waiting for the last coin to be told, and then exultingly cries out, "I am free," and goes his way. But there is another beside him, who watches with the intensest gaze every particle of the precious offering, because he knows what it has cost his father to procure it. In every piece he recognises the fruit of some privation undergone, or some cruel humiliation endured. On one he reads his father's hunger, on another his abject toil. He remembers, as one portion of the store is brought out, that it was gained at the expense of calumny and hatred from friends; and when another is produced, that it was earned by the loss of those most dear to him. At every instalment he looks into his dear parent's countenance, and sees its manly sorrow, and his varying emotions, as these same recollections pass over his heart; and though the smile of love is on his lips, as the last golden drachma falls from his hand, at thought of what he has achieved for his children, even this is but more heart-rending to the tender one of the two, and he almost loses all sense of his own liberation, in the anguish inflicted by its price. He thinks not of himself, for love is not selfish. He goes not away, singing, "I am ransomed, I am free," but he rushes to his father's feet, exclaiming, "Thou hast purchased me, I am thine."

Such we believe to be the true difference between the Protestant and the Catholic modes of looking at our Saviour's passion. The one looks at it with an acquisitive eye, the other with the eye of love. To the Protestant it would have been the same if the simple act of death had been recorded, and its preliminary and accompanying sufferings had been suppressed.—Not one emotion would have been lost to him, any more than, in his system, any advantage. What does the cruel agony in Gethsemani give him? It does not redeem him. What does he gain by the welts and gashes of the Roman scourges? They do not ransom him. What profits him the mock coronation, and its insulting homage? It does not save him. And then what can Mary and John do for him at the cross's foot?—He declares he does not care for them. What matters it to him if the seamless garment be died for, or rent? It bears no deep mystery of faith to him. No; only let him secure that moment when the last breath passes over the Victim's lips, and it is enough—for it is the atonement.

Yet all that we have briefly enumerated was suffered for our sakes, and recorded for our profit. Although the last piece completed our ransom, all that preceded it composed the sum. For surely our divine Redeemer did nought in vain, nor aught superfluously. He was generous, indeed, but not wasteful. The Catholic, therefore, treasures up in his heart every smallest gift of love, where the smallest is immense. From this minuteness of Catholic preception springs a sense of reality, an approximation of feeling, which makes that not merely vivid, but present, which is separated from us by ages. On the other side is a mere hazy and vague generality, merging in a conception of the mind, instead of a real fact. And from this unreality easily springs up a lurking infidelity, that saps the foundation of Christianity. The mind comes to think it unnecessary to trouble itself about details, so long as the one apprehended truth is certain. "Christ died

for us, no matter how," is the whole needful dogma of an evangelical mind.

But there is another view from which the Protestant eye habitually shrinks, but one which the Catholic boldly contemplates; it is that which completes the circle, by joining the beginning and the end of the Gospel together, steadily uniting the incarnation and the death. The first of these great mysteries receives but little prominence in modern Protestantism, because it lacks the daring of faith, to believe that He who died was the Word incarnate. And it is this feebleness of belief that leads to that vagueness and generalization in doctrine, which we have described. Say to a Protestant, "God was struck in the face; God was scourged; God was crowned with thorns," and he dares not trust himself to look upon the doctrine. The eagle eye that can gaze upon the sun belongs not to his system; it is but a craven bird. He feels himself unable to grasp the awful mystery. If he deny the divinity of our Lord, his atonement is gone. But he dares not contemplate the dogma through its various applications, and he shrinks from such phrases as we have given with a misgiving terror. They sound shocking and almost profane. And thus he is driven to suppress in his thoughts those detailed sequels of the incarnation, and dwell upon only obscure perceptions of two doctrines, which he has not learnt to firmly combine. Socinianism thus becomes the refuge of a vacillating attempt at faith.

The Catholic Church is a stranger to this wavering. She pursues one doctrine through all the mazes of the other, and combines the two inextricably. The Infant and the Victim are equal realities, nay, a unity, beginning in God, and in God ending; God throughout, in feebleness as in might, in obscurity and in brightness, in suffering and in glory. Nothing in Him is little, nothing unworthy; the fool's garment on Him is as sacred as the snow-bright vesture of Tabor; the scourge of cords in His uplifted hand is as powerful as the thunderbolt; the first lisping of His infant tongue as wisdomful as His sermon on the mount, a bruise upon His flesh as beautiful to angels' eyes, as adorable to man's soul, as His first smiling radiance shed upon his virgin mother. Thus does the Church believe, thus realise her faith. She alone understands the true doctrine of her Saviour's death, as He Himself expounded it; for none other has learnt this lesson from His actions, that love is an essential condition of forgiveness as well as faith, and love it is that will linger over every detail of love.

CATHOLIC INTELLIGENCE.

EXTRACT FROM THE PASTORAL LETTER OF HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF TUAM TO THE CLERGY AND FAITHFUL OF THE DIOCESE OF TUAM.

St. Jarlath's, Tuam, Feast of St. Bridget.

DEAR AND VENERABLE BRETHREN.—We are prompted to address you thus early, in order that you may avail yourselves of the assembling of the legislature, to endeavor to obtain from their wisdom and humanity the removal of all vexatious restrictions on our faith and discipline, as well as a share in the public funds, to which we are entitled, towards the extension of pure Catholic education. To your heroic patience under the most frightful privations, and to your uniformly peaceful conduct, under provocations the most cruel and exasperating, you can confidently appeal in your petition for obtaining all due facilities for Catholic education for the youth of this diocese. Of these exasperating scenes, our own town of Tuam has been for weeks the theatre, civil and ecclesiastical forces having been sent in to aid in the work of proselytism, and, thank God, not one soul has fallen away from the faith.

While thus you claim from the legislature a fair share of the taxes to which you contribute towards the proper education of the youth of the country, you will not fail to point their attention to the injustice and the danger of planting and fostering in the land seminaries and colleges fraught with the seeds of infidelity, and in which a Catholic clergyman cannot hold any office without being visited by the heaviest censures of the Church. Great must be the corruption which those who are called the salt of the earth are not able to purify by contact—nay, when all contact is forbidden, lest the salt should lose its flavor and become assimilated to the prevailing corruption. Should any of the youth of your parishes have had the misfortune of tasting them, you will take care to withdraw them from the troubled streams which, from fresh accessions "of strange and noisome errors, are daily becoming more impure and poisonous."

Besides, the Queen's Colleges, the schools known by the name of national schools, for they are national only in name, have engaged the serious attention of the Synod of Thurles, as well as of the Holy Father who inherits the keys of St. Peter, to whom our divine Redeemer confided the care of His entire fold. The former, viz:—The Queen's Colleges, have been solemnly, repeatedly, finally, and irreversibly condemned. The latter, the national schools, are of an ambiguous nature, some of them under Protestant and Presbyterian patrons, or if you will of persons having no distinct notions of any religion, but a hatred of the Catholic faith, and in the hands of such persons, especially when they are cruel landlords or parsons, the national schools become instruments of proselytism and perversion. Nothing, then, can be more deceitful for children than the sign board, "National Schools," for by it the artless, unwary children, as in Partry and other parts of this diocese might be decoyed into the very worst schools to their own destruction. It is only in the absence of Catholic schools, and with the safeguards required in the decrees of the Synod of Thurles (mostly extracted from the letter of Gregory XVI.) and again confirmed by the present Pope Pius IX., the least dangerous of the national schools should be tolerated.

To show how far those schools are from answering the requirements of the Catholic Church, the aforesaid statutes run thus:—"Now, we (the bishops) deem it our duty to declare that the separate education of Catholic youth is by all means to be preferred

to it." You will, therefore, perceive that it is your duty to establish and extend, as much as possible, schools purely Catholic, unconnected with the government system of education.

Where Catholic schools are not sufficiently provided, the following safeguards are required in order that the national may be tolerated:—First—You will take care that all books containing anything contrary to the canon of scripture or its purity, or the doctrine of the Catholic Church, or its morality, be excluded; and hence, those noxious compilations called "Scripture Extracts" are never to appear in the schools. Secondly—You will observe that the Holy See, far from being content with the system as then presented (for since it has become worse), lays down as a solemn injunction for bishops and parish priests strenuously to labor to obtain a better order of things and more equitable conditions. Thirdly—The sacred congregation attached the utmost importance to the legal dominion of the schoolhouses, declaring that it would be most useful if the school premises were, in their own right, legally vested in the parish priests or bishops. Such is the just jealousy of the Catholic Church about the freedom of the education of its children, being anxious to assimilate the tenure of schools with the tenure of its churches.

Yet far from acquiescing in this just requisition of vesting the legal right of the schools in the parish priests and bishops, the Commissioners of Education, who sometime before granted such leases, now refuse to allow aid towards building school houses, unless the right of those houses is vested in themselves. Hence the system has become immeasurably worse and more dangerous than it was before. The Catholics generally, from apprehensions justified by sad experience, as well as the advice of the Holy See, refuse to aid in building schools on condition that they should become the legal property of a corporation, of which the great majority are the steady enemies of their creed.

The consequence is that Protestant landlords, many of whom are at once rancorous bigots and exterminators, so far from feeling any difficulty in complying with the arbitrary rule of the commissioners, find it most convenient, since it affords them a useful outlay of money, and secures to them so many little fortresses on their estates to harass their Catholic tenants with the alternative of evictions from their holdings, or sending their children to schools—national ones, too—where their faith is sure to be destroyed.—And yet this bigoted regulation, which keeps the schools of Catholic patrons at a stand, while it is filling the country with the national schools under Protestant influences, is attempted to be defended on no better ground than that the commissioners will keep the schools in repair, as if they could not keep them in repair if vested in priests or bishops as well as in themselves. The necessary result of the regulation could not escape the least observing, and hence the statutes of Thurles forbid Catholic trustees to transfer into the hands of commissioners the legal ownership of such schoolhouses, observing that that body should sustain the expenses of their repair. To persuade them, however, to do to the Catholic people must have recourse to the paramount authority of parliament.

4thly—For the safety of these schools, the Fathers of the Synod of Thurles require—nay, enjoin, that those Catholics alone be placed over the schools who are approved by the ordinary, as also that the books even of secular literature to be read in the ordinary as well as in the nominal or model schools receive from the ordinary a like approbation.

We have dwelt on this subject more at length, in order that you may feel how erroneous would be their impression, who could mistake for a general approval of schools confessedly so dangerous a very qualified toleration founded on the instruction that the conditions which the bishops and the Pope require for their safety must be fulfilled. It would be trifling with all that is solemn in religion, and with that reverence which even Pagans declared was due to children, to lay down certain rules as necessary safeguards against danger, and then to abandon children to their schools, as places ordinarily safe, without the least solicitude about procuring the safeguards required. It is the more necessary to make exertions to procure those conditions, as the government have not yet paid the least attention to the requisition of the Catholic bishops on the subject. You will, therefore, we trust, take the earliest opportunity of sending your petitions to parliament to have this system accommodated to Catholic principles. As it has been the expressed wish of the synod of Thurles that the archbishops would endeavor to procure from the government this just and necessary accommodation, we shall not be wanting in lending our own share of co-operation to the accomplishment of an object in which the welfare of society and religion are deeply involved.

As purely Catholic schools are those which are deserving of all encouragement, you will endeavor to have as many as the circumstances of the people will permit you to establish. It is fortunate that the ground is already pre-occupied by several schools, which are not to be connected with government institutions, or in any way controlled or interfered with by their inspectors. Such are the schools of the monks of St. Francis, where children, besides the rudiments of learning, are deeply imbued with the principles of faith and morality, and taught that which is most valuable in education—to become honest citizens. We cannot too strongly recommend the schools of the Christian Brothers, in literary training the rivals, if not the superiors, of any teachers in the service of the government schools; and not to be at all compared with them in teaching the one thing necessary, and lighting for young children the path which will lead them to Heaven.

And finally we have some conventual schools under the care and superintendence of the Sisters of the