

of the Oxford writers be, for other reasons, supposed true. Mr. Goode must be resting on no solid grounds, when he expects that they will be given up, should persons find at last that they are really identical with the Roman. We are not asserting that this is the case; we are perhaps not the fairest judge how far it is so: we can only say, that we earnestly hope that in his attempt to prove it to be the case, Mr. Goode's arguments will be generally found as cogent and satisfactory, as on all other subjects they are feeble and inconsequential."

As Rev. Mr. Newman is known to be the principal Editor of the able Review, it is manifest that he at least cherishes a long-ling desire for union with Rome. The writings of other divines of the same school give evidence of a similar disposition. Will those who on this side of the Atlantic have re-echoed the Oxford sentiments, generously advance with them, or even outrun them to the happy goal?

We copy the following communication [says the *Boston Pilot*] from the New Haven Herald of a recent date, in reply to that prince of religious mountebanks, Dr. Brownlee, of New York.

ST. PATRICK.

Messrs. Editors,—Permit me through your columns to reply to the remarks of Dr. Brownlee, hinted at in your paper of yesterday. The Dr. stated that he wished to rescue the memory of St. Patrick, who was a good and great man, who was in Heaven seven centuries before the Catholic Religion was introduced among the Irish—that Popery first established in Ireland by Henry II, on the authority of a bull granted by Adrian IV, Pope of Rome, that St. Patrick was a Culdee, or in other words a Protestant, and he came from Scotland.

Now, if he wishes to rescue the memory of St. Patrick, how does his fellow anti-popery men go to work? Ledwich, in his "Antiquities of Ireland," which may be found in the College Library, affirms that Patrick is an imaginary personage, and several yet deny his existence. The very mention of Patrick's day in Ireland is received with a sneer by almost every Protestant, and his name is received with ridicule by all but Catholics. This is what Dr. Brownlee would call rescuing the memory of a good man from Catholic protection. The Catholics reverence him, Protestants laugh his memory to scorn—who then rescues his memory and cherishes it?

But let us examine the Bull itself, to see whether Pope Adrian acknowledged that Popery was unknown in Ireland till the invasion of Henry II. as the Dr. quoted the document as historical authority. The Bull states expressly, that Henry knew that Ireland already belonged to the right of St. Peter and the See of Rome, that Henry was to "increase the Christian Religion," not to introduce it, and that he was to "preserve" not to establish "the right of Holy Church." The Bull itself, then proves that Ireland was under Catholic dominion when Adrian granted Henry temporal authority over her. The very

grant implies possession of the thing to be given away, and this was the reason why England gained such easy possession to Ireland. Had not Ireland acknowledged the authority of the See of Rome, she would never have submitted to such a bull as made England her ruler.

Seventy-seven years before the English invasion, Donough, the son of "Brian the Brave," went to Rome to consult the Pope, on which occasion he presented his Holiness with his father's harp, which is now placed in Trinity College, Dublin. The venerable Bede states, that Pope Celestine sent Palladius into Ireland about the year 430. Palladius was compelled to fly from the Island, and Patrick soon followed him and received the few converts made by Palladius. Dr. Warner, a Protestant writer, admits that Patrick went to Rome to be consecrated for his mission, and even Dr. Brownlee admitted that he received the name Patrick (Patricius) from Rome. Plowden, in his history of Ireland, though an Englishman, I believe, says that it is "asserted by all ancient authors and admitted by the most respectable modern writers, that St. Patrick was sent by Celestine, Bishop of Rome, to preach the gospel to the Irish." Doctor Brownlee says, that Ireland differed from Rome in the time of celebrating Easter, but he forgot to mention that one of the earliest Synods held in Ireland, resolved, that "the question should be referred to the head of cities." This was done, and the Roman computation was adopted.

But Dr. B. says that the ancient Irish Christians were Protestants. If so, these Protestants believed in the celebration of Mass and the immolation of the host, as is admitted by the great Usher, who is the most respectable authority that claims Patrick as a Protestant. They offered prayers for the dead, believed in a middle state of existence, in auricular confession, and in absolution. They fasted on certain days of the week, practiced making pilgrimages, and Patrick himself prescribed penances for certain sins. (See Moore's Ireland, vol. 1, page 237, Et. Seg. in Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopedia.) Such are the doctrines claimed as protestantism!!!

But Dr. B. told us that Patrick came from Scotland. This is not so. He may have gone to Scotland to impart some Irish light to the benighted natives of that country, but he did not come from that place originally. St. Columba went over from Ireland to civilize the Isles of Scotland, as Johnson will inform the Dr. in his tour with Bossey. Scotland received the light of Christianity and took her very name, and people and rulers, from the Irish colony of Argyllshire. Ireland was called Scotland before what is now called Scotland was known as such.

I hope I have thus rescued the name of Patrick from those who insult his memory.

About the dangers impending over this country from the increase of Catholics, I shall leave to them to settle, as I am not a Catholic myself, but the American historian, Bancroft will tell those who want information, that Catholics were the first friends of civil and religious freedom, in this country. The followers of Calvert were founding an asylum for every perse-

cuted sect at St. Mary's, in Maryland, while Puritan bigots were hunting poor old Roger Williams from Salem to Seekonk! See Bancroft, vol. 1, chaps. 7 and 9. ENIGMA.

The Western Christian Advocate of this week, contains a long tirade to prove that immoral persons are never expelled from the Catholic Church. We stated in reply to the same charge, in our last paper, that persons who lead bad lives and neglect to have recourse to the sacraments are excommunicated, and after death are not allowed to be interred in the same ground with the faithful departed. If this be not expulsion, we are at a loss to find the meaning of the word.

The Advocate also affirms "That wickedness does not disqualify them from administering any of the Sacraments—that the Council of Trent declares that whoever shall affirm that a minister who is in a state of mortal sin does not perform or confer a sacrament, although he observe every thing that is essential to the performance or bestowment thereof let him be anathema." This is the gist of the Advocate's argument. Now for the answer in the fashion of a little Catechism for children.

Does the Catholic Church tolerate wicked Clergymen and allow them to officiate? No, she does not; when the fact of their guilt is known, they are driven from their mission by the Bishop of the diocese in which they reside, as recently happened in Ohio.

Does their wickedness disqualify them from the administration of the Sacrament?—No, because the efficacy of the sacrament is derived from Christ who instituted it and not from the personal holiness of the mortal who administers it. It is true, however, that the Priest who administers a sacrament in a state of sin, adds thereby to the heinousness of his own guilt. This does not affect the soul of the recipient of the divine favor.

Here then is the whole matter about which the Advocate effects so much pious sensibility. Let it be understood, however, that no Catholic is at liberty to have recourse to the ministry of a suspended priest as long as one can be found who is recognised by the Ecclesiastical authorities. It is only in cases of necessity, where no other can be had, that the faithful may have recourse to an abandoned minister. Is not this the practice of the Methodist sect? If a man is dying who had never received baptism, would the Editors of the Advocate be justified, supposing they believed that they were wicked, in refusing to administer the sacred rite without which no one shall enter into the kingdom of God?—Taking them on their own ground, do they believe that baptism administered at any time by the Rev. Mr. Richardson, whom they lately dismissed, were invalid, because he was a sinner? They will not assert anything so monstrous; neither does the Catholic Church.—As well may they affirm that the contract of marriage is invalid because administered by a bad magistrate or Preacher, and that the parties consequently live in sin; as well affirm that the decisions of our Courts are nugatory because the judge and the jury may be very wicked men. Such a doctrine would be received with acclamation in the Penitentiary!!!

The Advocate concludes as follows, "There is a remnant both among the Clergy and the Laity who have not de filed their robes. Such will, therefore, walk with Christ for they are worthy."

Much obliged to your references! "Idolaters, the followers of the man of sin," the children of Antichrist, "walking with Christ for they are worthy"!!! Well! that's charitable and very Evangelical.—Telegraph.

LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

We copy from the *True Tablet*, an account of vexation and inhuman treatment of a poor prisoner, for refusal to join in religious worship with a Protestant chaplain. We have been told that, at Sing-Sing, the lash is sometimes applied to subdue the scruples of prisoners. In the Pennsylvania prisons certain visiting committees and matrons often molest the sufferer by forcing him to retain in his cell the Protestant Bible, and taking from him his Catholic prayer-book. In the House of Correction the inmates are all forced to attend worship or preaching of some kind in the Chapel. This is entirely at variance with our ideas of liberty of conscience. Even in the dungeon conscience should be free.—*Catholic Herald*.

"FOLKINGHAM PERSECUTION.

Tremens, immisso lumine manes.

Mr. Pigou, in a letter to the *Morning Chronicle* of Thursday, draws attention to a piece of cruelty enacted in the gaol of Folkingham. "This case," he says, "though not equal to the celebrated one of Salford, where eleven laborers were committed to gaol for an indefinite term by the merciful magistrates of that district, on the charge of not attending their parish church, is yet not inferior in its principle, and it illustrates the danger of confiding to gaol chaplains any matter of religious toleration."

He then proceeds to give the chaplain's (whom he calls the zealous man,) narrative of the case, promising that *Christmas day* was the time chosen for this display of mercy.—T. N., are the initials of the martyr prisoner:—

"T. N., having refused to attend chapel, I visited him, and as he could give no satisfactory reason, or state a sufficient objection to the service, he was locked up, as guilty of a breach of the prison rules.

Dec. 27.—Prayer and sermon (on toleration, perhaps). Visited and remonstrated with T. N., who still expresses a determination to absent himself from the chapel.

Dec. 29.—Prayers, &c. (for mercy, perhaps). Visited T. N., who has been again locked up, for refusing to attend chapel—his ignorance, bigotry, and obstinacy, still more apparent."

It may here be well enquired, whether the bigotry and obstinacy were not a good deal stronger in the chaplain's mind than in the ignorant, but conscientious, prisoner's?

Jan. 1, 1841.—The year opens with the gentle clergyman's oration. The bigoted man yields to cold, hunger, and darkness. T. N. is led in triumph to chapel. This is the *Pæan*:—

"T. N. was removed to his ward yesterday, on his expressing his willingness to attend chapel in future.

During all this T. N. was a conscientious Roman Catholic, and said he would not attend with heretics (this word did not perhaps shorten or soften his trial), and he only acted, in his humble sphere of martyrdom, as Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, in theirs. His spectators were limited to the chaplain and turnkey; there's were half England.

The gaoler's account is as follows:—The lay authority, the secular arm (observes Mr. Pigou,) is briefer than the divine's; he enters not into polemics, but bluffs says—

Dec. 25.—T. N. refusing to attend chapel: 72 hours' black-hole; discontinued Dec. 28.

Dec. 29.—T. N. refusing; 50 hours, black hole; discontinued Dec. 31."

120 hours of "lock-up," according to the divine, is 120 hours of "the black hole" according to the gaoler. There is, however, no discord in their statements.

The Inspector in his report, says most audaciously, that this man's refusing came with