

associations are not without influence, but the doctrine is new that nations accept a king readily in proportion to the number of predecessors on the throne who have borne the same name. We have some recollection of a king whose subjects brought him to a woful end, although he was styled Louis XVIth, and the sovereign whose name in ages to come will be surrounded with the brightest corona of popular love, will be the first of her name in number as in glory—Victoria 1st. There are also two fatal defects in the assumption of the name of the new king being a charm; first, the fact that in Spain “reading and writing” do not follow Dogberry’s law and “come by nature,”—neither do they come by the ordinary process of study and practice. The vast mass of Spaniards are most innocent of the three R’s, and the history of their country’s kings is about the last thing they would care to read if they had the chance. This is perhaps well, for the last two Alfonsos are respectively famous for unpatriotic subserviency to Rome, for association with broils and quarrels which are not outrivalled in history for shamelessness and crime, and for restrictions of popular liberty such as led to that revolution in England which brought there what Spain now agonizes for the lack of—civil and religious liberty.

---

Monsignor Capel, the eminent proselytist of the Roman Catholic Church, has taken a step which we cannot understand—a false step we must believe at present. He has charged the Ritualists with “unconsciously teaching the doctrines and encouraging the practices” of his Church, and proved his indictment by confession of Canon Liddon, the Ritualistic champion. What can be gained by Mons. Capel doing this? What is his “game”? Certainly he does not wish to warn the Ritualists, or expose them in the Protestant interest, or seduce them by flattery, or repel them. He is too astute not to know that in vain is the net spread in sight of the bird; yet he tells these Ritualist high-flyers that they are walking in the meshes of the very net it is his business to set and draw in when the bird is past escape. Mons. Capel forgets

that the first books of devotion of a distinctly Roman Catholic type which were published for use by members of the Church of England, were compiled by priests of his own communion, who had the effrontery to officiate without license in a Protestant church by invitation of clergymen who had the more audacious effrontery to invite them as assistants. We testify in this matter what has been seen. We are well aware that a crucifix was on one occasion hung on the bed of a sick woman, a Protestant, by a clergyman who came to her as curate of the Church of England. He placed the bread, in administering the Sacrament, direct into the mouth of communicants. He refused to allow any layman to touch the cup. He preached in a Protestant church, announced the hours during which he would receive confessions, and read his manual of prayers and hymns compiled from Roman Catholic works for use in Protestant Sunday-schools. He was exposed. After his exposure and a visit from the Bishop, this same clergyman officiated at mass in his proper character as a priest of the Roman Catholic Church: in the same week he had worn the surplice, used the Book of Common Prayer, and preached in a church of another faith! The Church of England husbandman, looking out in amazement and consternation at these books full of anti-Protestant teaching as to the Holy Communion, the invocation of saints, prayers for the dead, the necessity of auricular confession to a priest, may well and most truthfully exclaim, “An enemy hath done this!” Mons. Capel makes either a great mistake or is perpetrating a joke in saying the Ritualist manuals “unconsciously” teach the doctrines of his Church. The right word, as he well knows, in some cases, should be—consciously, intentionally, but deceitfully. “*Facilis descensus Averni*,” the slope from Ritualism to Rome is greased with Jesuitical casuistry, and the bottom is hidden from view by the metaphysical fogs of Ultramontane theology. One strange feature of the recent Capel-Liddon controversy is, that Canon Liddon and others have set forth or de-