

opinions had begun to be spread about in Germany by Luther and others, and had found their way to a considerable degree into England. Cranmer himself as he afterwards declared, was, during all this time, a Protestant in his heart, disbelieving many Catholic doctrines, more especially that of our Lord's real presence in the blessed Sacrament of the Altar. But this was not at all the case with Henry himself. He hated Luther most cordially, against whom he had once written a book, and all the new doctrines of the Reformers. In his own wicked life he disregarded all the obligations of religion, and he had no wish to make any change at all in the religious belief of the people, except in the one point of his own spiritual supremacy. But to take out one stone of the spiritual building is to endanger the whole, and the English Church began to fall to pieces much faster than Henry could put it together again. He set about it, however, with his old tools, the axe and the halberd, to which he now added another, the stake; for while he hanged and disembowelled Catholics for refusing to take the oath of supremacy, at the same time he burnt Protestants to death for denying the real presence in the blessed Sacrament: Cranmer all the while assisting in both the hangings and the burnings, though he had himself once taken an oath of obedience to the Pope, and though he himself totally disbelieved that very doctrine of the real presence; and so the work of murder went on, until the country almost perished under the fearful tyranny.

Truly has it been said, then, even by a Protestant writer, that the so-called Reformation in England was a work "begun in lust, strengthened by plunder, and cemented with blood." We have not space here to trace its further progress; suffice it to say, that it went on according to this beginning; and surely you have heard enough already, to enable you to make your own comparisons between the Christianity of Augustin and Ethelbert, and that of Cranmer and King Henry VIII., at least as far as concerns the means and the persons whereby it was introduced into this country.

THE REV. MR. MACLACHLAN'S LECTURES AT FALKIRK.

(From the Glasgow Free Press.)

"Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and speak all that is evil against you, falsely, for my sake."—Mat. v. 11.

Sufferings and persecutions have, in every age, fallen to the lot of the children of God. Christ himself suffered and was persecuted; his apostles and their successors, the whole body of the faithful, were, during three long centuries, subjected to the most cruel persecution. Nor did the cruelties so unjustly inflicted on these men excite any surprise in them—nor was their faith shaken, or their patience exhausted; they neither murmured nor repined—they looked upon the "sorrows of the saints" as a matter of course. "Christ," said they, "our master, suffered, and we are His disciples—we are in union with Him—we are, so to speak, one with Him, feeding daily, as we do, on His sacred flesh, and quenching the thirst of our souls with His precious blood; we are other Christs. As He suffered then, so shall we—as He died for us, so we should not hesitate to lay down our life for Him.—Happy we if we can show, by suffering for His sake, that he did not suffer in vain for us!" Ah, these men, our forefathers in the faith, when they thought and spoke thus, proved how well they understood those words of their crucified Lord, "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and shall persecute you, and shall speak all that is evil against you, falsely, for my sake."

The Catholics of these kingdoms have, as every one knows, been long subject to persecution for their ancient and holy creed. The penal laws enacted against us were, and still are, a disgrace to the nation; and, even now, when these laws have been for the most part repealed, we cannot flatter ourselves that our sufferings are at an end. It is true our enemies can no longer shed our blood, or confiscate our property, or drive us, as they drove our ancestors, from our native country. Still they do not cease to persecute us; and, in their malice, they inflict upon us the most cruel and the most incurable of all wounds, those of the slanderer's tongue. They speak all manner of evil against us, falsely; they describe us as disloyal subjects, useless citizens, and men of inferior mould. Our religion, according to them, is an odious compound of outward splendor and inward meanness and corruption, a bastard Christianity, an idolatry equally gross and degrading, and scarcely less criminal, than the heathen worship of old. These, and a thousand other iniquities, are laid to our charge; and this is that persecution which we are now subjected to—a persecution, perhaps, more intolerable than that which sheds blood, and confiscates property, and sends worthy citizens into unmerited exile. And let me not be told that such persecutions do not now take place, and that the hardships of which Catholics complain exist only in imagination. I will show that this is not the case, and that our complaints are but too well founded. I will illustrate this truth by referring to the 'Lecture on Popery' delivered in this town only a few days ago by a well known traitor to the Catholic cause, and a notorious slanderer of the Catholic Church—of which, he still says, he is a member, and of which he once was, alas, an unworthy minister. The ravings of this wretched foreigner are but the echo of native bigotry, and they express but too faithfully the feelings of a large portion of the community. Gavazzi (for you are aware that it is to him that I allude) aided and abetted our persecutors here by urging against us, in one portion of his discourse, as inserted in the *Falkirk Herald* of 13th Nov., the old calumnies of our enemies, and in another by inventing a few others more to his own taste. Four distinct classes of persons were furiously assailed by this infatuated man. The Sovereign Pontiff, Cardinal Wiseman, the Jesuits, and, lastly, the whole Catholic body.

1st. The Sovereign Pontiff.—Against the Pope, Gavazzi declaims or the plea that he dared "to parcel out Great Britain, and to appoint territorial bishops therein." This, says Gavazzi, might pass in Catholic countries, but in Protestant England it was "an invasion on the rights of the British Crown and British people." All his Holiness could do here was to appoint vicars-apostolic, who would derive their titles from some outlandish place, far from the British shores, and perhaps unknown to the British people; and these

vicars were all that the Catholics of this country required for the "free and full exercise of their worship." In other respects, "the glorious liberty of conscience legally possessed in England" secured the Catholic body from everything in the shape of persecution.—But this would not satisfy the ambition of Rome. Pio Nono must "exhibit his glory to England, and bring her once more under the debasing yoke of spiritual despotism." This was the crime of that Pio Nono, who was a great tyrant at home—who fled from his capital merely to escape the bloody swords of Gavazzi's friends—who introduced the French troops into Italy to reign in his stead, and who sent to our Great Exhibition only "some little statuary, some gems, some mosaics, and twelve bishops and archbishops, with a cardinal at their head." So says Gavazzi.—But it is consoling to think that, in support of these charges, he can adduce, not the holy Scriptures, not any arguments from inspiration, but the very fallible and too famous letter of Lord John Russell, and the commentaries of the English press, and the vile fabrications of his own imagination. Gavazzi tells us that we should be contented with vicars-apostolic; and our reply is, that we do not ask his opinion about our religious wants. A man who can dispense with a religion and form of worship himself, cannot be supposed to be very well qualified to decide with regard to the spiritual necessities of others. As to his holiness parcelling out England, and dividing it among his bishops, we may say that this is an imaginary crime, against which the British Senate have endeavored in vain to legislate. The Pope sought not one penny of British gold—nor claimed one shovelful of British soil—nor interfered with the right of the British Queen to make Protestant bishops, the only kind of bishops the laws of Britain enable her to create. On the other hand, the Catholics of England, in virtue of that "religious freedom" of which Gavazzi says they are "legally possessed," have an inherent right to have Catholic bishops, deriving a title—a merely spiritual one—from the place in which they perform their episcopal functions. The Catholics of Birmingham may have a Bishop of Birmingham, and those of Plymouth a Bishop of Plymouth, and the Catholics of every other town may have a bishop of each town, without invading the rights of their Protestant fellow-subjects, who, at the same time, are at perfect liberty to have as many Protestant bishops as they choose.—The episcopal functions are of a spiritual nature; and it was spiritual powers alone, which do not come under the control of the British Crown, that the Pope imparted to his bishops and his illustrious cardinal. Had he sought to make them peers of this realm, and to endow them with some thousands of British money, then, indeed, might people begin to complain of their rights being invaded, and of foreign interference, and insolence, and ambition, and other things of this kind. So true is all this, that the British Parliament, when attempting to legislate against this alleged invasion on the part of the Pope, enacted a law which is not observed—which the Catholics declare they will not observe—and the observance of which cannot be enforced unless by depriving them of that "religious freedom" of which they are said to be "legally possessed," and to which Gavazzi refers in such poisonous language. As to the other charges against the Pope, alluded to by Gavazzi, they are below contempt. His flight from Rome was the consequence of popular excesses, committed by Gavazzi's own friends; and he did not leave his palace until his life was in imminent danger, and until some of his faithful servants were shot down by his side. And did not Gavazzi himself fly from Rome when all was peaceable there? taking flight to himself, and verifying the words of the wise man, "The wicked flee, when no man pursueth."—Proverbs, xxviii., 1. With regard to the poor display said to be made by the Pope at the Great Exhibition, verily this is a strange accusation. The Catholic countries of Europe appeared there to great advantage, and Italy, among others, shone conspicuously in various departments. If there was any deficiency on the part of the Papal subjects in particular, this may be accounted for by the revolutionary state in which their country has been long kept by the machinations of that party to which Gavazzi belongs.

2d. Cardinal Wiseman.—From abusing the Pope, Gavazzi naturally proceeds to abuse one whom he feigns to consider as the Papal "Ambassador" in England—Cardinal Wiseman. Against this illustrious prelate and most learned divine the foul-mouthed apostate inveighs in no measured terms, pouring out, without shame and without remorse, the most slanderous accusations. The extreme virulence of his calumnies is the best refutation of them. We shall quote his words; they cannot be quietly listened to without exciting indignation in every generous bosom:—"Cardinal Wiseman," exclaims Gavazzi, "in all his pomp and glare of outward splendor, was he, think you, a successor of the apostles? was he a fit representative of the meekness and gentleness, the temperance, the holiness, of Jesus Christ? nay, was he not the fitting representative of the pride, the impiety, the rancor, the malignity of the Court of Satan? Yes, or Satan. Look at the recent bloodshed at Liverpool—the murder of a policeman—in connection with this very Papal aggression. And what had this Cardinal Wiseman done? He had approved of this diabolical deed. Cardinal Wiseman had stood, as it were, to gather in his hands the blood of this murdered Protestant, and had therewith baptised the Papal aggression and his cardinalate." Gavazzi's notions of Cardinal Wiseman's alleged moral deficiencies are but the foul suspicions of a foul mind—the rash judgments of an unfaithful servant with regard to a fellow-servant; while his assertion that the Cardinal approved of bloodshed in Liverpool, or, indeed, anywhere else, is an odious and unmitigated calumny. There is not one word of truth in the whole of this most uncharitable tirade, as every one knows who is in any way acquainted with the illustrious Cardinal. But, while talking of bloodshed, I would ask of Gavazzi, How many innocent men have in Italy fallen under the knife of those base and bloody assassins, hired by his own political friends, from the day when Count Rossi, the Papal Minister, was stabbed in the street, to the hour when he came to horrify the peaceable inhabitants of Falkirk by the atrocities said to have been approved of by Cardinal Wiseman? Who, I would ask, has shed most blood on the continent during the last three years? Gavazzi, and Mazzini, and the other revolutionists, can best answer this question; the cruelties of these men are crying to heaven for vengeance.

3d. The Jesuits.—When Gavazzi had malign'd, as far as in him lay, the words, and actions, and even the secret thoughts, of Cardinal Wiseman, he threw himself with characteristic fury on the Jesuits—these worst used of all ill-used men. He attacks the Jesuits in Rome, and he attacks them in England; and, having

vilified and slandered to his heart's content the real and professed members of the Society of Jesus, he next falls foul of the Puseyites, who, he assures us, are for the most part Jesuits in disguise. Gavazzi's hatred of the Jesuits is cordial—nothing can exceed it—but there is a way of accounting for this, and I will let you into the secret. For the last three centuries the Jesuits have acted a conspicuous part on the stage of this world. Their object—the end of their institution, as a religious body, was to instruct youth—to preach the gospel at home, and to carry it into foreign countries; and never did any society of men accomplish more perfectly than they did the task imposed upon them. Of all teachers of youth they have ever been the very best; and of all missionaries they have been the most zealous, the most laborious, and the most successful; while, at home, they have been the ablest and most staunch defenders of the religion of Jesus Christ. The wicked world could not forgive the Jesuits the possession of so much talent and the practice of such eminent virtue—it hated them, it slandered them; it persecuted them, it conspired their ruin; and, for a while, it effected its evil purposes by causing them to be ejected from every Catholic country, and finally suppressed. This was the triumph of infidelity, which ever beheld in the Jesuits its most formidable opponents. But the joy of the wicked was not to last for ever. The Holy See revived the Jesuit Order, about the end of the late wars; and from that time to this they have been assiduously performing their glorious mission—defending Christianity as formerly, and suffering for it. They are now, as they have ever been, the butt of the infidel party; hence they are honored with Gavazzi's hatred, and bespattered with his foul abuse. I think I can best illustrate what I have been here stating by a quotation from a well-known author, the late Professor Robinson, of Edinburgh. This good and learned man published a work, towards the close of the last century, in which he collected "proofs of a conspiracy against all the religions and Governments of Europe, carried on in the secret meetings of Freemasons, Illuminati, and other reading societies." At page 82 of this most interesting volume, he tells what means the conspirators took to accomplish their nefarious purpose. They did what Gavazzi did here only a few days ago—they denounced the Jesuits as very bad men, and then passed off as a Jesuit every one whom they sought to ruin. Listen to Professor Robinson, and you will be convinced that Gavazzi and the German conspirators against Christianity are very closely allied. "They (the conspirators) proscribed all religion whatever, and openly taught the doctrines of materialism and atheism. Most of these innovations were the work of Protestant divines. . . . But no man contributed more than Nicholai, an eminent and learned bookseller in Berlin. . . . He fell upon a very safe method of rendering the orthodox writers disagreeable to the public, by representing them as abettors of superstition, and as secret Jesuits. He asserted that the abolition of the Order of Loyola is only apparent. The brethren still retained their connection, and most part of their property, under the secret patronage of Catholic princes. They are, therefore, in every corner, in every habit and character, working, with unwearied zeal, for the restoration of their empire. He raised a great alarm, and made a journey through Germany hunting for Jesuits, and for this purpose became Freemason and Rosicrucian. . . . His journey was published in several volumes, and is full of frightful Jesuitisms. This man, as I have said, found the greatest success in his method of slandering the defenders of Bible-Christianity by representing them as concealed Jesuits. But, not contented with open discussion, he long ago published a sort of romance, called "Sebalduis Nothanker," in which these divines are introduced under feigned names, and made as ridiculous and detestable as possible. All this was a good trading job. . . . Now, is not Gavazzi another Nicholai, raised from the grave and perambulating England as he formerly journeyed thro' Germany, trading on slander, and, as Professor Robinson says, making an excellent 'job' of it? I may be told that Gavazzi is no infidel nor Atheist. One hardly knows what he is—he has ceased to be a Catholic, and declares himself to be no Protestant. One thing certain is, that, like Nicholai, he abuses the Jesuits, and holds up to execration nearly all the Catholic clergy, and some of the Protestant divines too, as so many vile Jesuits. He everywhere denounces the defenders of Bible-Christianity. He finds Jesuits in all places—in England, in Scotland, in our town and country, in our schools and universities—even in Oxford itself. Now, the truth is, that there is not now, and there has not been for many years, a single resident Jesuit in the whole of broad Scotland—there is none in Edinburgh, none in Paisley, none in Greenock, none anywhere—so that to serve his purpose, to push his trade, Gavazzi here asserts what he knows to be untrue; and this is the man whom so many delight to honor! The fact is, Gavazzi, to raise the alarm, delivers orations, as his prototype Nicholai wrote romances, "full of frightful Jesuitisms." In this spirit and with these base motives, he attributes to the Jesuits all the misfortunes and crimes of the country, even the last riots at Greenock, of which the supposed Jesuits, that is the Catholics, were the victims, and not the originators or perpetrators. Anything, then, more untrue than what Gavazzi advances, both with regard to the presence of Jesuits in this country and the crimes which he lays to their charge, can scarcely be imagined. Is not this enough to show that this crafty foreigner was perpetrating a practical joke when he exclaimed, with so much apparent earnestness in the parish church of Falkirk, "O Knox! O Knox! foremost in the battle for the truth, what feelings would affect thy soul to witness Popery rearing its front in thine own Scotland—to see Jesuits in Scotland—Jesuits in Greenock—Jesuits in Paisley—Jesuits in Perth—Jesuits in Glasgow—Jesuits everywhere?" This was a bitter sarcasm on the part of Gavazzi—well did he know when he uttered these words that, although wholly untrue, they would produce the desired effect on his credulous and alarmed hearers.—This was so much in the way of trade, and he cared for nothing besides.

4th. Let us now notice his fourth and last charge: it is levelled at the whole Catholic Church and the entire Catholic body. According to Gavazzi, "Popery" degrades and ruins nations. This he illustrates in the following manner:—"The history of nations resembled the revolutions of a wheel, constantly turning and turning. Italy was once at the top of the wheel—the foremost nation in the world; but, alas! she had sunk and sunk into utter degradation, and the weighty influences that have pressed her down have been superstition, then idolatry, then spiritual despotism, so that lower she could not lie." Against this superstition and idolatry the orator warns the people of Britain—

"People of Britain," says he, with much emphasis, "listen to the voice of warning. Britain, without Popery, stands now at the summit of the wheel, the first of nations. In enterprise, commerce, and moral influence, and above all, in the possession of entire religious freedom, there is no country like her on the whole face of the earth. But beware, men of Britain!—people of Scotland, beware!—the wheel may turn, and Romish bishops, Cardinal Wiseman, the Jesuits with their chicanery, the masked disciples of Dr. Pusey, these are instruments which, through culpable sloth on your part, may tell with fearful effect in the overthrow of Britain's glory, and the extinction of the brightest of all her blessings—religious liberty."

However well these fine words may sound, it needs only one moment's cool reflection to perceive how void they are of heaven-born truth, and how full of human sophistry. Let us analyse them, let us weigh them, and we shall find them light as chaff. The burden of Gavazzi's song is, that Protestantism has made England the first of nations—that to Protestantism she owes her commerce, her spirit of enterprise, and the blessings of religious liberty. Now, I have no objections to illustrate the rise and fall of nations by the turning of the wheel; but I deny that the wheel is moved by the power of religion; or, in other words, that the true religion secures to those who are in possession of it the superiority in temporal affairs over other nations whose worship may be less pure. I maintain that nations, like families and individuals, have their beginning and their end—their ups and downs—their culminating point of prosperity, from which they fall to rise not again. This is the very law of nature; and history is at hand to prove that this law has everywhere ruled supreme. Do we not read how, in times of yore, the Assyrians flourished, and then the Babylonians, and then the wise people of Egypt? Have we not read of the mighty empire of the Persians and Medes, of the Grecian republics, and the Kingdom of Macedon, with its mighty Alexander? Then came the Romans, the mightiest of all, who subdued all. Now, all these nations were heathens—they adored false gods; yet each in their turn were warlike, great, and prosperous; and, meanwhile, the people of God, the chosen people, who alone knew and worshipped the true God, were, comparatively speaking, a poor, and paltry, and obscure nation, confined to a small spot of the earth, utter strangers to what we call enterprise and commerce, scarcely known to other nations, and despised by such as knew them. At last this chosen race, of whom the Saviour was to be born, was subdued by the pagan legions of Rome, and held by them in cruel bondage. Yet all the while they worshipped—and then, of all the nations of the earth, they alone worshipped—the true God. This worship, this true religion, did not, however, place them on the top of the wheel. No; their creed, the only true one, was one cause of their depression; it made them odious to the Gentiles, who united against them to crush them. It is clear, then, that Gavazzi's theory does not hold good if tried by the criterion of ancient history. Nor will it appear to more advantage if tried by that experience which the knowledge of modern history affords. Let us see.—Spain and Portugal, France and Austria, are among the principal Catholic nations of Europe. Now, each of these, in its turn, was great and glorious, and that more especially when they were most Catholic. Portugal was at one time, under the great Emmanuel, one of the leading powers of Europe. Spain, under Charles V., was the most powerful monarchy on the face of the earth. France and Austria are still in the first rank of nations. England, a Protestant nation, is, I am happy to say, in the zenith of its fame and prosperity; but, observe, England owes its blessings to its institutions, to its constitution, to its fundamental laws, and all these are of Catholic origin. Protestant England adopted all that Catholic England had found conducive to prosperity; for you are not to imagine that the greatness of England dates from the Reformation. England, even now, owes much to the faith of which a libidinous prince deprived it; and Macaulay goes so far as to say that it would be hard to decide whether the south of Britain be most deeply indebted to Catholicism or to Protestantism. Gavazzi warns us against Popery, as being subversive of our country's glory, and hostile to its commercial prosperity; and I reply to this foreign quack in the words of an eloquent and intelligent Englishman—W. J. Fox, of London—"England was great and glorious while her religion was Popery. She then reared her head above the nations, outstripped them all in the career of improvement, and soared above them towards the heaven of liberty. The great charter of her freedom was then wrested from unwilling power, commerce and manufactures were raising her citizens, burgesses, and merchants, to wealth and intelligence, and placing them side by side with the barons; while, from contending elements, arose the harmony of representative government."—(Lectures, p. 49). Notwithstanding Gavazzi's authority, and in the face of it, every one must see that England was great while yet Catholic. She has, indeed, been growing in greatness, and long may her prosperity endure; yet, still, we cannot help foreseeing that, like all besides, this too will have its limits. Like the stately oaks of her own noble forests, she herself will one day wither and decay. Her Protestantism will not save her. Holland, Denmark, Sweden, are all Protestant nations, and they are all on the decline; they are not what they once were, when Holland competed with England, and when Sweden shook the Austrian and the Russian thrones.

As a further proof that Catholicism is not accountable for the rise and fall of states, here is Russia, whose religion is more superstitious than any Protestant can imagine Catholicism itself to be, and whose government is more despotic than that of any Catholic State—here is Russia, great and glorious as England, and making more rapid progress in civilization, in the arts and sciences, in commerce and manufactures than England herself. Russia, however, owes nothing to Protestantism—her religion is more nearly allied to that of Rome than to that of Great Britain. According to Gavazzi, Russia ought not to meet with that success which has long marked her astonishing career. But the truth is, Gavazzi was talking nonsense all the time, and he knew it; he came into these parts, not to instruct the people, but to flatter and to fleece them—to fill his pockets at the expense of their anti-Catholic fanaticism. Hence the slanderous accusations urged so vehemently by him against us Catholics, and which I hope I have successfully repelled.

And now, let me ask, although we feel no difficulty in refuting these false charges, is not the fact of our being subjected to them itself a cruel persecution? If this be the land of perfect religious freedom, why are Catholics harassed, tormented, driven sometimes almost to despair, by the vilest calumnies? Why are