

JESUITISM.

(Continued.)

This extract from "Cases of Conscience," by Escobar, a Jesuit, citing as his authority Suarez, their greatest philosopher and theologian, will be sufficient to show what is meant by their doctrine of probabalism. The confessor takes upon himself to judge of what may be the probable consequence of punishing the penitent, or even of enlightening him. The doctrine that a spiritual adviser had perhaps better not instruct his penitent as to whether his conduct is sinful or not, for fear the penitent should knowingly continue in the way of evil, is, we fear, more startling than edifying. The principle of mental reservation has been often commented upon and so often denied by the apologists of the Jesuits, that we cannot resist quoting the words of Sanchez: "It is permitted to use ambiguous terms, leading people to understand them in a different sense from that in which we understand them. A man may swear that he never did such a thing (though he actually did it), meaning within himself that he did not do it on such a day, or before he was born, or understanding any such circumstances, while the words which he employs have no such sense as would discover his meaning." And Filiutius proves that in so speaking one does not even lie, because, says he: "It is the intention that determines the quality of the action; and one may avoid falsehood if, after saying aloud, *I swear that I have not done that*, he add in a low voice, *to-day*; or after saying aloud, *I swear*, he interpose in a whisper, *that I say*, and then continue aloud, *that I have done that*, and this is telling the truth." Such a doctrine, of course, needs

no comments, and if generally followed would do away with the trouble of putting witnesses through the form of taking the oath in courts of justice. And the same equivocation which they preached they did not hesitate to practice on the most solemn and important occasions, even in the administration of the sacraments,—so much so as to bring themselves under severe censure from the Court of Rome, even before their suppression. The cause of displeasure was, that in their Indian missions in Mysore and on the Malabar and Carnatic coasts, to curry favor with the Brahmins, they mingled the ceremonies of Brahma with those of the Roman Catholic Church, going so far as to consecrate burnt cow-dung, held in much veneration by all Brahmins, laying the ashes on the altar near the crucifix or the image of the Virgin, and afterwards distributing them among the congregation. They moreover, by their own showing, disguised the name of the cross, changed completely the time and mode of baptism, and refused the sacraments of confession and communion to pariahs. In fact, to suit themselves, they instituted and practiced a new religion of their own, half Brahmin, half Christian. These excesses were complained of at Rome by other missionaries, who having refused to lend themselves to such abominations had been ill-used and driven out by the natives. The matter was enquired into, several nuncios sent, orders issued from Rome and completely derided and set at defiance, until at last, in 1741, Benedict XIV. published against them a terrible bull, in which he describes them as what they always have been,