

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

A VISIT TO THE VATICAN.

BY THE REV. DONALD ROSS, B.D., LACHINE.

A little more than a month ago there came flashing across the sea from "the city of the seven hills," the message, "Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, is dead." The intelligence sent a shock of surprise through every heart. Every one who had a true appreciation of the grand results of his life-work—the consolidation of the Italian States into one kingdom, the establishment of responsible government, the adoption of a wise policy for the development of the resources of the country, the organization of a national system of education—received the news with profound sorrow. No reigning sovereign was more beloved by his subjects than he. He won their affections by his great public virtues, his sterling honesty, and his unflinching fidelity to the constitution, for which they gratefully styled him, "*Il Re Galantuomo*," (the honest king). They loved him because he had made the dreams and aspirations of poets, statesmen, and patriots through many centuries an accomplished fact, not from any selfish motives, but from love of country and of freedom. It was hard at first to believe that this stalwart, robust, healthy-looking man, who was every inch a king, had laid down his sceptre and made his exit from the stage on which he had played so distinguished a part. But it was too true. He was summoned away just when he had commenced to enjoy the fruits of his long and successful struggle after Italian unity. His body lies in the majestic, old Pantheon, which has survived the havoc twenty centuries has wrought upon the splendors of the Rome of the Augustan age. Peace be to his ashes!

The agitation produced by the king's death and funeral obsequies had not subsided, when another of the chief actors in the thrilling drama of Italian history was removed. It could not be said that Victor Emmanuel and Pius IX. were lovely in their lives, although it appears they cherished a secret admiration for each other, but in death they were scarcely divided. For the last twelve months the balance was trembling between life and death, and no one would have been surprised to have heard at any moment that the self-styled prisoner of the Vatican had been called away to answer for the deeds of a most eventful life. For among the many eminent occupants of the Pontifical chair, he was certainly one of the most remarkable. At the beginning of his Pontificate he was one of the most enthusiastic of the apostles of progress in Italy. He threw himself with passionate zeal into the strong tide of republicanism which was then sweeping over Europe, and rocking the monarchies with its violence. But he was almost petrified with horror, when he saw whither he was drifting, and realized that he was guiding the bark of St. Peter, whose helm had been placed in his hands, towards a frightful precipice. He reversed his course, and persistently struggled to the last to stem the rapid onward current of our nineteenth century civilisation. But he was engaged in a vain conflict. He was fighting against the stars in their courses, and they would not be stayed. "Through the ages one increasing purpose runs," and no "bulls" let loose from the Vatican could avail to thwart it. He gnashed his teeth with rage, but the world marched on, paying him not much heed. Science pursued her glorious career of discovery, philosophy went on her meditative way, endeavoring to define "first principles;" the spirit of freethought brooded over the nations, enfranchising the human mind from the bondage of priestly authority and superstition. Against the enlightening influence of these mighty agencies he strove to no purpose to roll back the darkness of mediævalism upon the world. But his Pontificate will be ever memorable for its audacious aggressiveness, its impious assumptions, its addition to the creed of the Church of the blasphemous dogmas of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and the infallibility of the successors of St. Peter, and not less for the overthrow of the temporal sovereignty. His eulogists assert with special emphasis, that during his *regime* the Church has prospered and become more influential in Germany, England, Canada, and the United States. The statement is unquestionably true regarding the last three countries; but in the land of Luther and of Bismarck, the Church has been shorn of much of its power by the latter, who has assumed an attitude of uncompro-

missing hostility against it, as the enemy of civil freedom and progress. The Bible has of late years been extensively circulated throughout the whole Papal domain, and the wide diffusion of the word of truth must be affecting the influence of the Church. It must be undermining the power of the priesthood over the consciences of the people. Plus IX. lived long enough to see the heresy of Protestantism flourishing under the very shadow of the Vatican, and evangelistic work vigorously carried on in many of the larger cities and towns of Italy. From his palatial prison, looking across the Tiber, he could perceive at least two Protestant places of worship within the walls of Rome, and the Scotch and English Churches without near the Porta de Popolo. The sight of them within this ancient preserve of Papacy must have embittered his life, and provoked many an anathema against the Government which guaranteed religious toleration to all denominations. He has gone to the grave, and one hundred and fifty millions who revered him as the true Vicar of Christ, sadly deplore his departure, while they have offered solemn masses, according to the magnificent ritual of the Church, for the repose of his soul. They must now be satisfied, one would think, that after life's fitful fever he sleeps well in the stucco coffer in St. Peter's, in which his body has been laid until the election of his successor. Whatever may be our judgment of him as the visible head of the Romish Church, we must honor his memory for his private virtues. His private life stands out in brilliant contrast to that of the large majority of his predecessors, though he had his weaknesses; as who has not. The future historian of the Popes must set him in the highest rank, for the purity of his character, and his bold and vigorous measures for the advancement of the interests of the Church, and strengthening its hold upon the world. The brilliant essayist, Macaulay, ventured the prediction that, when in the far-distant future, a New Zealand tourist, standing on a broken arch of London Bridge, shall sketch the ruins of St. Paul's, the Church which has seen the commencement of all the governments and ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world, may flourish in undiminished vigor. But I venture to think that its power is already on the wane, and that the aggressive attitude it has taken towards the spirit of modern freedom and progress under the administration of the deceased Pope, has precipitated a crisis which will, more speedily than is generally imagined, bring about the overthrow of this great spiritually despotic organisation which has during so many centuries been the curse of the world, and deaged it with the blood of the noblest and bravest of our race.

(To be continued.)

ARCHBISHOP LYNCH'S CONTROVERSIAL WORK. V.

On page 8 he says, "The Protestant Churches deny the necessity of good works, affirming that faith alone is all sufficient, consequently a man may live all his life without any works of charity." I defy his Grace to prove what he here says. He has but a very imperfect knowledge of the views of Protestants regarding good works. It is quite true that in one sense they "deny the necessity of good works, affirming that faith alone is all sufficient." They believe that, as regards meriting eternal life by them, good works—that is, those which God calls good—are *utterly worthless*. There is nothing more clearly taught in the word of God than this, that we cannot, in the least degree, merit heaven by our works. If we could do so, however little, we would have "whereof to glory." But Paul tells us that the gospel way of salvation excludes boasting (Romans iii. 27). He also says that eternal life is "the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord (vi. 23), and that we are saved by grace, through faith, and that not of ourselves it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast (Eph. ii. 8, 9). In the finished work of Christ alone, the Scriptures bid us trust for salvation. But Protestants believe that in another sense, good works are of *very great value*. Paul says that they who have believed in God should be careful to maintain good works (Titus iii. 8). The Epistle of James treats largely of the importance of good works. By good works we prove the reality of our faith in Christ and our love for Him—we do good to our fellow-beings—and glorify God in the world. Only by our words and actions can we let our light shine before men. Good works are not the *root* of salvation, but the *fruit* of it.

As Augustina very beautifully says, "We work not for life, but from life." None can do good works but he who is already saved. Faith is the source of all good works, but "he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." It is utterly impossible for the sinner to refrain from shedding abroad light and heat, because it has these in itself. It is utterly impossible for a thing which has life to refrain from showing it in one way and another. So it is with the Christian. We do not speak contemptuously of the plough, when we say that though it is of the greatest use for turning up the ground in order to receive the seed, it is utterly useless for reaping with. The *utter worthlessness* of good works on the one hand, and their *very great value* on the other, and consequently their true place with respect to our salvation, is a question of the utmost importance. Multitudes of those who profess to hold correct views on this point, are, in reality, very ignorant on it, owing to man's natural anxiety to be, at least in part, his own saviour. I would here notice what he says about good works on page 37: "Catholics believe that good works being the effects of the grace of God operating in their souls, are meritorious when joined with the merits of Christ, for atoning for their sins." In one part of this sentence, he and I, for once, perfectly agree. I refer to the sentiment that good works are the effects of God's grace working in men's souls. Of course then, of themselves, they cannot atone for sin. Even among men, future reformation does not atone for past transgression. But, according to the Archbishop, they are meritorious when joined to the merits of Christ. If, however, the merits of Christ be infinite, of what value are our works as regards merit? To add them to Christ's merits, is trying to increase the infinite by adding to it the finite. The poor Archbishop seems to be about as much in the dark regarding the way of salvation, as Nicodemus was regarding the new birth! To him also, the question may very properly be put, "Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" (John iii. 10).

Taking his words just as they stand, Protestants fully agree with him in his answer on page 10 to the question, "Is it true that no matter what church a man belongs to, if he is honest and well conducted he will be saved?" He says, "The truth announced by Christ should not be a matter of indifference to us, as it is not to God himself who will condemn the unbelievers. He who believeth not shall be damned." The same is true of his answer (page 11), to the question, "Is a man honest in all respects when he merely pays his debts and is just to his neighbor, and most unjust to God?" He says, "Men who are honest to their neighbor, but who pay no worship or honor to God, pride themselves on being upright, wherein they only perform half their duty." The same is true of the following passage on page 16, "Many persons join religious denominations with far less thought and care than they take to buy a horse. The affair of salvation is the most serious business of earth, 'What will it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?'"

Many effigy Protestants, as I may call them, say that the spirit and teaching of the Romish Church are very different from what they have been. The Archbishop does not take that as a compliment to his Church. I would direct the attention of the Protestants of whom I speak, to the following passage on page 11. The italics are my own. There he says, "The Catholic Church was founded by Christ himself, who with infinite wisdom gave it laws and doctrines; therefore there can be no improvement made. The Catholic Church has been always the same from the beginning and will be the same to the end of time." If thus, she seems to be more liberal than she once was, it is simply because she sees that her liberty is lessened.

On pages 12-14, his Grace gives eleven points of difference between Roman Catholics and Protestants. I can notice only one or two. He says, "Protestants acknowledge as many heads as there are denominations, and sections of denominations." There he shews great ignorance. He says, "Protestants admit women to preach contrary to the order of St. Paul," etc. This many Protestants do not. He says, "The Catholic Church obliges her children to fast after the example of Christ and His apostles The Protestants do not require any fasting, except perhaps one day in the year, holding that it is at any rate pleasing to God." Christ and His apostles did not fast by eating fish on certain days; eating eggs though refusing to eat hatched ones, that is fowls; and supping soup