

regulate their consciences, who have misquoted, mistranslated, and misinterpreted this document. Writers in the United States have had the hazardous dishonesty to select sentences and place them in a succession which they do not hold in the letter, so as to produce an impression upon readers different, and sometimes entirely opposed to the author's. Others, like the 'Christian Messenger,' have perverted the meaning of various passages—others mistranslated them—and scarcely has one neutral party had the candour to expose the hidden trait, by which public happiness might be destined to destruction.

It is true that the Pope, as HEAD OF THE CHURCH, has prohibited the circulation of *spurious* scriptures—or what might be *spurious* scriptures.

It is true that as a Temporal Prince he has prohibited the public dissemination of Sedition.

It is true that he condemned the efforts of the 'Christian League,' formed at New York, and whose operation had for their object these two things.

But it is *FALSE* that His Holiness prohibited directly or impliedly, the circulation of the Bible in circumstances where the circulation of it should be useful.

Here we would close, but that it may be useful to make an observation on the general circulation of the scriptures.—The charity is misplaced, which obscures its imprudent dogmatism upon men, whose sources of instruction are as pure and as numerous as those of zealots. Such charity we fear, only assumes the "form of an angel of light." It seldom—indeed never succeeds in its object—and it leaves an inheritance of social heart-burning and rancour behind it.

In Italy these men sought to circulate the Scriptures. Even though the sacred Volume was as integral as it came from the pens of the Evangelists, the Act of the 'Christian League' was an assumption, that the Church and the Prince had violated the Christian Constitution and had *had no right to reign*. Ought the State have permitted such a public assumption to be made? Would it have been wise to permit it? We think not. Then passiveness on the part of the Pope would be, to permit the office of Religious instruction to pass from the Clergy into the hands of an unappointed and unauthorised republican rabble. Would it have been promotive of public order if he had done so?—There is no man of common sense in the world who would not reply in the negative. Heaven forbid that we should see the day when public licentiousness will attack our QUEEN's title to her Throne—and that men should call the coercion of treason an invasion of National Liberty. This would be turning the food of life into Poison, indeed.

It is not only an assumption of the Church's neglect, when persons thus presume to enter our sanctuary even with a Bible—but it is an insinuation of the falsehood of our belief. When a Catholic once concludes upon reasonable or scriptural grounds that the church is *infallible*, he submits, entirely, to her teaching. He is sure that she will neither neglect nor deceive him. This is his FAITH. When a man comes up to a Catholic with a Bible he supposes that the Catholic Church does not teach him a sufficiency of Faith or does not teach him truly—and in either case he covertly asks him to abandon her. We say so much to shew some zealous, but misjudging persons, how impossible it is without insulting us or openly attempting proselytism, to be running round with Tracts and Bibles—turning their reverence for the Gospel into a vain superstition.

Our separated friends should always remember this:—It is *their* principle to *teach themselves* from the Bible. It is *our* principle to be *taught by the Church*. According to ours we may have one or may not. To suppose we *ought necessarily* to have one, which their zeal implies—suppose we ought to "turn" Protestants—or being Catholics, that we ought to adopt Protestant principles.—Now the first supposition is an insult—the second an absurdity.

The Pope in his letter seems to think that if CHRIST had intended indiscriminate circulation of the Bible, as the only means for propagating Christianity—more than one in a hundred should know how to read—Bibles should not have

been impossible to nine hundred thousand out of ten, for fifteen hundred years—and the world should have been blessed with the art of printing, and "Bible Societies" long before. Agreeing as we do with His Holiness, we think he served the "Christian League" as he should have served it.

According to their principle—every man should possess a Bible.

We, Catholics, have a most unbounded respect for the Bible. We think, however, that there are things in it difficult to be understood. St. Peter said so. His successor Gregory the XVI, says so, in this Letter. Indeed the quantity of division which has resulted in *Eight Hundred Christian Sects*, shew that there must be some obscurities, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction.—Practically, *some* must be falsifying the Revelations of God. Now we think that if we can get a code of Doctrine and morals, already selected out of this difficult book,—selected by men in whom we can confide—men of holiness, erudition and deep study,—we act more usefully and more reasonably, in placing such a code in the hands of ignorant men and boys, than if we should send them to spell the mysteries of the Apocalypse, or lose themselves in the abstruse Doctrines of St. Paul. We give them Catechisms—and explain to them the Gospel, just as the Apostles did to those who have gone before us.

Hence then we hope that every reasonable and thinking Christian man will see, that public policy—Christian obligation—Catholic principle—and Catholic views of the philosophy of the question justified—nay, demanded the course adopted by the Pope. As the Pastor of the Faithful he was obliged to see that they were not led to poisoned waters—he was obliged to condemn everything which was *not submitted to him*. As a Prince he was obliged to repress *sedition*. As a Priest he was obliged to resist the transition of the People from the hands of their legitimate instructors to those of irresponsible fanatics. As a Catholic he was obliged to condemn the presumption that the possession of a Bible was *necessary*—and as the successor of the APOSTLES, he only repeated the words of one of their earliest disciples, St. Tertullian who lived in the year 182. "Non ad Scripturas provocandum est, nec in his constituendum est certamen, in quibus aut nulla aut incerta est victoria aut par incertitudo. Non periclitor dicere ipsas Scripturas sic esse ex Dei voluntate dispositas ut Hæreticis materiam subministrarent cum legum oportet Hæreses esse."

We ought not to appeal to the Scriptures, nor in them constitute the conflict, in which there is no victory, or the victory is indecisive or nearly so. . . . I do not fear to say that the scriptures themselves are so disposed as to supply matter for heretics, since I can read, that '*Hæreses must come*' which without the Scriptures would be impossible."

By the following our friends in the "Messenger" will see that public liberty in England is likely to be considerably exposed. Most of these gentlemen, too, mentioned in the following article are *converts* to Catholicity. If Scott Murray could spare time from Parliament and the descendant of the great Talbot's would join him in a transatlantic expedition, the M. P. might be reconverted and the nobleman awakened to the error of his ways—or perhaps the Editor of the "Messenger" might get himself "designated" to England, and save that country from the combination of pious Puseyism, and profuse popish expenditure;

#### CHURCH BUILDING IN ENGLAND.

Churches are in course of completion, being, and about to be erected in the following places: London—Two churches by Pugin and Scoles; Convent of Mercy, by Pugin; Convent of Mercy,