

weighty charges against them. It was yet for the friends of the unhappy Mary to learn how the craft of Wallington could mix her with the most criminal portion of Babington's rash designs. As to the premature discovery of the proposed attempt of Lord Dacre and his friends, the Percy and the Nevill, it had been developed—chiefly by the cunning espionage of Bertha Allen, and the shameful treachery of Rudolph, who, the moment he found a possibility of danger to himself, revealed the whole design, and threw the blame of its concealment upon the spy, Mistress Allen.

Gertrude meanwhile had scarce listened to this recital: She was absorbed in sorrow for her father, who spoke as one whose hours on earth were numbered. His endearments even—the fond pressure of his cold damp hand—the praises which he lavished on her dauntless journey to the North—all served only to pierce her heart with a deeper sorrow. She thought on the splendors of Elizabeth and Leicester, and then looking to her father's low couch and dreary place of shelter, the bitterness of her repining spirit found a tongue.

"Are these the rewards of virtue? Oh, my father, why are you stretched here in misery to die while your foes are still triumphant, while the power of wickedness prevails?"

"Forbear, my daughter," said the aged Prior Alban; "weigh not the Divine wisdom in the balance with thy filial grief, lest of a virtue you make a fault."

"And, my Gertrude," said John Harding, "impugn not in my behalf that retribution which is just. If pity has been denied to me, there was a time when I was pitiless; nay, towards a miserable object, meet only for compassion, for long years did I nourish nought but cruelty and scorn. Oh, blessed be that heaven which, though it has stricken, gives me grace to feel the justice of the blow; and blessed be that mercy which has brought thee to my couch, whose charitable spirit may yet, perhaps, in part repair the evil to which thy father's pride and cruelty gave birth! A mournful secret, my Gertrude, must I now disclose. The time was when I had a sister—an innocent, beautiful sister. Oh, how proud was I of that beauty which was her bane!"

"Your sister, my father!" exclaimed Gertrude, as all the horrors of the preceding evening seemed pressing her again. "Oh, your unhappy sister! might now may benefit her on earth?"

"Do you know—have you seen her?" said John Harding in a hollow tone, raising himself on his couch, and fixing his falling eyes on the countenance of his daughter. "Oh, did she tell how I, who had so loved her, spurned her harshly from my feet, and hurled her back to ruin and to Leicester? And, more than all, did she tell how, by a horrible mistake, the dagger of the false Lord drank my brother's blood for mine? Oh, my dear brother—my blooming, bright-haired Edmund! Ill was the oath I took that your ashes should never find a grave till I had avenged your death, with that of your unfortunate sister. More evil it was when for years I mourned only that I could not, to execute that oath, find the retreat to which she had been conveyed."

"But more charitable dispositions, my son, have I hope, in later years been fostered in your heart," said the Prior.

"My heart did indeed, too late awaken, father, to better thoughts," replied John Harding, "and the dearest proof of her affection which my daughter can now bestow will be in the promise of pity and Christian kindness to my betrayed and ill-fated Euphrasia."

"Alas, my father," murmured Gertrude, "kindness or cruelty will in this world affect your sister no more; but may it be some slight solace to your sorrow to know that her dying head was pillowed on the bosom of your child—that her winding-sheet was folded up by your daughter's hand?"

"Severe is the justice of Heaven," moaned John Harding, "and my repentance is too late. Oh, my Gertrude, when was it that you so attended on your miserable aunt, tell me and the cause of her death?"

"Last night, father, did she depart," answered Gertrude. She hesitated to reply to the latter portion of the question; but John Harding reiterated it, charging her on her duty to deceive him not.

"Alas, my father," said Gertrude, "she had swallowed poison, administered, I fear me, by the Earl."

"Oh, Euphrasia—oh, my sister!" groaned John Harding; then, after a bitter pause, he turned to the Prior, and asked "if there might be mercy for him who had shown no mercy to a sister?"

"Alas! my son," answered Alban, "it was indeed a grievous fault; but who will say there is no mercy for any sinner who repenteth?"

"And mine own time on earth vanisheth away," said John Harding, "and I am vainly once more witness the celebration of those holy mysteries which the hard decrees of Elizabeth deny to the suffering children of the faith."

"And even now, my son, was I about to propose their celebration," said Basil, who had left the crypt on the entrance of Lord Dacre and Gertrude, but who now returned thither, followed by Father Hilary, and soon appeared at the little stone altar vested to offer the mass. Gertrude would have knelt by her father's side, where she could see all that was passing in the crypt, but John Harding motioned her away.

At the altar, my child, at the altar of thy God; kneel there with my good Lord Dacre, and solicit grace for the parting spirit of thy father."

"Thus bidden, Gertrude left the Prior only kneeling by her father's couch, and for once unwilling she took the extended hand of Lord Dacre, and ascending the steps which led into the crypt, knelt with him at its altar's foot. More had the ancient faith of its pomp of ritual when of old it was administered, in the face of day, in the splendid abbey church of Lanercost, but never more of majesty, and awe, than in that hour of its mourning, when one only of its faithful servants stood at the altar of the darksome crypt.

A deep and mellow voice had Father Basil, and its full, melancholy tones sunk impressively upon the heart as they rung under the ribbed arches of the crypt; and most musical and melancholy too, was the slight sound of the silver bell, preserved amid their poverty, which Father Hilary rung at the elevation of the host. Pensive and ghostly was the light of the pale lamps and glimmering tapers, trembling over the massive columns as if only to show the shadows that lurked between them, and gleaming more strongly upon the carving of the altar, upon the huge stone crucifix erected there, and upon the statues of the Virgin and Saint Austin that graced the niches on either side. Then, too, there were the thin countenances, the white locks, and drooping figures of Basil and his assistant, and at the altar's foot, his rich habit contrasting with the gloom of the place, Lord Dacre, his head bent in prayer, and the softer form of Gertrude kneeling alike in devotion and sorrow at his side; while in the far background was faintly discernible the couch of the dying man, with the Prior leaning over it, while John Harding made his confession. The mass was over, and all those rites with which the Catholic Church seeks to support her children in their parting hour had been administered to the merchant; he had partaken of the bread of life, and the sacred oil of extreme unction had been applied to his feet, and to his hands. His breath grew fainter, and his eyes closed as if in sleep; then he started, and looking towards the Prior, faintly expressed his wish to die upon the altar's steps.

Tenderly was he conveyed thither; and Gertrude, rushing for his sake the agony of her grief, knelt at his side, clasping his hand fast in hers. Once after he was thus extended, he turned to Lord Dacre, and as that nobleman bent over him, the sound of a few words, of which Gertrude caught only the sound of her own name. The reply seemed most grateful to the dying man, for while pressing the hand of his daughter a sudden smile broke over his poul-

ance; the next moment, however, it disappeared, and the words, "Oh, my sister," passed with their last breath from the lips of John Harding.

(TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT.)

THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

The Archbishop of Toronto on the Forgiveness of Sins.

Sunday evening Dec. 6th. His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto delivered another lecture in St. Michael's Cathedral, before a very large audience. After a few introductory remarks His Grace said:—

Since the fall of Adam Remission of Sins has been a great question, for alas! fallen and sinful man requires forgiveness for his transgressions. Sin was remitted and the sinner reconciled to God, by true and sincere repentance; for without sincere repentance no sinner ever or can be remitted. Ezekiel xliii, 12. xxxiii, 12; and Joel ii, 12.

Repentance for sin may be considered under two heads; perfect contrition, and imperfect, called attrition. Perfect contrition is an act of sorrow, intense, proceeding from a principle of love, animated with humble hope in God, and this of itself reconciles the sinner to God, as in the case of David. The prophet Nathan aroused up his dormant conscience. (2 Kings, xii, 13.) David, touched to the quick, cried out, "I have sinned against the Lord." His contrition was perfect. Attrition of itself does not remit sin; it is a sorrow for sin, but not sufficiently intense to obtain forgiveness. It is supported by a love of God, but is not perfect; it requires the assistance of other acts, for instance, alms-deeds, fasting, other good works. "Prayer is good with fasting, and alms; more then to lay up treasures of gold." (Job xxii, 8.) Isaiah says (c. 57), "Break thy bread with the hungry; then shalt thy light break forth like the morning and thy cure shall soon follow." Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar, "May my advice not offend thee O King; redeem thy sins by alms-deeds; and thy iniquities by relieving the poor." (Dan. iv. 24.) "Give alms, and behold all is clean to you." (Luke xi.) "Hide thy alms in the bosom of the poor, and it shall obtain thy pardon" (Ecclesiasticus xxix, 15, Douay.) Our Lord shall say, "I was hungry and you gave me to eat." &c.

Imperfect contrition must be supplemented by penitential works, as by alms. "Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Matt. iii, 7.) "The people came confessing their sins." (Matt. iii, 6.) "For in Tyro and Sidon had been wrought the mighty works that have been wrought in you, they would have done penance long ago sitting in sack-cloth and ashes." (Luko x, 13.) "Except you do penance you shall all likewise perish." (Luko xii, 5.) So that in the New Testament the doctrine of sorrow, supplemented by works of charity and penance, is clearly set forth. "Charity covereth a multitude of sins." (Peter iv. 8.) These texts amply prove that penitential works, fasting, prayer, move God to mercy; and when coupled with alms-deeds the appeal has greater force. All these acts suppose faith in God, hope in God, and love of God, in a more or less perfect degree.

Christ instituted a tribunal for the forgiveness of sins, as a general method of forgiveness. The poor had no alms to give, and all required to atone for their sins by the humiliation of confessing themselves; sins that had been committed without shame and in the face of the sun. He promised to Peter "to give him the keys of the kingdom of heaven." &c. (Matt. xvi, 19.) And again in chap. 18, verse 18, He says to all the Apostles, "Whosoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." This promise He fulfilled on the night of His resurrection: Breathing on His apostles, He said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," &c. (John xxii, 20.)

The doctrine and practice of Christ, of absolving of sin, and confessing, was denied from time to time in the Church. Religious fanaticism and private views were continually disturbing the harmony of the Church; heresies arose in opposition to almost every doctrine promulgated by Christ; Councils were held; Bishops of the Church were consulted and Popes made their decrees to put down these heresies, and to restrain the wild extravagances of proud and fickle enthusiasts. In the second age, Montanus and his followers denied the doctrine of forgiveness of the greater sins, viz., murder, apostasy, &c. The Novatians, in the third age, held that there was no forgiveness for those who, in times of persecution, denied Christ, and sacrificed to idols; also for those who gave up the Sacred Writings to infidels and who were called *libellatici*. They gave a wrong interpretation to the words of St. Paul when he says, "For it is impossible for those who were once illuminated to be renewed again to penance." (Hebrews vi, 4-6.) Impossibility does not mean absolute impossibility, since nothing is impossible to the infinite mercy and grace of God. The thief on the cross blasphemed, repented, and was saved. It is exceedingly difficult, which is the Apostles' meaning, Sins against the Holy Ghost (Matt. xii, 31), Christ says, will not be forgiven in this world, or in that to come, because sins against the Holy Ghost, being against the brightest light of conscience, are generally not repented of and hence cannot be forgiven. Peter Waldo, with his followers, called Waldenses, promulgated the doctrine, which was advocated afterwards by John Huss and others, that no priest in a state of sin could forgive sins; but that pious laymen could. Luther, in his book on the "Captivity of Babylon," denied that Penance was a sacrament; and yet his followers have retained the confession and the words of absolution in their Liturgy changing nothing of the Catholic form.—"I, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, absolve thee from all thy sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." See the Book of Common Prayer of the Anglican Church. Calvin's doctrine was pretty much the same; saying, however, that Penance was not distinguishable from Baptism where recollection, by faith, is renewed. Other Protestants say that sins are remitted by faith alone in Christ, and by the renewing of the Spirit, when they "get religion"; others, that there is no distinction between small and great sins—between the theft of a penny and that of a thousand dollars. The Great Spirit looks upon his dear ignorant child with mercy. Libertines and grievous sinners, to expiate their sins, founded hospitals and Magdalen and orphan asylums, that some good might be done in lieu of the great evils which their, sins had caused.

The Catholic doctrine is that Christ gave His Apostles the power to forgive sins in the Sacrament of Penance, and that this power of the Apostles passed to their successors by regular ordination. Whatever power Christ conveyed to His Apostles for the salvation of His people passed to their successors. Christ instituted the same mode of redemption and sanctification for all—for those who had lived since His own time, and those who had lived since. His words are clear and conclusive. He breathed on His Apostles, and in that breath was the Holy Spirit, for the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son. The Apostles certainly received what Christ told them to receive—that is, the Holy Spirit—for an especial purpose, and that purpose was the forgiveness of sins. But to forgive sins, they must be known, and to be known, they must be confessed; for this tribunal is not like the tribunals of the world. Earthly tribunals are to condemn and punish the culprit; the tribunals of heaven, established on earth, with ministers of Christ as judges, are for forgiving sins, and setting the culprit free on the conditions of true sorrow, humble confession, and satisfaction for past transgressions. These acts of penance, together with the absolution of the priest remit sins; for Christ has said, "Whose sins you shall forgive on earth, they

shall be forgiven in heaven." There are, therefore, two tribunals—one on earth and the other in heaven. Heaven ratifies the sentence of earth, when rightly pronounced; but if the sinner fail to have true sorrow for his sins, or is not truthful in his confession and deceives the confessor, or refuses to make satisfaction for his sins, though the priest pronounced absolution that absolution is not recorded in heaven—the culprit is guilty of sacrilege. As this subject would require longer time to develop, I do not intend to enter into further proofs. I will content myself with stating the doctrine. So that it is totally false to say that a priest, of his own authority, and not as a minister of God, having the word of reconciliation, as St. Paul calls it, can remit sin or that sin can be remitted without true repentance and change in heart, life, and morals. Some Catholics, I am sorry to say, do not go to confession, because they are not prepared to make this change of life. They put off repentance from day to day, and some die in their sins. But, it is said, who can forgive sins but God alone? Who thought and said this? The Scribes and Pharisees.

We read in the 5th chapter of St. Luke that Jesus said to the palsied man that had been passed through the roof of the house and laid at His feet, "Man thy sins are forgiven thee," and the Scribes and Pharisees began to think saying: "Who is this who speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God alone! And when Jesus knew their thoughts, and answering He said to them: What is it you think in your hearts? Which is easier to say: Thy sins are forgiven thee, or to say: Arise and walk? But that you may know that the Son of man hath power on earth, to forgive sins (He saith to the sick of the palsy), I say to thee, Arise, take up thy bed and go into thy house." Here remark that Christ said that the Son of man had power: in contradistinction to God alone, mentioned by the Pharisees. The priest in the Sacrament of Penance forgives sins, not of his own power, but as the minister of God, and in the name of Christ. God alone can infuse into the soul the grace of sanctification, by which sins are remitted. Four things constitute this sacrament. Three are supplied by the penitent:—1st. A true and sincere sorrow for sin. 2nd. An humble and candid confession of all grievous sins to a properly ordained and regularly authorized priest. 3rd. That the penitent be prepared to make satisfaction and restitution (when necessary) for all sins of omission or commission. 4th. The part of the priest, absolution. This mode of obtaining pardon is far more difficult to flesh and blood than the Protestant mode of confessing to God alone, and believing you are absolved. Confession of sin is nothing new in the world. We read in the Book of Numbers (chap. 5). "When a man or woman shall have committed any of the sins that man are wont to commit, and by negligence shall have transgressed the commandments of the Lord, they shall confess the sin and restore the principal, and a fifth part over and above." And in the Book of Ecclesiasticus (chap. 4), we read, "Be not ashamed to say the truth for the sake of your souls; for there is a shame that bringeth sin; and there is a shame that bringeth glory and grace." Be not ashamed to confess thy sins; but submit not thyself to every man for sin." (Eccles. iv, 24, 31.) "And he that hides his sins shall not prosper; but he that shall confess and forsake them shall obtain mercy." (Prov. chap. 28.)

If we look to the New Testament we shall find in St. Mark, 1st chap., that it was the practice of the Jews to confess their sins. They went out to St. John in the wilderness from all the country about Judea and Jerusalem, and were baptized by him in the River Jordan, confessing their sins; and in the 1st epistle of St. John, 1st chap., 8th verse, "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity." The Apostle does not say to confess our sins to God; but he reproves the pride of the Christians who said before men or in their assemblies that they had no sin; consequently it must be in their assemblies that they were to confess their sins. This St. James corroborates when he says, 5th chap., and 16th verse, "Confess your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that you may be saved." And again we read in the 19th chap., 18th verse, of the Acts of the Apostles, "Many of them that believed came confessing and declaring their deeds." Those deeds were evil, as we read in the 19th verse. And St. Paul speaks of his ministry as reconciling sinners with God; 2nd Cor., 5th chap., 18th verse, "But all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Christ; and hath given us to us the ministry of reconciliation, for God indeed was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing to them their sins; and He hath placed in us the word of reconciliation." That word of reconciliation still obtains in the Church, for that copious redemption which Christ brought upon the earth flows through it, in all countries, and will to the end of time. We have the same redemption and means of grace in Canada in the nineteenth century as the Christians had in Judea and Jerusalem in the first. Never could the practice of confession have obtained universally in the Church, and be submitted to by Popes, Bishops, Priests, Kings, Emperors, and all Catholic peoples, were it not of divine institution, and obligatory; so that Christians are not at liberty, without sin, proudly to disdain the institution of Christ. By pride man fell; by humility he is raised up. "Except you become as little children you cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven." God resists the proud, and gives His grace to the humble; and St. Paul says, "If you live according to the flesh you shall die."

We cannot suppose that Christians, except through invincible ignorance, can obtain remission of their sins if they knowingly set aside and despise this Institution of Christ. Priests cannot forgive sins for money without committing the sacrilegious sin of simony. But you ask me, have not indulgences been bought with money? I answer, indulgences are not the remission of sin. The sin must be remitted in the sacrament of penance before an indulgence can be gained. An indulgence means the remission of temporal punishment due to sin, when the guilt of the sin is remitted. It very often happens, as in the case of David, that the guilt of sin is pardoned, but not all the punishment due to it. His sin was remitted, but yet a temporal punishment was inflicted. "Thou shalt not die," said the prophet Nathan to him. "Nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, for this thing, the child that is born to thee shall surely die."

The Archbishop concluded his very eloquent discourse by announcing that his next lecture would be on the subject of Indulgences.—Toronto Globe.

THE BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM, ENG., ON MR. GLADSTONE.

A pastoral on the subject of Mr. Gladstone's Pamphlet and the Vatican Decrees, by Dr. Ullathorne, Bishop of Birmingham, was read in the various Catholic churches of the diocese on Sunday. The pastoral opens with an injunction to the faithful to be steadfast against the wiles and deceits of the day, reminding them that the exigency is no new one in the history of the Church. "You have heard such warnings from St. Peter, you have heard such warnings from St. Paul," it proceeds, "and at every point of time in which new heresies have arisen to scandalize the faithful and to tempt the weak and wavering like warnings have been heard from the Pontiffs and the Bishops." After reviewing the constant accusations against our Lord of seducing the people from their allegiance, and tracing the history of the several heresies which have arisen from time to time as successive doctrines were defined by the great Councils of the Church, the pastoral proceeds to describe the rise of

the Old Catholic (Dollingerite) Party as a consequence of the definition of the Pope's official infallibility. What can we see in that sect, priests and laymen, in no great numbers, rejecting the decision of a general Council, rejecting the now unanimous voice of the Bishops of the Church with the Pope at their head, and rejecting thereby not only the doctrine defined, but rejecting, as a consequence, as well of the Apostolic See as of the whole Episcopate. Following the instinct of heresy they have at once recourse to a long-condemned heresy, that of Jansenism, from which to obtain ordination. They further extend the hand of fellowship to other sects and heresies, invoking to their communion seats which were condemned 300 years ago, and against which their author and founder, Dr. Dollinger, has written on the side of the Catholic Church in his better and most faithful days. Not satisfied with these strong manifestations of the spirit of heresy, they have gone further and if they have not been in all respects the actual originators, they have lent themselves vehemently to promote the most bitter and unrelenting persecution of their Catholic countrymen that has been seen since the days of Julian the Apostate. Such is the character of the last, the newest, the smallest, and most internally divided of all sects. A great English Statesman, to whom we have owed much in the past, has been pleased to put out a pamphlet within the last few days, in which under the guise of the politician, he attempts the theologian, and as against the Catholic subjects of Her Majesty he throws himself on the side of the Dollingerites. But the most astounding thing which he has written in that amazing production is the assertion that "the most famous and learned living theologian of the Roman communion is Dr. von Dollinger." Then this assertion could there be a greater proof of incapacity to understand the nature of theology? From the testimony of his old fellow-students, of his co-professors, and of his former Archbishop—some of whom we have heard—he never was a theologian, and never much cared for the accepted sciences of theology. His line has been exclusively that of the critical historian. As a historian of the critical school which is never constructive but is ever looking out for blots, he has studied the external aspects of the Church in her ever-varied history, and the exterior unfolding of her doctrine, rather than the interior mechanism of their order, proportion, relation, dependence, and tradition, which is the proper province of theology. Theologians are of the cast of St. Athanasius, of St. Gregory Nazianzen, of St. Augustin, of St. Thomas Aquinas, and of Suarez. This, however, is the great danger of the mere critical historian, that bending his eyes back upon the past of the Church, and interpreting them by his critical—that is, his private judgment—faculty, he is apt to forget his duty of listening obediently to the voice of the living, speaking and authoritative Church of which he is baptized a member. After describing the logical absurdities of the position of the Dollingerite party, the Bishop reverts to Mr Gladstone in the following terms:—

And we have seen within this fortnight a marvellous spectacle. An English Statesman, first among the foremost, a Protestant if ever man was Protestant, subtle in the rhetoric of speech beyond the force of logic, planting himself on the side of this unhappy sect taking his lesson from its members, and stepping forth in a most singular production to interrogate Her Majesty's Catholic subjects in a see-saw, self-contradictory fashion as to their duties of civil allegiance to the State; but let Mr. Gladstone and all men know that we Catholics—ye, brethren, your priests, and your Bishops—besides the motives common to other men, have a motive for obedience to the civil power that is peculiar to ourselves, and that is the fixed and unchangeable doctrine and enforcement of the Catholic Church, that not merely for man's sake, but much more for God's sake and as a part of our religion, we should be loyal and obedient to whatever civil Government is constituted and established over the society in which we live. Need we point to other proof beyond our own habitual conduct? Indeed, we have often been reproached by politicians with too great an acquiescence in the existing state of things and with too much indifference as to political changes. Nor is this unnatural with men who have quiet consciences and who care more for the future than for the present world. What would Ireland have become, with all her grievances, had not her Bishops and clergy incessantly inculcated the Catholic duty of obeying the civil authority? It is a well known fact that the heads of Fenianism maintained and inculcated that the one great obstacle to successful rebellion and revolution was the influence of the Pope and the Catholic Church, ever inculcating the duty of civil obedience. That society was condemned and put down by the Pope, at the instance of the Irish Catholic Prelates. If the records of the Foreign Office tell all the truth, which is very much to be doubted, they would show how often instance has been made at Rome to endeavour to obtain some declaration from this or that Pope to this or that portion of Her Majesty's subjects of the doctrine of the Catholic Church respecting the duty of obedience to the civil power. Those records would likewise tell, or at least the private portfolios of successive Foreign Ministers could tell, what a constant propaganda of revolution has been kept up, if not now, at least until recently, in Catholic States, the chief obstacle to be overcome having always been the loyalty to the constituted civil authority of the real good Catholics. And now as to the home question—whether the doctrine and belief in the infallibility of all detracts from our civil allegiance—this illustrious statesman, but very poor theologian, shall have his reply. The Church was always believed to be infallible, although that doctrine had never been defined before the Vatican Council, and all men know it; and the Pope always wielded his infallibility, and all men knew this to be a fact. What practical change, then, has the definition made? The Catholic Church is always what it was, neither more nor less. The definition declared what practically the Holy See has always been. The infallibility leaves all things as before, except that now it is a term of communion. The infallibility only teaches and enforces the unchangeable doctrines of the Church, what was always, everywhere, and by the concurrent fathers held. And one of those unchangeable doctrines is that enforced by the example and words of our Lord the "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's;" and by St. Paul, that we be subject in obedience to the temporal magistrates and to the powers that be. How many Papal constitutions of recent times enforce this doctrine and duty the much reviled and misunderstood Syllabus which is a collection of passages from pontifical constitutions is pregnant with this doctrine and duty. But the author of this insulting pamphlet shall have his special reply, and we scarcely appeal to his own memory and conscience. During the sitting of the Vatican Council, being then Prime Minister, he wrote a letter to an intimate friend, who was a Catholic, and in that letter it was said that if the Church invaded the civil sphere she must expect the law of retaliation. To this letter its receiver invited the Bishop of Orleans and the present writer to reply. What the Bishop of Orleans did we do not know, but the writer of this pastoral replied in a letter communicated to Mr. Gladstone, in which, among other things, it was plainly stated, not merely on the writer's own authority, but on that of one of the Cardinal Presidents of the Council obtained for the purpose, that there was no intention in any Act or decree of the Council to invade the civil sphere. With that letter of the year 1870 in his possession; it seems almost incredible, but for the fact that its receiver should raise the question anew, in 1874; and that on the score of the ancient doc-

trine of infallibility. The mode in which the illustrious pamphleteer treats the clauses of the Syllabus is simply disgraceful to a scholar, and to one whose words carry with them a deep responsibility. To interpret the sense of the Pontifical constitutions demands the science of Catholic theology and an intimate knowledge of its language, but even an ordinary logician ought not to be guilty, of turning particular negatives into universal negatives. This is to destroy the fundamental sense of language. The language of the Papal Encyclicals is not for the uninitiated; they are addressed to the Bishops of the Church, who have the science of this interpretation. Take an example. "Mr. Gladstone tells us that the Pope has condemned the freedom of the Press and of speech." Not all freedom most certainly, but unlawful freedom—that is to say, what is unjust, ungodly, and licentious. And have the laws of England no condemnation of the freedom of the Press and of speech? Is there not the law of libel, the law against threatening language, the law against perjury, the law against blasphemy, and the law against obscene publications; and would the laws of England allow of treasonable language or the teaching of the Communist doctrine that property is theft? There may be and there is a difference as to what the Church tolerates, because one has the sphere of conscience and the other the sphere of social order; but the fundamental principle that prescribes limits to the freedom of writing or of speech is common to both authorities. Let there be one specimen given of the way in which Mr. Gladstone renders the sense of an Apostolic Constitution, and so shall the subject be concluded. The original words rendered into English are these:—"We cannot pass over their audacity who, not enduring sound doctrine, affirm that without sin or any loss of Catholic profession we may withhold assent and obedience to those judgments and decrees whose object is declared to regard the general good of the Church or her rights or discipline provided the dogmas of faith and morals are not touched." This Mr. Gladstone has rendered in the following words:—"Or who contend that Papal judgments and decrees may without sin be disobeyed or differed from unless they treat of the rules of faith or morals." He thus makes that proposition universal which is limited in the text to the general good of the Church, to her rights and her discipline. There can be no doubt that the pamphlet on the spirit of which we have commented was published, among other reasons, with a view to bring out divisions among the Catholics of these realms. Yet, whatever painful manifestations as to individual belief it may have elicited from some two or more who have hitherto professed the Catholic faith, it will fail of its aim of striking out divisions among the faithful flock itself. No one is a Catholic who does not believe the teaching of the living Church and who adheres not with steadfastness to the dogmatic decisions of her Popes and Councils. Every Catholic since the Council of the Vatican is bound to believe in the infallibility of the Pope when teaching all the faithful what concerns doctrine in faith and morals from the chair of authority, and whosoever does not so believe has not the Catholic faith, is no longer a child of the Church, and has no right to her sacraments or communion. This it becomes our solemn duty to declare. No one, therefore, has any right in truth or in justice to affirm that such persons are members of the Catholic and Roman Church unless they repent and, by the mercy of God, recover the Catholic faith. In conclusion, says the Bishop, appealing to his flock, "You who are known as orderly, peaceable, and loyal subjects of the realm, who fulfil your duties as members of society, bound by equal laws, because such is the line of conduct taught by our holy religion, will find no difficulty in reconciling it with the claims of a higher and holier obedience which you render to the Church of God—an obedience which is the mainspring of your daily life, and, indeed, is that which gives freedom, light, and peace to your soul."

GLADSTONIAN FALLACIES.

The air is still filled with the smoke from the great Gladstonian bombshell. The papers still discuss that extraordinary "coup de theatre" and in the "leading journal" a controversy of singular interest is being carried on. It is plain that among the couple of millions of English Catholics there are a few gentlemen of standing who sympathize with the Old Catholic movement and the views of Dr. Ignatius von Dollinger. Lord Acton, who, it has long been known, is a thorough adherent of his old tutor, has written a letter charged, to overflowing, with abuse of the pontiffs, doctors, saints, and councils of the Church. The letter has been condemned on all hands, and a writer in the *Spectator* declares that such a shell ought, in common fairness, have been fired from outside the Church, and not from inside it. Lord Camoys, an English Catholic nobleman, and Mr. Petre, a member of the well-known Catholic family of that name, have also written to the *Times* letters advocating the "Old Catholic" or Dollingerite view of the situation. The voices, however, of the handful of "Old Catholics" is utterly drowned in the loud and general protest raised by the Catholics of England against the Gladstonian letter. The communications which we publish elsewhere will, we are sure, be read with the greatest interest. In perusing them we are at every moment reminded that the question raised by Mr. Gladstone is not at all one of pure theology. It is in its essence political in the widest and largest sense of the word. Mr. Gladstone has charged the Catholics of Great Britain with being deficient in loyalty and allegiance to the State. If that assertion were true, or even if it were generally accepted as true, it would of necessity affect the whole history of the English State in its relations to its Catholic subjects. If the States of England really believed that Catholics qua Catholics were, by the very nature of their creed, tainted with disloyalty and treason, the next step would be to refuse every concession to Catholics in the future and to reclaim many of the concessions which they had made in the past. This is the gist of the political side of the discussion, and, bearing it in mind the weight and importance of such a letter as that addressed by Canon Oakley to Mr. Gladstone will at once be seen. The Canon's letter is marked by all the gentleness and savvy of the man who, in obedience to the dictates of conscience, laid down a high position and splendid prospects in the Anglican Church—who now toils a loved and honoured priest among the poor of Islington. Canon Oakley's letter is an amplification of the good old saw—"By their fruits you shall know them." It must now be acknowledged that Mr. Gladstone's wonderful theory as to the utter revolution which passed over the face of the Catholic Church in the month of July, 1870, has been scattered to the winds. It has been established in the most conclusive way that the Vatican Council only affirmed beliefs which had always been held by the Catholic Church. If these Catholic doctrines led to disloyalty and to a forfeiting of civil allegiance, the history of Catholicism, say in England, would have shown the working of these doctrines. Canon Oakley reminds us that the very opposite is the fact. In old times, English Catholics clung to their sovereigns and to their country when the hands of the first were stained with Catholic blood, and the statute-books of the second, swarmed, with penal enactments. In the dark days of Elizabeth the "gibbets of Tower Hill ran with the best blood of Catholic England; yet when the invader threatened the coasts, the Catholic gentry thronged round the Queen at Tilbury, and a Catholic Admiral swept from the sea the mighty natives of Castile. A couple of generations later the grandsons of the man of Elizabeth's time fought the cruellest and treasonous of the House of Stuart, and, when the banner of Charles the First was given to the winds at Nottingham Castle, rallied round the flag of the King of Scots, and fought the