

therefore, not to resist the bishop, that you may be subject to God; — for all those whom the Father of the family sends for the government of his house you ought to receive as you would him that sends them." We will not press the words of Saint Ignatius so far as to conclude that he attached infallibility individually to each bishop. Those of whom he speaks were personally known to him. He knew that their doctrine was pure & conformable with the universal doctrine; that union reigned between them and the priests, between them and all those whom the Father of the family had sent for the government of his house. Now this unity would have ceased immediately if a bishop taught any dogma contrary to the received doctrine of the Church, as we have seen in the case of Paul of Samosata condemned and deposed by his brethren. Thus, then,

we come to analyze the matter, we find that it was upon the conformity with the general doctrine of the bishops, that Saint Ignatius founded, on the one hand, the particular authority of each bishop, and, on the other, the entire submission he required to be paid to them by the people; and by a more remote consequence, it appears necessary, according to his principles, that the doctrine of the great majority of the bishops must have been infallible, otherwise the faithful, by conforming themselves to the bishops according to the command of God, might have been drawn into error, without any means of being preserved from it. In a word, if we understand the doctrine of this great man, he teaches us that the unity of the Church depends upon the submission of the faithful to their particular bishop, and on the agreement of the bishops among themselves, that is to say, that the supreme authority given to the body of the bishops is the safeguard of unity. We find the same doctrine taught one hundred and forty years afterwards by the illustrious doctor and martyr of Carthage. "The Catholic Church is one," wrote Saint Cyprian, "and the bishops joined together are the bonds of this union."* These few words comprise the whole subject of this and the preceding letter: they give you in abridgment the entire theory of the unity and the infallibility of the Church.†

*Ep. XXXIII.—†"There is but one episcopacy spread on all sides in many bishops united together." Cyprian, in his *Epist. Antodianus*, bishop of Africa, and again, in his book *On Unity*; The Catholic Church is united in all its parts and consolidated by the cement (glutino) of the bishops adhering to one another. We who are bishops and who preside in the Church, we ought particularly and more closely to embrace and defend this unity."—†Born in 120, martyred under Marcus Aurelius in 203.

To be continued.

DEFENCE OF CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES,

By Demetrius A. Gallitzin, a Russian Prince; now a Catholic Priest; addressed by him to a reviler of our Holy Religion.

Continued.

I shall now, in a few words, explain the doctrine of the holy Catholic Church respecting

IMAGES, PICTURES, AND RELICS.

Much indeed need not be said on that subject, to

those who are candid, and provided with the least share of common sense; to these, who with seeing eyes will not see, and with hearing ears will not hear, too much has been said already.

The general council of Trent declares, that "The sacred bodies of the holy martyrs, and of other saints, who were living members of Christ, and the temples of the Holy Ghost, which bodies will by him be raised to eternal life and glorified, ought to be venerated by the faithful on earth."—*Conc. Trid. Sess. 25.* "Also that the images of Christ, of the blessed Virgin, and of the other saints, are to be retained, especially in churches, and that due honor and veneration is to be given to them, not that any divinity, or any power, is to be believed to reside in them." The catechism of the council of Trent adds, "*istud maxime cavendum, ne quod Deo proprium est, cuiquam præterea tribuant.*" *T. 2, p. 603;* "particular care must be taken that none be given what belongs to God alone."

Here is nothing but what every Christian must approve, as conformable to the word of God and of reason.

St. John the Baptist venerated the very latchet of our Saviour's shoes. *Mark i. 7.*

The Israelites venerated the brazen serpent, a type or figure of Christ. *Numb. xxi.*

By the command of God, two images of Cherubims were made and placed on the ark. *Exodus xxv.*

The primitive christians venerated the very shadows and garments of St. Peter and St. Paul, and received particular blessings thereby. *Acts v. 15, and xix. 11.*

Roman Catholics venerate the images of Christ, of the blessed Virgin, and of the saints, on account of their prototypes. None of them are so stupid as to believe, that any divinity, any power or virtue resides in any of those images.

How many, both Protestants and Catholics, keep the picture of a great General, and exhibit the same in the most conspicuous place of their houses, certainly with the view of showing honor to his memory. Nobody, in his senses, ever thought of condemning that practice as superstitious.

How many Protestants have hung upon the walls of their houses, the pictures of their deceased parents and friends? How many a Protestant child will honor the picture of a deceased parent with a costly frame; look at the picture with sentiments of respect and veneration, perhaps bedew that picture with tears of sorrow and gratitude, nay, with the most sincere affection press that picture to its lips? Sir, will you accuse that child of superstition?

Let prejudice subside, and now substitute a Catholic in the room of the Protestant, and the picture of Christ crucified in the place of the picture of the deceased parent: pray, dear sir, will you not permit that Catholic to exhibit his crucifix in the most conspicuous part of his house? Will you not permit him to look at his crucifix with respect and veneration? Will you not permit him to bedew his crucifix with tears of sorrow and gratitude?—

Nay, with the most sincere love and affection to press that crucifix to his lips? And suppose that Catholic should allow an honorable place to the picture of the most blessed Virgin Mother of our Saviour, and likewise to the pictures of the holy Apostles, and of other servants of Christ, would you condemn him? would you accuse him of superstition? I cannot think so.

I have spent many happy moments before the celebrated picture of Guido Reni, in the gallery of Dusseldorf, in Germany, which represents the assumption of the blessed Virgin, and I must confess, that I was struck with awe. I found myself in a deep contemplation, my soul, as it were, withdrawn from its earthly habitation, and elevated towards the mansions of eternal bliss. The heavenly looks of the Virgin, as expressed in the picture, pointed out to me the proper object of my affections. With the deepest sentiments of my own unworthiness, I had the most exalted ideas of the dignity of man, & it was with regret I left the spot, when called away to my lodgings.

Religious pictures, in general, are well calculated both to enlighten and to edify. To enlighten, by exhibiting the most remarkable and prominent facts belonging to the history of religion; to edify, by kindling up the fire of devotion.

What place then, could be found more proper for religious pictures, than the church, the house of God, the sanctuary where the tremendous sacrifice is offered, and where the sacraments, the divine mysteries, are administered. That place, above all others, is the place of devotion, and it is there, that, by hearing the word of God, by offering up our prayers, by meditating on divers religious subjects represented by our pictures, meditating on the religious and moral virtues of the saints whose images are before us, meditating especially on the great sufferings of Christ, as represented by our crucifixes, on his immense love for sinners, &c. it is there, I say, and by such means, that our piety is both enlightened and inflamed.

Superstition!!!—Amiable superstition indeed, which is productive of so much good! And does not zeal for the cause of religion suggest a sincere desire, that the crucifix, and other religious pictures would be substituted in the place of many of those pictures that often adorn the walls of our people of fashion, to the detriment of both religion and morals? Would not that zeal which attacks our religious pictures, and exhibits them most shamefully, as the objects of our superstitious worship, be more meritoriously employed in condemning those indecent, immodest, and truly scandalous pictures, which by defiling the imagination, and tarnishing the purity of the heart, are well calculated to extinguish devotion, or the love of God altogether, and therefore to produce an effect the very reverse of that produced by religious pictures: and if the commandment of God "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image," &c. ever was intended to be understood in the literal sense, was it not principally with regard to such images or pictures as have a tendency, by defiling the imagination, and corrupting the heart, to withdraw from the great Creator, that