

anon. But why does he stand there and from me? They told me he was buried in the glen. See there is no blood upon my hand."

There was something too frightful in those discolored features; and Gertrude summoning all her courage, took a sheet from the bed, and wound it in the body of Euphrasia. Often, while engaged in that terrible duty, did she start and tremble, and look fearfully towards that window at which had been heard those terrific and mysterious blows during the parting agony of her unhappy aunt. But there was no sound now, save that of the beating rain, and of the wild winds that sung the dirge of the departed.

Gertrude had finished her awful task, and with her crucifix clasped to her bosom she yet breathed prayers for the dead. The storm still raged fearfully without—a frightful contrast to the spring-like beauty of the past day; and now as she glanced to the unbarred door of her chamber, a bitter thought presented itself—that for that storm, the way had now been open for her to escape, but it were certain death to venture at that dark and terrible hour out into the open glen. Ever and anon, amid the pause of the gust, the roaring of the river met her ears; and a false step in the glen which she was so little acquainted, might precipitate her into the foaming waters. She longed for the morning light, for with that she resolved to attempt an escape. She was not indeed forgetful that, with that morning light, Lord Leicester had promised to return, and that at the hour of midnight she might expect Ralph; but in foiling their intentions she trusted that the sudden and terrible storm might yet prove her friend. The fears of the death-chamber were, however, now becoming too great to be endured. She could not look upon the shrouded person of Euphrasia, but all the horrors of the face which that shroud concealed were present to her mental eye. If she glanced towards the closet, her thoughts were with the grisly tenant of the trunk; and if she looked towards the more remote parts of the chamber, her busy fancy sketched amid its shadows a thousand dreadful forms. So great was the horror of Gertrude, that she dared not move even to take the lamp and leave that apartment, but covered on her knees by the side of the bed, oppressed with a nameless apprehension. While she thus knelt, she heard between the pauses of the gust, the sound of a horse's hoofs rapidly coming down the glen. That sound restored her sinking energies; and springing to her feet, she mustered all her courage to her aid. She took the lamp to leave that horrible chamber, resolving to seek concealment in some other part of the house. But the rider had been probably nearer than she had imagined; for ere she reached the end of the gallery, she heard a foot ascending the stairs, and another light than that she carried flashed upon the walls. She now hesitated whether to advance or recede; and while she hesitated Ralph Adams appeared.

"Well, sweet dame!—fair Mistress Gertrude," he began, "how comes it thou art out of thy cage, and where, I pray thee, is that proud dame, Euphrasia? She was like, my Lord told me, to be sick, to-night; but she is ill so soon?"

"Man," said Gertrude, "she is dead! Let her lie in a warning even to thyself."

"Aye, aye," said Ralph, whose staggering step and swimming eye showed him to be under the influence of strong drink, "is it even so? Well, mourn not, Mistress Gertrude, for of a verity, when the Lord decrees, we must all die; therefore doth it behoove us to take in due time the pleasures of this goodly world, lest it seem that we slight the bounty which spread them before us. Be of good heart, Mistress Gertrude, for with the morning's light the right noble Earl of Leicester will be here, and he holds thee highly, maiden, in his love; wherefore, I pray thee, reject not the illumination which is offered thee, but turn thy back upon the darkness of Papistry and the abominations of Rome."

"Leave me, wretch!" said Gertrude, as she returned to her chamber, and set the lamp upon the table, "leave me for the presence of the dead is less horrible than this."

"Nay, nay, I will not leave thee," said Ralph; "I had not left thee so long but that it behooved that I should once more see and dupe the fool Sir Philip; but now, since the Earl may not be here until the light of morning, even solace thee in my company till he comes, and I will count up the rewards which thou shalt have for the loss of mine hand, which I owe to the strong-armed stranger who defended thee. Ha, ha! he is a traitor too; our Queen will have his heart's blood; maiden, yet."

GRAND LECTURE

ARCHBISHOP OF TORONTO,

"Alleged Doctrine and True Faith of Catholic Church."

On Sunday evening, Nov. 29th, the Archbishop of Toronto delivered another lecture on the above subject. St. Michael's Cathedral was crammed to the doors, at least four thousand people being present. After compline, which was said by the Archbishop, the Rev. J. J. Shea acting as reader, His Grace ascended the pulpit, and delivered the lecture.

His Grace said:—Since my last lecture I have received a few notes containing objections to some things which I then stated. One is that from words used by Catholics in addressing the Saints, Divine Worship is implied. For instance, *Cultus Virginis—Cultus in Latin*, they (Protestants) say, means worship. All classical scholars know that *cultus* means reverence, respect, and sometimes worship, according to the dignity of the person addressed. *Cultus deos* means to worship the gods. *Micipsa* said to his sons, "Collo Jurgurtham." Words signify such a meaning as is generally attached to them. Persons who find fault with the expressions, "Most Holy Father," "The Divine Augustine," "The Immaculate Pontiff," are not certainly Freemasons, who employ bolder terms;—"Most Worshipful Grand Master," or Aldermen, who salute "His Worship the Mayor," or even Church of England married people, who, according to their Liturgy, say in the ceremony of marriage, "and with my body I thee worship;" or mothers who say "my life, my love," to their children. We must not forget that this Liturgy of the Church is largely tinged with Oriental thought, expression, and ceremonies, as the Greeks had a large share in the early formation of the Church services, in its very first ages. The scholar or Oriental traveller understands our expressions. Our theological students are often called divines or students of divinity. Another objection urged is that Catholics pray too often to the saints. Well, this is a matter of taste. If it be no harm to do it once, it is no harm to do it a thousand times. Catholics again, it is said, offer up masses to the saints, and have churches and altars dedicated to them.—No mass was ever offered up to any saint; it is offered to God alone on a saint's day, when we pray to the saints in an especial manner. The Governor gives a dinner on the Queen's birth-day and invites many guests. Is the dinner in honor of the guests? They partake of it, it is true; but the honor is referred to the Queen. So the mass is offered to honor God, but the saints partake of the joy.—Churches are dedicated to God under the invocation of saints; but the church itself is God's church. Is Knox's Church in this city in honor of John Knox or merely to propagate his doctrine? A Church of England minister, going to attend a Synod in one of our cities, ordered a cabman to drive him to Christ's Church. The Catholic drove him right straight to St. Patrick's. "Is this Christ's Church?" said the minister. "It is your Reverence." "But," said the minister, "this is St. Patrick's." The cabman replied, "Christ has not a church in town if this is not His. It is only called St. Patrick's."

A gentleman from Amherstburg wants us to interpret St. Paul's qualities of a bishop, I. Tim. chap. 3. The point, I presume, he wants us to interpret is that a "Bishop should be a husband of one wife and have his children in subjection with all gravity." The Apostle's meaning interpreted in conjunction with other expressions of the same Apostle is, that a Bishop should not be chosen if he were married twice, as he seemed by a second marriage to be uxorious, and not sufficiently spiritual. It cannot mean, certainly, that a Bishop should have one wife at least; better two like Abraham. The Apostle lays stress on one, in contradiction to two or more. This must be St. Paul's meaning, for he would otherwise be in contradiction with himself, when in the vii. chap. 7th verse of Corinthians, giving directions to married persons on their duties to each other and intimating that they might live in continence for a while, that they might be given to prayer; he says, "For I would that all men were even as myself, unmarried," as all know that St. Paul was not married—at least his wife was not heard of. He concluded his advice, verse 8, by saying "But I say to the unmarried and to the widows, it is good for them if they so continue even to us." In the same chapter and verse 27, the Apostle says, "Art thou bound to a wife? seek not to be loosed;" in verse 32, "But I would have you to be without solicitude. He that is without a wife is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord how he may please God," as a bishop should; in verse 35, "And this I speak for your profit, not to cast a snare upon you, but for that which is decent and which may give you power to attend upon the Lord without impediment." This gentleman also, wishes us, I dare say, to interpret the warnings of St. Paul, against those who speak lies and hypocrisy and "commanding to abstain from meats." The Apostle here alludes to the sect of Catechumens and others who taught that marriage was bad in itself, and that the generation of mankind should be put a stop to, because it was so wicked. The Catholic Church, with St. Paul, is opposed to this doctrine, and forbids furthermore none to marry who are fit to do so. St. Paul would forbid children to marry, and brothers and sisters; and some wiseacres would forbid all those to marry who have not some prospective means of supporting a family. Soldiers and sailors are forbidden to marry for State reasons. The Catholic Church does not permit those who have made vows of chastity to God to break those vows. She chooses for her ministers only those who have made such vows, in order that they may have more time to devote to God, and the affairs of God. The Catholic Church does not condemn marriage; she holds it a holy sacrament, and, as we have just seen, forbids it to none but such as by vow have chosen the better part, or those who are forbidden by lawful impediment.

St. Paul also speaks of the same heretics who absolutely condemned the use of all kinds of meat, because they pretended that all flesh was from an evil principle; whereas the Catholic Church prohibits not the use of any kind of meats whatsoever, in proper times and seasons, though she does not judge all kinds of diet proper for days of fasting and penance. But it may be argued from Scripture still, that "nothing that entereth the mouth defileth the soul." That is true, provided the thing that entereth in the mouth is not forbidden. The apple was forbidden to Adam, and the eating of it defiled his soul. So meat with us on forbidden days.

We will now turn to the subject on which I wish to speak this evening—the Sacred Scriptures—a subject often treated upon from a Protestant standpoint. I shall confine my remarks principally to the New Testament. It was compiled at different times, for some special occasions, and by different holy personages. Christ sent His Apostles to preach. The Gospel could not have been spread throughout the world if Christ had given the order: "Go and write out the Gospel; distribute it among the people; and let every man interpret it as he pleases." The Protestant method was not known then. Two of the Apostles wrote Gospels, John and Matthew; Saint Peter and St. Jude wrote very short epistles. The other Apostles left us no writings, though they spread the faith throughout the world. Saint Paul wrote many Epistles, so profound, that the ignorant and unwary read them to their own destruction. Some holy persons wrote what was termed Gospels, containing very excellent things, but yet the Catholic Church did not class them among the inspired writings. These Gospel-writings could not have reached a great many persons. The Epistle

to the Ephesians was not read possibly in Corinth for many years and likely that to the Romans did not reach the Greeks. St. John did not write his Gospel until about sixty-three years after the resurrection of Christ; then we all know it was written to put down the heresy of Cerinthus and the Ebionites, who denied the existence of Christ before his birth from the Blessed Virgin Mary. With what reverence did not the early Christians keep the original documents, and with what accuracy the clergy of the Church preserved copies of these sacred books? Pagans thought they could destroy this religion by destroying these writings.—In the persecution of Diocletian, Felix, the Bishop of Thibars in Africa, was ordered by Magnalian, prefect of the town, to deliver up the Gospels, that they might be burned, and thus the superstition be destroyed. Felix nobly answered, "I shall not give them up; better that you should burn me than the Holy Scriptures." He was put to the sword. His festival occurs on the 24th of October. He was martyred in the year three hundred and three. Others were equally put to the torture. Euplius, the deacon, was also put to death because he would not say where the Sacred Scriptures were hidden.—His festival occurs on the 12th of August. During the long ages of persecution, and the invasion of barbarians who destroyed every vestige of Roman grandeur, the Sacred Scriptures were hidden, preserved, and copied, with extreme care. Monasteries, schools, and colleges were destroyed but on the approach of the spoiler three things were secreted in caves prepared for the purpose in every episcopal and monastic residence—the Sacred Scriptures, the Sacred relics and dyptics of the Church, and the Sacred vessels. During what is termed the Dark Ages the Scriptorium in every monastery and college multiplied the sacred deposit of truth. When we consider that printing had not yet been invented, the work must have been great. The supervision of the amanuenses must have been most strict that no material fault ever entered these sacred writings. It was a miracle of care and attention to have spread this sacred book throughout all the Church. I have said before that a married clergy never could have done it. The little ones would have mauled (here His Grace made a most significant gesture, imitative of a child reaching for and grasping whatever it can) the manuscripts, and would have distracted the writer.

How, and by what authority, were the true writings segregated and distinguished from the uninspired Scriptures? Was it by any internal or external evidence? It was by both. It was the tradition of the Church that procured them principally. But the authority that could say with certainty that such is an inspired book, and such is not, must not be subject to error—must in fine be infallible. It must be that Church "against which the gates of hell cannot prevail." It was done by the Roman Pontiff; for Rome, the mother and mistress of all Churches, had her well-organized government, with its archives, writers, and custodians, and her army of the most learned men to preserve the record of the Church. It was in a Roman Council, under Pope Innocent the First, that the present canon of the Church was compiled. The Fathers had before them immense piles of writings, containing many holy and great things, and many truthful things; but those writings were set aside as not being those of inspiration, and not meriting to be completely relied on. These Canonical books were read and acknowledged in the Catholic Church by all Christians, both Greeks and Latins, Asiatics, Europeans, and Africans, up to the time of the so-called Reformation, when a number of books of the Old and some of the New Testament were set aside. Now these gentlemen claim infallibility or exemption from error, when they can decide that such a book is not the Word of God. The reasons why they rejected some of the books were that they contained doctrines which they did not like. For example, the Second Book of Macabees, where we read, "It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins." The Church of England has decreed that she accepts only those books of Sacred Scripture of whose authenticity there never was any doubt. By this rule she would have to reject the last chapter of Saint Mark's Gospel, part of the twenty-second of Saint Luke, part of the eighth chapter of St. John, and the Apocalypse. Luther said that the Epistle of St. James, as the Apostle spoke of the necessity of good works, was an "Epistle of Straw." The Protestant Doctor Hilsen, in his "Conferences in the Tower," says: "The Church of Syria did not receive the second epistle of Peter, nor the second and third of St. John, nor the epistle of Jude, nor the Apocalypse." The Protestants reject fourteen books that we receive as true.

But now with regard to the calumny that the Catholic Church is opposed to the spread of the Gospel amongst the people, and to make the point very clear and palatable. One of the biographers of Luther, D'Abingne, the great Protestant historian, writes this little piece of romance called history:—"One day Luther was opening the books in the library, one after another, in order to read the names of the authors. One which he opened, in its turn drew his attention; he had not seen anything like it till that hour; he reads the title; it is a Bible, a rare book, unknown at that time! His interest is strongly excited; he is filled with astonishment at finding more in this volume than those fragments of the gospels and epistles, which the Church has selected to be read to the people in their places of worship every Sunday in the year. Till then he had thought that they were the whole word of God. And here are so many pages, so many chapters, so many books, of which he had no idea! His heart beats as he holds in his hand all the Scriptures divinely inspired. With eagerness and indescribable feelings he turns over those leaves of the Word of God. The first page that arrests his attention relates the history of Hannah and the young Samuel." But this was only the first Bible that Luther saw. He found another chained to the Augustine Council of Erfurt. Indeed it was chained to a pillar, that all entering might read it, but that none might take it away. If a rare book were then left so that visitors might borrow it, it would shortly share the fate of borrowed books of our own time. Maitland, the Protestant historian and keeper of manuscripts to the Archbishop of Canterbury, thus disposes of the little story:—"Is it not odd that Luther had not by some chance or other heard of the Psalms?" But there is no use in criticising such nonsense. Such it must appear to every moderately-informed reader; but he will not appreciate its absurdity until he is informed that, on this same page, this precious historian has informed his readers that, in the course of the two preceding years, Luther had applied himself to learn the philosophy of the middle ages in the writings of Occam, Scot (Scotus), Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas. Of course, none of these poor creatures knew anything about the Bible!

It was only at the Reformation that the Bible was circulated. We quote still the Protestant historian, who says that twenty different editions of the whole Latin Bible were printed in Germany alone before Luther was born.—These editions had issued from Augsburg, Strasburgh, Cologne, Ulm, Mentz (two), Basle (four), Nuremberg (ten), and were dispersed through Germany, I repeat, before Luther was born; and I may remark that before that event there was a printing press at work in this very town of Erfurt, where, more than twenty years after, he is said to have made his "discovery." Some may ask what the Pope was about all this time? Before Luther was born, the Bible was printed in Rome, and the printers had had the assurance to memorialize his Holiness, praying that he would help them off with some copies. It had been printed, too, at Naples, Florence, and Piacenza; and Venice alone had furnished eleven editions. No doubt we should be within the truth, if we were to say that besides the multitude of manuscript copies, not yet fallen into disuse, the press had issued fifty different editions of the whole Latin Bible; to say nothing of Psalters, New Testaments, or other parts. And yet, more than twenty years after, we find a young man who had received a "very liberal education," who had made great proficiency in his studies at Magdeburg, Eisenach, and Erfurt, and who, nevertheless, did not know what a Bible was, simply because the Bible was unknown in those days." A good story this.

Seckendorf, the great biographer of Luther, states that three distinct editions of the Bible, translated into German, were published at Wittenberg in 1470, 1483, and 1490; one of them thirteen years before the birth of Luther, another in the very year of his birth; and a third seven years thereafter. "And all these in the immediate vicinity of Luther's birthplace; not to mention another edition which, the same author assures us, was published not far distant, at Augsburg, in 1518, just one year after Luther had turned reformer, and twelve years before he published the last portion of his own German version of the Bible! Another learned Protestant historian, Dibdin, thus speaks of the earlier printed editions of the Latin Bible: "From the year 1402 to the end of the fifteenth century, the editions of the Latin Bible may be considered literally innumerable; and, generally speaking, only repetitions of the same text." Among the more ancient and valuable editions of the Latin version he enumerates the following:—"As thus: at Metz, in 1455; at Bamberg, 1461; at Rome, 1471; Venice, 1476; Naples, 1476; in Bohemia, 1488; in Poland, 1563; in Iceland, 1551; in Russia, 1581; in France, 1475; in Holland, 1477; in England, 1535; in Spain, 1477." But it is a well ascertained fact that, long before the Reformation of Luther, the people of almost every country in Europe had the Bible already translated into their own vernacular tongues. In most nations there was not only one, but there were many different versions. We begin with Germany, the theatre of the Reformation. We have already seen the testimony of Seckendorf and of Menzel on this subject. The Germans had no less than five different translations of the Scriptures into their own language, of which three were previous to that of Luther—in 1530—and two were contemporary with or immediately subsequent to it. The oldest was that made by Uphilas, Bishop of the Messo-Goths (now Wallachians), as early as the middle of the fourth century. This version seems to have been used for several centuries by many of the old Gothic and German Christians. The second version was that ascribed to Charlemagne (beginning of ninth century), probably because it was made by some learned man under his direction.—Besides, there was an old rhythmical paraphrase of the four gospels used in Germany from time immemorial. There was an old edition printed in 1466, two copies of which are yet preserved in the library of Leipzig. Fifteen editions of this Bible were published in the principal cities of Germany. So much for the falsehood that Luther was the first who translated the Bible into German. In 1534, a new translation of the Latin Vulgate was published at Mayence, under the auspices of the Archbishop; it passed through twenty editions, seventeen of which were printed at Cologne.

Turn now to Italy. Here were published two versions anterior to that of Luther; one by Jacobus a Voragine, Archbishop of Genoa, which was completed as early as 1290; the other by Nicholas Malenni, printed at Rome and Venice in 1471, and which passed through thirteen editions. Two other Italian translations were printed simultaneously with that of Luther in 1532, one of which, in twenty years, passed through ten editions; the other, printed at Venice in 1538, and successive years, passed through ten editions. In France an old version, that by Des Moulins, appeared about the year 1478, which was corrected by the Bishop of Angers in 1487, and passed through sixteen editions, of which four were printed at Lyons and twelve at Paris. Passing over a great many others let us see what benighted Spain has done. Here the Scriptures were translated into Castilian, by order of Alphonso the Wise. Bonifacio Ferrer, brother to the Saint of the same name, translated the Bible in its entirety into Valencian in 1406, reprints of which edition appeared at later periods. In 1512 Ambrosio de Montesma translated the Epistles and Gospels, which translation was published at Barcelona, Antwerp, and Madrid. England also had her editions of the Bible. The Venerable Bede, in the eighth century, translated it all, while Alfred the Great is said to have translated the Psalms into Saxon. In 1290 another English edition appeared. Aldhelm, Bishop of Salisbury, in 706 translated the Psalter into Saxon; so says the biblicist Horn. In the fourteenth century John de Trevisa published an English version of the whole Bible; in 905 Elfric, Archbishop of Canterbury, translated into English the Pentateuch, Joshua, Job, the Judges, Ruth, parts of the books of Kings, Esther, and the Maccabees.

Turn now to the lower countries. Archbishop Usher, a Protestant historian, asserts that the Bible was translated into Flemish by Jacobus Merland before the year 1210, and passed through seven editions before 1530, at which time Luther appeared. The Antwerp edition was republished in the short space of seventeen years. In Antwerp alone ten editions of the New Testament, translated by Cornelius Kendrick, were published before 1524. In Poland and Sweden, a Slavonian version was printed at Cracow in the beginning of the sixteenth century. St. Bridget, Queen of Sweden, had the whole Bible translated into the vernacular of the country in the fourteenth century. In Prussia the Bible was translated into Bohemian in 1488, and passed through three different editions. The last was published in 1511. Now let us finish by turning to Rome, from whose centre flowed religion to the different parts of the world. Bibles were printed in Syria, Arabic, and Armenian, and other dialects of the East. The Bible was translated in the Ethiopic language in 1548.—So that before Luther's version in 1530 at least twenty-two different Catholic versions, comprising seventy editions, were printed in various parts of the world, from 1460, the time from which printing dates; to 1530, a period of seventy years. Notwithstanding all these facts and figures, I presume the old calumny will be repeated that Luther's German translation of the Bible was the first that ever appeared. Cardinal Ximenes published a polyglot Bible in six folio volumes at Alcalá, in Spain, in the year 1515, two years before the Reformation, or while it was still brewing. Another was published at Antwerp in 1572; another at Paris in 1646. However, thirteen years afterwards a Protestant polyglot appeared in London, published by Walton. What can we now think of Luther's effusions; who says in his "Table Talk," "Thirty years ago the

Bible was an unknown book; the prophets were not understood; it was thought that they could not be translated. I was twenty years old before I saw the Scriptures; I thought there was no other Gospel, no other Epistles, than those of the pastora!" And this has been repeated from pulpit to pulpit, and to the little children attending Sunday School. It is too bad to disturb the quiet little story; it is so nice to run down the Catholic Church, without being conscious of lying; Now, I would ask, why were these versions multiplied, why so many translations, if the people were vetoed to read them? What publisher would be foolish enough to issue so many reprints of a book which no one ever read or dared to read? At no time did the Church forbid its reading; but always prohibited the circulation of erroneous editions. Not until 1563 was its being read in the vernacular prohibited, at which time a restrictive law was passed to that effect by the Council of Trent, when the Bible was made use of as the foundation of the most erroneous doctrines; that kings, rulers, magistrates, and all in power, lost their authority the moment they fell from grace—a most inconvenient doctrine now-a-days. Pearls must not be thrown to swine; the most sacred things are abused, and the Bible, too often; and monstrous doctrines are reputed to have been drawn from it. Certain portions of the Old Testament were not permitted to be read by the Jews until they arrived at a certain age—a wise precaution for our own times.—Children of both sexes in their tender ages, when passions are excited by curiosity, too often are found before the Bible class, prying into and finding out the meaning of what they had much better be in ignorance. We have drawn from Dr. Spalding's "History of the Reformation" many of the facts which we have cited. In conclusion, his Grace expressed his regrets that time did not permit him to speak on the Forgiveness of Sins; he would reserve his remarks on this important subject for another time.

Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament was then given by Very Rev. Vicar-General Rooney, who was assisted by Rev. Father Shea as deacon, after which the vast congregation dispersed.—Toronto Globe.

MR. GLADSTONE, LORD CAMOYS, AND LORD ACTON.

To the Editor of the Times.

Sir,—As Mr. Gladstone has stated that about one-sixth of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom held doctrines which, if logically carried out, are "incentive to general disturbance, a premium upon European wars," it is of the gravest importance that in meeting so serious a charge no false impression be allowed to influence the public mind. If the letters of Lord Acton and Lord Camoys go unchallenged, much misapprehension will obtain. Permit me, then, to trespass on your space to prevent this—

1. Excellent as are these noble peers, they are in no way representatives either of Catholic thought or of the Catholic laity. They take little or no part in the life of the Catholic body in this country, and would not have the shadow of a chance to be chosen as spokesmen of our laity.

2. Lord Acton, having made statements imputing atrocious charges to the Holy See, is bound in common justice to give equally publicly the authorities on which these rest.

3. If Lord Camoys seriously and obstinately refuses to accept the "doctrine of the personal infallibility of the Pope," then does he make shipwreck of the Faith, and ipso facto separate himself from communion with the Church and the See of St. Peter.

4. Before the Vatican Decree all Catholics were bound to hold that the gift of Infallibility belonged to the Church; that it was exercised by the teaching body of the Church united to the Pope either dispersed in daily teaching or assembled in General Council; and that this Infallibility was exercised over the whole field of "faith and morals."

5. After the Vatican Decree, Infallibility neither in its nature nor in its scope was added to; it was only decided that the *ex-cathedra* or official utterances of the Head of the Church were so directed by the Holy Ghost that they could not be at variance with the truth. This did but assert the unerring exercise of the Infallibility of the Church through its head.

6. It is, therefore, a misunderstanding on the part of Lord Camoys and Mr. Gladstone to imagine that the Vatican Decree in any way touched the former domain of Infallibility. If it were justifiable to emancipate Catholics, and extend to them the political privileges of other of Her Majesty's subjects previous to 1870, there is not the least reason now for raising a new cry against them.

7. The Church has always held—

- (a) That all power, civil or ecclesiastical, emanates from God.
(b) That both, therefore, are to be honoured and obeyed.
(c) That the ecclesiastical power is superior to the civil, and defines the limit of one and the other.
(d) That where the civil power passes its proper province, then has the Church the right to raise her voice and condemn it.

8. As in fulfilling the precept "Honour thy father and thy mother" cases may arise wherein the child must obey God rather than its parent, so likewise may unfortunately happen that the State may abuse its power, and conscience, clearly perceiving this, legitimately refuse obedience. But as the exception in the first instance does not justify us in speaking of a divided allegiance, neither does it in the second.

I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant,

T. J. CAPEL.

Catholic University College, Kensington, Nov. 15.

DR. DOLLINGER AND THE "OLD CATHOLICS."

The new sect to which Dr. Dollinger now belongs has assumed a new name (as is the wont of Schismatics), and call themselves "Old Catholics;" whereby they profess to hold the truths and teaching of the Catholic Church from the commencement of Christianity, or the Faith of the early Church during the first ages of its existence. From Dr. Dollinger we learn what was the faith of the Primitive Church; and what (ere he fell) was his own dogmatic teaching on the supremacy of St. Peter, and of the successors in Peter's See.

The following extracts are from the 33rd chapter of a treatise by Dr. Dollinger, entitled, *The Commencement of Christianity*, the subject of the chapters being, "Of the Primacy."—"As the Bishop represents and preserves the unity of his Church; as the metropolitan in the midst of his suffragans is their representative and their centre; in the same manner the whole building of Catholicism has its keystone, to serve as the support of all Churches, by maintaining them in unity of faith and of love. In the same manner as Judaism had its centre and supreme Head, so Christianity has its Sovereign Papacy attached to the See of the successor of St. Peter. Thus placed at the head of the Episcopacy, the Bishop of Rome became and has remained for the whole of Christendom what the Bishop is for his Diocese, and the Metropolitan for his Province. Jesus Christ, in plain words, 'conferred' to St. Peter authority over His Church. After having exacted from him a solemn declaration of his faith, 'He proclaimed him to be the Rock on which 'He' would found the Divine Edifice; and promised to him the 'Keys of His Kingdom,' that is, the power, which Peter needed for the government of the Church; and the maintenance of religious unity.' In the same manner, after having accepted from His apostles an assurance of unbounded love, 'He established' him as Chief Pastor, in these words: 'Feed my lambs'

anon. But why does he stand there and from me? They told me he was buried in the glen. See there is no blood upon my hand."

MR. GLADSTONE, LORD CAMOYS, AND LORD ACTON.

To the Editor of the Times.

Sir,—As Mr. Gladstone has stated that about one-sixth of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom held doctrines which, if logically carried out, are "incentive to general disturbance, a premium upon European wars," it is of the gravest importance that in meeting so serious a charge no false impression be allowed to influence the public mind. If the letters of Lord Acton and Lord Camoys go unchallenged, much misapprehension will obtain. Permit me, then, to trespass on your space to prevent this—

1. Excellent as are these noble peers, they are in no way representatives either of Catholic thought or of the Catholic laity. They take little or no part in the life of the Catholic body in this country, and would not have the shadow of a chance to be chosen as spokesmen of our laity.

2. Lord Acton, having made statements imputing atrocious charges to the Holy See, is bound in common justice to give equally publicly the authorities on which these rest.

3. If Lord Camoys seriously and obstinately refuses to accept the "doctrine of the personal infallibility of the Pope," then does he make shipwreck of the Faith, and ipso facto separate himself from communion with the Church and the See of St. Peter.

4. Before the Vatican Decree all Catholics were bound to hold that the gift of Infallibility belonged to the Church; that it was exercised by the teaching body of the Church united to the Pope either dispersed in daily teaching or assembled in General Council; and that this Infallibility was exercised over the whole field of "faith and morals."

5. After the Vatican Decree, Infallibility neither in its nature nor in its scope was added to; it was only decided that the *ex-cathedra* or official utterances of the Head of the Church were so directed by the Holy Ghost that they could not be at variance with the truth. This did but assert the unerring exercise of the Infallibility of the Church through its head.

6. It is, therefore, a misunderstanding on the part of Lord Camoys and Mr. Gladstone to imagine that the Vatican Decree in any way touched the former domain of Infallibility. If it were justifiable to emancipate Catholics, and extend to them the political privileges of other of Her Majesty's subjects previous to 1870, there is not the least reason now for raising a new cry against them.

7. The Church has always held—

- (a) That all power, civil or ecclesiastical, emanates from God.
(b) That both, therefore, are to be honoured and obeyed.
(c) That the ecclesiastical power is superior to the civil, and defines the limit of one and the other.
(d) That where the civil power passes its proper province, then has the Church the right to raise her voice and condemn it.

8. As in fulfilling the precept "Honour thy father and thy mother" cases may arise wherein the child must obey God rather than its parent, so likewise may unfortunately happen that the State may abuse its power, and conscience, clearly perceiving this, legitimately refuse obedience. But as the exception in the first instance does not justify us in speaking of a divided allegiance, neither does it in the second.

I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant,

T. J. CAPEL.

Catholic University College, Kensington, Nov. 15.

DR. DOLLINGER AND THE "OLD CATHOLICS."

The new sect to which Dr. Dollinger now belongs has assumed a new name (as is the wont of Schismatics), and call themselves "Old Catholics;" whereby they profess to hold the truths and teaching of the Catholic Church from the commencement of Christianity, or the Faith of the early Church during the first ages of its existence. From Dr. Dollinger we learn what was the faith of the Primitive Church; and what (ere he fell) was his own dogmatic teaching on the supremacy of St. Peter, and of the successors in Peter's See.

The following extracts are from the 33rd chapter of a treatise by Dr. Dollinger, entitled, *The Commencement of Christianity*, the subject of the chapters being, "Of the Primacy."—"As the Bishop represents and preserves the unity of his Church; as the metropolitan in the midst of his suffragans is their representative and their centre; in the same manner the whole building of Catholicism has its keystone, to serve as the support of all Churches, by maintaining them in unity of faith and of love. In the same manner as Judaism had its centre and supreme Head, so Christianity has its Sovereign Papacy attached to the See of the successor of St. Peter. Thus placed at the head of the Episcopacy, the Bishop of Rome became and has remained for the whole of Christendom what the Bishop is for his Diocese, and the Metropolitan for his Province. Jesus Christ, in plain words, 'conferred' to St. Peter authority over His Church. After having exacted from him a solemn declaration of his faith, 'He proclaimed him to be the Rock on which 'He' would found the Divine Edifice; and promised to him the 'Keys of His Kingdom,' that is, the power, which Peter needed for the government of the Church; and the maintenance of religious unity.' In the same manner, after having accepted from His apostles an assurance of unbounded love, 'He established' him as Chief Pastor, in these words: 'Feed my lambs'

(TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT.)