

British American Presbyterian

Vol. 4--No. 10.]

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1875.

[Whole No. 166]

Contributors and Correspondents

VATICANISM.

This is the title Mr. Gladstone gives to his rejoinder, to "the reproofs and replies" that have appeared since the publication of his article entitled "The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on civil allegiance." This is a most trenchant production. It enters very elaborately into all the questions opened up by his previous pamphlet; and fully sustains his reputation for learning and thoroughness. He evidently has not spoken, without in the first place taking a wide view of the subject to be discussed in all its connections and bearings. He proves himself thoroughly conversant with the history of Romanism. In the introduction, he refers to some of the strictures that have been offered upon his previous publication. (1) that of a considerable portion of the secular press condemning the discussion as inopportune and unnecessary. (2) that of many of the Ultramontane party who allege that the tract in question was an insult offered to the Roman Catholics of England. In reply to the latter charge, he disclaims all personal feeling. "To assail the system, is the Alpha and Omega of my desire; and it is to me a matter of regret that I am not able to handle it as it deserves, without reflecting upon the persons, be they who they may, that have brought it into the world; have sedulously fed it in its weakness, have reared it up to its baleful maturity, have forced it upon those who now force it upon others; and obtaining for it from day to day fresh command over the pulpit, the press, the confessional, the teacher's chair, the bishop's throne; so that every father of a family, and every teacher in the Latin communion, shall, as he dies, be replaced by some one more deeply imbued with the new colour, until at last in that moiety of the whole Christian family, nothing shall remain except an Arian monarchy, and one dead level of religious subservency." The third stricture to which he replies has reference to his own "ignorance and incapacity in theology," a charge made by Archbishop Manning, bishops Ullathorne and Vaughan, and others. To these Mr. Gladstone replies: "Censures of this kind have great weight when they follow upon demonstration given of errors committed by the person who is the object of them, but they can have very little where they are used as substitutes for such a demonstration." The reply, to which Mr. Gladstone attaches most importance, is that written by Dr. Newman, who is described by him as "the transcendent champion," and of whom he does not hesitate to say, "His secession from the Church of England has never yet been estimated among us, at anything like the full amount of its calamitous importance." After reviewing at some length these replies, and considering their explanations and modifications of the dogma of infallibility, he concludes: "It must not be forgotten that the very best of all the declarations we have heard from those who allow themselves to be entangled in the meshes of the Vatican Decrees, are, every one of them, uttered subject to the condition that, upon orders from Rome, if such orders should issue they shall be qualified, or retracted, or reversed."

The pamphlet is divided into eight sections. The first he calls the introduction. The second discusses "The Rusty Tools." Under this head, the Syllabus is discussed (1) as to its contents, and (2) as to its authority. His third leading division treats of the Vatican Council, and the Infallibility of the Pope, which subject is continued under his fourth head. His aim in this part of his pamphlet, is to show that Rome guilty of a "Breach with History" in the Vatican Decrees. He rests this charge upon the very important facts, one found in the history of Romanism in Britain for the last two centuries; the other in the history of the Council of Constance in the early part of the fifteenth century.

Our space will not admit of anything like a full statement of his masterly and unanswerable argument on each of these points; but we shall try to present as briefly as we can a few of the leading features of the case. Archbishop Manning announces the following propositions:—(1) "That the Infallibility of the Pope was a doctrine of divine right before the council of the Vatican was held." (2) That the Vatican Decrees have no jot or tittle changed either the obligations or conditions of civil allegiance." In opposition to these declarations, Mr. Gladstone undertakes to prove "that upon the authority for many generations of those who proceeded Archbishop Manning and his coadjutors in their present official position, as well as upon other authority, Papal infallibility was not a doctrine of divine right before the council of the Vatican was held."

In support of this proposition the following facts are given. In the year 1757, the Irish Roman Catholic Committee published a declaration in which they said, "It is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither are we thereby required to believe or profess that the Pope is infallible." Here it quotes from the Protestantism of the Roman Catholics of England in 1788-9. In this very important document, which brought about the passing of the great English Relief Act of 1791, it is stated (1) The subscribers to it "acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope. (2) That their church has no power that can directly or indirectly injure Protestants, as all she can do is to refuse them her sacraments which they do not want. And (3) that no ecclesiastical power whatsoever, directly or indirectly effect or interfere with the independence, sovereignty, laws, constitution, or government of the realm." This Protestantism was in the strictest sense a representative and binding document. It was signed by two hundred and forty one priests, including all the Vicars Apostolic, by all the clergy and laity in England of any note, and in 1789 at a general meeting of the English Catholics in London, it was subscribed by every person present."

The Relief Act of 1791 for England was followed by a similar act in 1796 for Ireland. The Oath inserted in this act is founded upon the declaration of 1757 and embodies the words "It is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither am I hereby required to believe or profess that the Pope is infallible." Then in 1810, the Irish Bishops assembled in Synod declared as follows:—"That said oath and the promises, declarations, abjurations, and protestations, therein contained are notoriously to the Roman Catholic Church at large become a part of the Roman Catholic religion, as taught by us, the Bishops, and received and maintained by the Roman Catholic churches in Ireland, and as such are approved and sanctioned by other Roman Catholic Churches." Mr. Gladstone goes on to say: "These are 'the declarations which reach in effect from 1661 to 1810, and it is in the light of these declarations that the evidence of Dr. Doyle in 1826, and the declarations of the Irish prelates of the Papal Communion, shortly afterwards, are to be read. Here, then, is an extraordinary fulness and clearness of evidence reaching over nearly two centuries; given by and on behalf of millions of men; given in documents patent to all the world; perfectly well known to the See and Court of Rome, as we know expressly with respect to the most important of all these assurances, namely, the actual and direct repudiation of infallibility in 1788-9. So that either the See and Court of Rome had at the last named date and at the date of the Synod of 1810, abandoned the dream of enforcing infallibility on the Church, or else by wilful silence they were guilty of practicing upon the British crown one of the blackest frauds recorded in history." Thus by the most reliable evidence Mr. Gladstone establishes his position in respect to the general sentiments of English and Irish Catholics during the last two centuries that the Church of Rome has lately changed her faith."

But let us now notice the second ground upon which this very serious charge is based. It is a distinct decision of the Council of Constance, which decision was sanctioned by Pope Martin V. and which declared that it had supreme power over the Universal Church. Here then is a direct contradiction by Council and Pope of the 19th century of Council and Pope in the 15th; which is right, and are both infallible? This is a very serious difficulty for the infallibilists, and the manner in which they attempt to meet it looks very much like very shallow quibbling. It is not denied that the Council of Constance was approved and affirmed by the Pope; but it is asserted that the decree of the fifth session—the one in question was not approved. Mr. Gladstone meets this allegation, and shows that instead of getting the infallibilists out of their difficulties it involves them in deeper. Mr. Gladstone presents them with the following dilemma:—"Pope Martin V. desired his whole power to confirm from his election to the Papal Chair by this Council of Constance, and this council was competent to elect because of the depositions of three rival Popes; for if the See was truly vacant before there had been no Pope since the schism in 1378 which is not supposed by either side. But the power of the Council to vacate the See was in virtue of the principle asserted by the decree of the fifth session. We arrive then at the following dilemma. Either that decree had full validity by the confirmation of the Pope, or Martin V. was not a Pope; the cardinals appointed by him were not cardinals, and could not validly elect his successor, Eugene IV.; so that the Papal succession had fallen since an early date in the 15th cen-

tury if that decree did not receive the sanction of the Pope."

The other topics treated of in the article are, viz., V. "The Vatican Council and obedience to the Pope." VI. Revived claims of the Papal chair (1) the deposing power (2) the use of force. VII. Warrant of allegiance according to the Vatican; and lastly, VIII. The intrinsic nature and conditions of the Papal infallibility decreed in the Vatican Council. We cannot give any illustration of the very thorough manner in which Mr. Gladstone discusses these several points. The whole paper is most learned and able, and we do not hesitate to say is one of the most important contributions that has yet been made to this, the greatest politico-religious question of the present day.—Com.

OUR SCHOOL BOOKS.

MR. EDITOR.—Is it a fact that under the direction of the Council of Public Instruction, Mr. Goldwin Smith is along with Archbishop Lynch engaged in revising Collier's History of England, with a view to the removal of all passages which may be offensive to Ultramontane Catholicism? Is it not enough that we have put our God's word from our schools at the Pope's bidding, but we must also falsify God's providence to save the system? Are we so ashamed of the glorious reformation and what God then wrought for our fathers, that we must agree to a vile misrepresentation of facts, and impose on our children ignorance of the constitutional struggles which have produced the empire of Great Britain? Mr. Editor, I am anxious to do all justice to my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, to give them every privilege I enjoy, I wish to see them educated, and would do so violence to their conscience, priest-ridden though it is. It is, however, a different thing when to save that conscience I must have my children taught a defective and false history, and kept in ignorance of the most honourable struggle of the sixteenth century and of the great principles of Protestant liberty. The Bible is withdrawn from our schools, the true source of spiritual truth and morality; are the lessons of history now to be withdrawn? And are we to expect next in order the revision of our scientific books so as to illuminate every thing contradictory to the leading of the Church of Rome that is found in the works of God?

I am not sure, Mr. Editor, that you have access to all political secrets, and would have addressed myself to the *Globe*, only that I see it is helping Popery; along and approves of separate schools, no Bible, etc. Perhaps, however, you can find some true conservative or evangelical liberal that can give you light as to the action of the Council of Public Instruction under the inspiration of Bishop Lynch and his amiable coadjutor.

Yours, truly,
10th April, 1875.
QUERENT.

Clerical Assumption.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—In a recent issue of a city contemporary, a letter appears signed "T. W. Patterson, Incumbent of Bradford," which attracted my attention, and excited my curiosity in consequence of its arrogant assumptions, and its daringly insulting sentiment. But for the concluding remarks, I should not have thought it necessary to say a word on the subject, and were it not that the writer's *isms* seems of more importance to him than a manifestation of sympathy in family bereavement, common decency among his fellow men, or even Christianity itself, he would have passed unrebuked by my pen. Hear it, and be astonished ye Bradfordians that by virtue of the power vested in him, by the authority of the dignitary of Trinity College, T. W. Patterson, the self-styled Incumbent of Bradford, has assumed the spiritual and supreme oversight of the whole of you, and now, henceforth, and forever, you are expected to bow down and do obeisance to your spiritual overseer. Hear his proclamation to you in the *News*:—"The incumbent of Bradford, a man indispensable, absolutely necessary to your welfare, has taken up his abode among you, full of the graces of Ritualistic mummery, he comes to dispense the blessings of the creed and prayer book which his predecessors have lost sight of, and these blessings are not to be confined to the small and meagre few (who are growing beautifully less) of his own church, but to the whole of Bradford Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Roman Catholics, and all others are embraced in his paternal arms. I hear this *novum homo* from his high and elevated rostrum uttering over your "Parva levia respiciunt animas," and you are expected "In perpetuum" to attend to his ministrations. One of the new

discoveries which he has been pleased to make known, is, that it is an offence for a Christian minister to pray on the burial ground of his church, simply because he claims superiority for his church, on account of its unbroken connection with the followers of Him who said, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye love one another." Surely this self-styled incumbent of Bradford has forgotten the good manners, the sentiments of reverence his good Scotch mother instilled into his mind, when he dares to insult an aged and venerable minister of the Church of Scotland, by forbidding him to pray on the burial ground connected with the church, to which he (the incumbent) belongs. "Tell it not in Gath," it should not be published in the streets of Adajla, that here in West Gwillimbury is a rival for pre-eminence, and priestly assumption. The Roman Catholic population of this section must be more than satisfied, when they see so large a portion of the graduates of Trinity College returning to grasp the power and privilege of "Lording it over God's heritage;" their hearts must rejoice, when they read that this man of yesterday in his Ritualistic zeal, not only insults an aged Protestant minister, but forbids that God Himself has enjoined that "men pray everywhere." "No," says this incumbent, "not in my church burial ground; this privilege is reserved for myself, and those who can trace their descent through the line of prelate, unbroken succession." "Clear out of my presence," says this autocrat. Paul's old-fashioned advice to Timothy is obsolete in these days. Instead of intruding the venerable oligarchy as a father, this Incumbent boasts that he rebuked him, "withstood him to the face," while the hearts of the bereaved friends were wrung with grief, as they prepared to lay their bright and beautiful in the dust, this clerical upstart forbids that prayer should be offered to God for the consolation which the friends of the deceased so much needed, unless it was offered by himself, and as if ashamed of his conduct, (and well he may be ashamed of such conduct) he now wishes us to believe that it was not on account of his high church notions, that this difficulty arose; but what are the facts? There are men cognizant of the fact that this Incumbent insulted a member of the family he refers to, by directing him to take off his hat when he entered a pile of bricks and mortar, in which this Incumbent and some others were standing round the stove, during one of the ordinary working days of the week, talking about the ordinary affairs of life. The absence of several members of the family he refers to from the church of their choice, is directly chargeable to the high churchism of this Incumbent, who, during the few months he has been here, has merited the appellation which some apply to him—an incumbrance to Christianity in general, and to his own church in particular. With the quarrel in his own church, men in general have little to do, but when this newly fledged clerical gentleman so far forgets himself as to insult "an aged and venerable clergyman of the Church of Scotland," and through him, every minister of the gospel in the land, it is time he should be answered, lest he should become wise in his own conceits. The men of South Simcoe, with some few exceptions, understand that a tree is known by its fruits, and if they have to partake of the Roman apple, they prefer to have it direct from the garden of Pope Pius the IX, rather than partake of that mongrel grown thing, which the gardener of Trinity College cultivates, and which this Incumbent of Bradford and his compeers labour to make people believe, is not grown there at all.

The time is past, when ignorant impertinence will pass muster for moral and intellectual greatness, or the shadow be taken for the substance. If Christian courtesy, kindness, and liberality is a species of low churchism, command it to us, say we. If the predecessors of this Incumbent neglected to turn to the east in certain portions of the church service, and omitted to bring before their hearers those anti-Christian doctrines of the Church of Rome, which have been incorporated with their system of doctrine, they did not forget to preach Christ crucified, and to manifest in their lives a degree of brotherly kindness, which still lives in the hearts of those to whom they ministered, and with whom they associated and came in contact, and I doubt not will continue to live, when the present Incumbent and his popish notions are obsolete and forgotten. "Murder will out." The inference is, that as the prayer to be offered by a Protestant minister, would have been an insult to this Incumbent and his church, if made on his church ground, that he is no Protestant at all, but a Jesuit in disguise, living upon a community whose Protestant principles he is seeking to undermine and remove.

ANOTHER PROTESTANT.
West Gwillimbury, January 30th, 1875.

Hymn Books for Special Services.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—Allow me to call the attention of your readers to a very interesting collection of Hymns, entitled the *Ontario Hymn Book, for Evangelistic services*, compiled and sold by Mr. Robert MacKay, Evangelist, Kingston, Ontario, and published by Lovell, Montreal. It contains 100 of the choicest Hymns, best adapted for special services, prayer meetings, or Sabbath Schools—the Hymns now most frequently sung at all Union meetings—and special services. Printed in good clear type and on good paper, and all for the small sum of five cents each. I have no hesitation in saying that it is by far the cheapest and best Book of the kind now in the market. Any person can get a supply by writing either to Mr. MacKay as above, or the publisher.

ROBERT WALLACE.

Professor McLaren's Lecture.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—I had the pleasure of hearing the lecture delivered by the Rev. Professor McLaren, on the second commandment, in Knox Church, on the evening of Wednesday the 7th inst., and must confess that it was the ablest defence of the lawfulness of instrumental music in the worship of God I remember to have heard or read. I have regarded the use of musical instruments in the service of praise as wrong because I could not see any scriptural warrant for it. Professor McLaren disposed very satisfactorily of several of the arguments that have been advanced on both sides of the question: so far, he has done good service, and would remove the difficulties felt by many on the subject if he had gone a little further. The learned Professor is satisfied that instrumental music formed no part of the Mosaic economy because "Miriam and her band, before" that "economy was inaugurated, used instrumental music in singing the public praises of God on the shores of the Red Sea." According to this reasoning, it appears to me, that priests and animal sacrifices were no part of the same economy: for they were used in the public worship of God "before the Mosaic economy was inaugurated." I hope Professor McLaren will be kind enough to clear up this little difficulty. Afterwards he said: "We demur to the . . . position, viz.: that instrumental music, as an aid in the worship of God, requires to be re-inacted in the New Testament. We have no reason to suppose that it had been expressly enacted by God where Miriam and her band employed it in celebrating his praise, and it may be equally lawful now without any warrant, save that supplied by the light of nature and Christian procedure." Mr. McLaren has done well to qualify his statement by the adverb "expressly," for "we have no reason to suppose" that "Miriam and her band employed it" without divine warrant. If they did, it was will-worship.

The lecturer maintained that instrumental music forms no more a part of the worship of God than a church and a church bell do, but to my mind there is a marked difference. The church and its bell are certainly external circumstances and from no part whatever of the service, but "the majestic and solemn swell of noble organs pealing through the resounding aisles of cathedrals," is an integral part of the service of praise when used therein, and often the principal, if not the only part of it.

I wish the learned Professor had given some proof of his statement, that the Jews and early Christians had no harmony in their music. There are several things which a careful historical inquiry show to be little more than the revival of what was known and practical in ancient times. Musical harmony may be one of these. There are certain passages of Scripture that to my mind closely indicate so much. In the one hundred and fiftieth psalm, we find the people commanded to praise God with full concert of musical instruments, and it is evident that some of these—the trumpet, the cymbal, and the tumbrel, were accompaniments only. It is therefore not correct to say that the Jews "had no harmony in their music."

While I agree with the principle so clearly stated by Mr. McLaren, that Ritualism is a system of religious symbol, I do not admit that we are at liberty to introduce into the worship of God, practices that have no divine warrant, even though we attach no symbolical significance to them. To follow in matters of this kind, the guidance of "the light of nature and Christian prudence" is not without serious danger, and this the compilers of "the Confession of Faith" evidently felt to be the case, for they expressly directed that these should be followed "according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed."

There were other statements made by Mr. McLaren that should be noticed, but my communication has already extended beyond the limits which I intended when I commenced. I therefore close, and remain,

Yours, truly,
A LIBERAL CONSERVATIVE.

'By Their Fruits Ye shall Know Them.'

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—I desire to ask a place in your paper for another brief note. I gave, and give again, my name, for the simple reason that I do not wish to utter a word on the subject of God's praise, but with guarded lips. It would be far better, in my humble judgment, were the writers on Psalms and Hymns in your paper to give their names. My desire at present is to lift the case from personal experience to the wide basis of general statistics. We live in an age of secretaries and annual returns. It seems to me perfectly fair dealing to put every Church to the test of work done. Which Church has "laboured more abundantly" in missionary enterprise? What proportion of heathen converts and their children have been trained to sing Psalms? What number sing Psalms bent with the rigidity of a translation—after the fashion of our Psalter?

Put the question with all incisive closeness, so that the whole truth may be given us. Ask Scotch, English, Irish, and American Presbyterians, "What do you sing in your mission churches?" Finally, let us by all means know the number of missionaries in the field from those Churches that sing only Psalms.

It has been a century of mission activity. I, for one, will judge that Church that has the smallest record to be like the fig tree—green, but no fruit. Will the Lord of the Vineyard deny a blessing to those who hold the truth as it is in Jesus?

If I have made myself understood, I hope we shall stand by our Lord's searching saying: "Ye shall know them by their fruits." I am, yours truly,
WALTER ISOLA.