

sprang up, and while the number of Protestant Christians became more numerous, the number of sects multiplied accordingly, until to-day we might say that each individual is a sect in himself, no two agreeing upon any one fundamental dogma. And in accordance as the divisions augmented the denominations drifted farther and farther away from the original Protestantism, until they have so protested and inter-protested against each other, that not a single vestige is to-day left of the first doctrines preached by the authors of the Reformation. Let us take the words of Hallam, the Protestant historian. In his "Literature of Europe," he says: "The prodigious increase of the Protestant party in Europe, after the middle of the sixteenth century, did not continue more than a few years. It was checked and fell back, not quite so rapidly or completely as it came on, but so as to leave the antagonist church in perfect security." Listen now to Macaulay: "We think it a most remarkable fact, that no Christian nation, which did not adopt the principles of the Reformation before the end of the sixteenth century, should ever have adopted them. Catholic communities have, since that time, become infidel and become Catholic again; but none has become Protestant." Lecky says: "During the last century of the many hundreds of great thinkers and writers, in every department, who have separated from the teachings and practices of Catholicism, it would be difficult to name three men of real eminence, and unquestionable sincerity who have attached themselves permanently to any of the more conservative forms of Protestantism. Amid all those great semi-religious revolutions which have unhinged the faith of thousands, and have so profoundly altered the relations of Catholicism and society, Protestant churches have made no advance and have exercised no perceptible influence." The same historian, in another place, says: "Of all the innumerable forms into which the spirit of dogmatism crystallized after the Reformation, not one seems to have retained the power of attracting those beyond its border. Whatever is lost by Catholicism is gained by Rationalism; wherever the spirit of Rationalism recedes, the spirit of Catholicism advances."

But as far as Protestantism is concerned it has no fixed principles; it is without an anchor. It is not aggressive; or if it attempts to be aggressive it has no power to affect its purpose, because its own ranks are divided, and it has no general to command—no central authority to guide. It has no conservative vitality; it is self-destructive in every move. Looking from a high plane of observation upon the world before us, contemplating time by centuries and space by continents, what do we behold? "A seceding host which, at the very moment of schism, broke into innumerable divisions." We see Protestantism as it really is, a host of sects multiplying daily—yes, hourly. We perceive these divisions clashing with each other, scrambling in all directions after fragments of truth. Nowhere do we see one Faith; nowhere is there any acknowledged or universally accepted authority; nowhere is there union of principles. There they are swayed and governed by the whim of circumstances. To use the words of Dr. Stone: "So far as such a body has any cohesion, it is that of mere congeries, like the *concurus atomorum* of the old philosophers; it is an amorphous conglomerate, which needs but the hammer of some great crisis to shatter it into individual particles."

Another evidence of the failure of Protestantism is the fact that it has

never succeeded in reaching the masses. A Salvation Army drum may summon a few hundred into the ranks, but they are merely acting under the spell of a sensationalism. But Protestantism, as a faith, as a Church, cannot exist on account of its own intestine divisions; but that which apparently is intended for a church is for the wealthy, not for the struggling people, the poor, the lowly. It is a religion of caste, and as such it cannot perform the mission which the Church of Christ is bound to fulfil.

In the next place a sign of the failure of Protestantism is apparent in the dread that its leaders, its thinkers, its writers seem to have always entertained. They appear to have had a fear of some terrible catastrophe that the Church of Rome has been preparing for them. They hold Catholicity in awe and horror; and they seek every imaginable means whereby injury can be done to the one only Church that they universally oppose. Think over this question, dear reader: Did you ever know a Catholic who "worried" about his Church, who was despondent for the purity of the Faith, who looked forward with apprehension to "the next Convention," who went about his work in a feverish excitement, as if his Church needed his championship? Did you ever hear of a Catholic who, in the hour of persecution, in the bitterest moment of the Church's troubles, on the occasion of the death of a Pope, or when victorious armies were driving a Sovereign Pontiff into exile, was heard to express a doubt as to the stability and perpetuity of his Church? The last thought that ever enters a Catholic mind is one of dread. The mere idea of the possibility of the Church perishing never yet flashed through a Catholic brain.

Again, Protestantism has failed most deplorably in its mission work. But on this subject we will speak later on. To conclude for this issue, we may say that the spasmodic outburst called the Reformation has long since squandered all its strength, and is merely existing upon the memory of achievements and conquests that are over forever. One hundred years hence the world will see the same Catholic Church; but Protestantism will be a mere jumble of unintelligible creeds, growing weaker and weaker as the end approaches.

THE FLESH VS. THE CHURCH.

Recently we wrote an editorial on the very comprehensive subject of the World versus the Church, in which we pointed out the antagonism that has ever existed between the powers of the world and the powers of Divine Truth that abide in the Church of Christ. We indicated the uncompromising attitude of the Church towards the infidelity, the irreligion, the wickedness of the age, also did we refer to the sole point upon which the numerous denominations of Christianity are united—that of opposition to the Catholic Church. Not only is the world at perpetual war with the most sacred institution of the ages, but the Flesh is equally her deadly antagonist. Before referring to the third and most important enemy of the Faith, namely, the Devil, we wish to show that his right and left bowmen—the World and the Flesh—are being constantly arrayed, with all their imps, against Catholicity. We do not say *Christianity*; we say *Catholicity*, and our reason for such a distinction we refer our readers to the article of the week before last upon the World versus the Church.

As an illustration of this unending and uncompromising struggle between the serpent of immorality and the pure spirit of the Church, we need but point

to the universally admitted fact that no Catholic ever turned Protestant in order to reform his morals and lead a better life. To quote the words of James Kent Stone, we will put the matter in a more undeniable shape: "No Protestant ever became a Catholic in order to throw off restriction and indulge his passions. The system of the Catholic Church is a system of restraints; the sinner is hedged about by her on every side, and if his heart be not right her yoke is galling."

Erasmus, during the early progress of the Reformation, wrote: "It seems as if the Reformation aimed at nothing more than to strip a few monks of their habits and to marry a parcel of priests; and this great tragedy terminates at last in a conclusion that is entirely comical, since, just like comedies, all ends in marriage." One more quotation from the first-mentioned author: "I have been asking for an explanation of the fact that the Church has so long withstood the assaults upon her; if I am requested in turn to furnish an intelligible reason why mankind should cherish against her such undying animosity, here is a sufficient answer: The Catholic Church wages ceaseless warfare against the lust of the flesh."

There is our contention set forth in a few words; there is the secret of the great widespread hatred felt by all outside her pale for the Catholic Church. She is at war with the World, and at war with the Flesh. Side by side with her dogmatic love we find her moral theology. This latter "is a department of sacred science which in Protestantism has no existence." The late Cardinal has noticed the fact that Andrew's *Exposition of the Ten Commandments*, Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium*, and Saunderson's *Cases of Conscience*, are the only attempts which the Anglican Church has made to supply this void in her theology; and that no three works have been more completely forgotten. In the Catholic Church the works on moral theology would fill a vast library. As this subject is one upon which we desire to be most explicit, we are more anxious to allow great writers and deep thinkers to express their views, than to merely depend entirely upon our own limited information. We will, therefore, quote the following from the ex-president of Hobart College.

Thus does that eminent convert speak: "The Protestant minister, in general, vibrates between his study and his pulpit. He lives in his books. He preaches to an ideal congregation, and knows the members of his flock only as friends and admirers, or as well-bred acquaintances. Moral questions he looks at only in the abstract. He knows almost nothing of the wants and weaknesses of individual souls; and the deep festering corruption of human nature is something which he would gladly cover up and forget. Perhaps his only acquaintance with the great moral theologians is through the unclean medium of such works as *Le Confesseur* (or we might add Chiniquy's rotten abomination—*The Priest, the Woman and the Confessional*). Or, if he has not read for himself, he has done so, not only with prejudice, but without appreciating the design of his authors, and therefore without the key to their meaning. He is perplexed by the minuteness of detail which he is compelled to follow; and he is almost angry at finding the wounds of the soul laid bare as by scalpel. He forgets that these words were 'not for the Preacher, but for the Confessor,' he forgets that 'sin consists in the thoughts of the heart'; it never occurs to him that the true physician, if he could prescribe for patients, must both know them and un-

derstand their maladies; and he comes to the hasty conclusion that Catholic priests must be men of subtle and even purged minds."

In another place the same distinguished scholar touches more closely upon the subject in hand. We have been attempting, through our articles on Divorce, to show how unbending the Church has ever been where there is question of morals, even as when there is question of dogma. We desire now to show, beyond all power of contradiction, that the future salvation of the human race—socially, morally, and religiously—depends upon the same unchanging and uncompromising Church. For the better attaining the object we have in view we are anxious to fortify our position with the best of material drawn from the most reliable of sources. To come back then to our author, he writes as follows: "It will hardly be denied that the tone of public morality is very low, and that there is even cause for grave apprehension in the lawlessness and fierce incontinence which abound on every hand. For myself, I sometimes shudder lest sins which rival those of Sodom should call down upon our nation some stroke of Divine vengeance. If, then, we were asked to name those evils which have made the most fearful inroads among us, so as already to extort a warning cry, we should probably mention these two: the contempt of the marriage tie, and that other crime which might well be called (perhaps has already been called) the murder of the innocents. Now, I have no hesitation in expressing my belief that the prevalence of these great sins is directly traceable to the fact that Protestantism has abolished and trampled upon two of the Sacraments of Christ's Holy Church—the sacrament of Matrimony, and the sacrament of Penance."

As to the former of these sacraments we have already written several articles upon its sanctity and its violation, the causes and the effects of both, whether under the heading "The Decline of Marriage" or that of "Divorce." If our readers desire to learn how the Continental Reformers regarded the Sacrament of Matrimony, let them read Luther's sermon on Marriage (if they can do so without a blush); or better still, the dogmatical judgment of Luther, Melancthon and Bucer, giving permission to the incontinent Landgrave of Hesse to commit bigamy, pure and simple. The precious document is to be found full set forth in Bossuet's sixth book of the *Variations*. No grander testimony than the words of Clement VII., when refusing to sanction the lawless divorce of Henry VIII.; the Pontiff wrote that "the Church knows not how to flatter the positions of princes nor approve their scandalous proceedings." It mattered not that the action of the Pope was about to cut off from the Church a whole nation and created a deadly enemy to the Faith; as long as a principle of sublime morality was at stake he did not for a moment hesitate to condemn that King of whom Heylin writes that he "never spared woman in his lust nor man in his anger." The inviolability of Marriage had to be maintained, and the Church was true to its pure and moral principles, leaving to God the future of those out off from her communion.

What Clement did regarding Henry, in the sixteenth century, was but the same assertion of the supremacy of the Divine law over the rebellion of sinful man, which had been made by Nicholas I. and Adrian II. against Lothaire in the ninth; by Urban II. and Pascal II. against Philip of France in the eleventh; by Celestine III. and Innocent III. against Philip Augustus, and by Clement