

applies to his soul the merits of the sufferings of Christ. 'And if he be in sin, his sin will be forgiven him.' "

But what if the priest do *not* reach him while he "still breathes?" And yet even the very Archbishop himself is exposed to this awful contingency of dying suddenly without receiving that sacrament which alone "applies to the soul the merits of the sufferings of Christ! Well may such a Church teach her votaries to pray for deliverance from "sudden death!" The "cruelty," as it seems to us, is not in "depriving the sick person of this beautiful means," but in taking away CHRIST from the people, and offering them "the sacraments;" in giving them a stone when they ask for bread!

Dr. Lynch says again:—"We are accused of image-worshipping, of worshipping the saints and the Virgin Mary, and of paying divine honours to relics. All these allegations are simply untrue and absurd. We pay no divine worship to any except to God. We venerate the Saints as friends of God, and give them that secondary honour which is due to dignity and rank. We are told, 'Honour thy father and thy mother,' and the king, and magistrates, and rulers, and this secondary honour, though in a higher degree, we pay to the Saints." His reply is (as Dr. Lynch himself admits in speaking of the Pagan Sallust) almost precisely the same as is given by the more intelligent idolators among the heathen. But do the common people so understand it? What *must* be the result, when they are taught to pray ten times to the Holy Virgin,—*"Ave Maria!"*—for one *"Pater-noster"* to our great Father in heaven! Besides, what likeness is there between the "honour" due to a parent, and the prayers offered to the Virgin and the Saints? Does Dr. Lynch daily prostrate himself before his father's bust, or his mother's picture, and pray to it? And once more, and more important still, does not the Bible say of such acts of devotion, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above," &c. "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them &c." But we had almost forgotten that the existence of such a prohibition in the Bible, and its exclusion from the Roman Catholic *catechism*, is one of the reasons why Rome doesn't wish her people to possess the Word of God.

The worship of saints, and of the Holy Virgin, is just one shade less absurd than the worship of gods of silver and gold, and only one. For, after all Dr. Lynch's specious arguments in favour of it, on the ground that the angels in heaven "know when the sinner repents on earth," and that the Virgin and the saints may know when the sinner prays, there still remains the fact that unless the saints whose help is implored be more than human, they cannot attend to the prayers of thousands and millions of men and women, in all parts of the earth, at the same moment of time. The Infinite Mind alone can do that!

"We are accused," he says, again, "of holding damnable doctrines, such as, that a priest by his own power can forgive sins; that the Pope can grant indulgences to commit sin; that indulgences remit actual sins; and that for a fair sum of money the Catholics can get permission from their priests to do very many evil things. This, certainly is damnable doctrine, but, thank God, it is not ours. No man can forgive sins of his own authority. All remission of sin must come from God. No sin ever was, or ever can be, forgiven without true repentance. No power on earth can permit any man to do wrong. Indulgences mean the relaxation of temporary punishments due to sin when the sin has been remitted by the sacrament of penance, but indulgences remit no sin."

For once we agree with His Grace; the sale of indulgences is "damnable doctrine," and more damnable practice. Tetzel sold them in the 16th century, however, by authority of Pope Leo X, and we can furnish the Archbishop, if he desires it, with a "price list" of the particular sins for which he was authorized to grant indulgences, and "plenary remission," in the name of the Holy Trinity! *Perhaps* Rome has changed since then,—perhaps not. But we cannot follow Dr. Lynch through all the points discussed in his lecture. His arguments for the celibacy of the clergy, however, and the gratuitous assumptions with which he starts out, demand