

under torture that he had been guilty of a Joltory. He was deemed to be hanged, but the sentence was commuted. He was only flogged through the city, and imprisoned in chains for ten years. Among these records we find a child sentenced to be hanged for cursing its parents, another to be flogged for saying his mother was a she devil; a girl to be excommunicated for putting on boy's clothes, and her mother also for not preventing her, a woman condemned to banishment for singing profane songs to psalm tunes; a man to imprisonment for reading the tales of Poggio; and a peasant to the same punishment for swearing at his cattle. In half a century 150 people were burned for witchcraft . . . . . Gruet was suspected of posting a libellous placard against Calvin. He was arrested and his papers seized; and the search after these papers, extended to the dust hole and cess pool. From the fragments thus collected a new charge of heresy was framed; he was tortured until he confessed every thing that was desired, and was then dismissed to the scaffold. Calvin was not yet satisfied; he insisted that the senate should condemn Gruet's writings to the flames; the senate could not frame a sentence against scraps of foul paper, so Calvin undertook the task himself, and this strange document is still preserved in his hand writing among the archives of Berne!"

Let us relate another liberal exploit of the Apostle of the Guardian, from the same authority who quotes the original documents.

Pierre Ameaux was a member of the Genevan Council of twenty five. At a supper, being excited by wine, he said some severe things of Calvin. At his table, another man, Henry de la Mar, had also said amidst the applauses of the guests, "that Calvin was a spiteful and vindictive man, who never pardoned any one against whom he had a grudge. The next morning Ameaux was cited before the Council. He excused himself by saying he was inflamed with wine. They fined him 30 Dollars, a large sum at that time. "On hearing of this sentence, Calvin arose, donned his doctor's dress, and escorted by the ministers and elders, penetrated into the hall of the Council, demanded Justice in the name of that God whom Pierre Ameaux had outraged, in the name of the morals he had sullied, and of the laws he had violated and declared he would quit Geneva if the man were not compelled to make the *amende honorable*—a public apology, bare-headed, at the City Hotel, and in two other public places. The Council yielded, and the next day, Ameaux, half naked, with a torch in his hand, accused himself in a loud voice of having knowingly and wickedly offended God, and begged pardon of his fellow citizens!"

So much, this week, for the dethronement of the Presbyterian Idol. We ask again, was it likely that God selected such an instrument for the reformation of the Christian world, or the foundation of a new Church?

## THE GREAT PROTESTANT CONFEDERACY.

'Q. What is Protestantism?

A. The abjuration of Popery, and the exclusion of Papists from all power.' Bishop of Durham's Catechism.

Of all the wonderful things in this very strange world, the hostile conjunction of all the scattered and discordant elements of the absurdity, called Protestantism, in opposition to Catholics, is not the least remarkable. This Protestant War-cry enrols under its motley standard a greater confusion of tongues than was seen at the tower of Babel.

"A motley crew with ever varying face,  
Devoid of spirit, order, strength and grace.  
Such as old Falstaff led, or such as might  
Have sought the banners of La Mancha's Knight."

They excommunicate and anathematize each other, as heartily as the first Reformers did. They all profess to be guided by the Bible, and no two Protestant sects agree in its interpretation. Reason as well as Scripture convinces us that as there

is but one true God, one faith and one Baptism, there can be but one True Church. Yet each Protestant sect calls itself the true Church and if its members be sincere, they must believe the rest of mankind to profess an erroneous faith. In most Protestant Churches, the ministry of the priesthood is degraded or lost. Having driven the altar out of the Church they abolished Sacrifice, and having no sacrifice to offer, they had no necessity for priests. Neither do they require a clergy to expound the Scriptures. They will submit to no human dictation. They can interpret the Scripture for themselves, and can read it by their own fireside, as well as hear it read in a Church by a fallible poor being like themselves. Hence in their gospel journals, they are all prophets, doctors, and Apostles, and may in religion "think what they please, and say what they think." Priestly absolution from sin, they have also abolished. All that the minister can do, is to "declare to the truly penitent that God will forgive their sins." But surely the town-crier could make this announcement at a much cheaper rate, and thus the overgrown innoxious Church Establishment could be reduced.

A priest is not required by them for Baptism, any layman, they say, can administer that; and according to some, it is a mere ceremony, by no means essential. Confirmation is no Sacrament at all, in their opinion. Why then require a Bishop or a priest? If it be merely a renewal of the Baptismal engagement, a declaration to that effect could be signed before the magistrate, just as in Marriage, or made in presence of the congregation. As for the Eucharist, there being no consecration of the Elements, the people themselves can read over the bread and wine, and take them without any ministerial assistance. To be sure they accuse the Catholic Church of depriving the laity of "the Cup," though it is well known the early Christians communicated indifferently under either kind, but they have robbed the people of the entire Sacrament, altogether, and instead of the Body and Blood of Christ, which the Catholic receives under either species, they give but a morsel of bread and a drink of wine. Having renounced the Popish sacrament of Extreme Unction, contrary to the clear and convincing authority of St James, they require no priest for the sick. What can he do for them beyond any of their godly neighbours? Besides, if there be contagious disease or pestilence, their Protestant minister is sure to fly, because he has a wife and children and has scoffed at Popish celibacy to gratify his beloved flock; and we have it on the high authority of the present Archbishop of Dublin that the Clergy are not *would* expose their lives in attendance on their dying people, for his Grace Dr. Whately published an Apostolic Pastoral during the Cholera of 1832, in which he distinctly told his dear children in Christ, that they had no right to send for their ministers in their last agony, lest they should carry home disease and infection into the bosom of their families! With regard to Holy Orders, they deny it to be a Sacrament, and any authority or spiritual power they intend to convey thereby is all a mockery and a delusion, as we have seen above. Those who think some ordination necessary, are never certain that they have one truly ordained Bishop or priest amongst them. The ancient and glorious Church of Christ from which they claim their ordination, has for the most valid reasons always rejected their claim, so that if the Archbishop of Canterbury were to return to-morrow to the faith of his sainted predecessors, Theodore, Elphege, Anselm, or Thomas a Becket, he would be treated in the Catholic Church as a simple layman. Those who do not believe in the necessity of ordination, appoint their own ministers; or give them a *call*, as it is comically termed, and rule the Church by unordained laymen. Thus the priesthood is trampled under foot, its dignity destroyed, its functions abolished. Even in that large section of Protestants, which has a nominal hierarchy, the head of the Church is a woman, was once an infant, and may be so again. Hapless Church! what a wretched and inglorious substitute for the venerable English Catholic Church of one thousand years before the sacrilegious robbery of the Reformation! Degraded Church! which is the creature of an act of Parliament, and which, exists only by sufferance. Feeble hierarchy! who have within our own day, seen ten of their num-