

## RELIGIOUS REFORMERS.

AN exchange, quoting from a Paris correspondent, says that Father Hyacinthe (Loyson) will in future hold his services in the Protestant Episcopal Church, of the Rue de l'Alma (Paris); and remarks that this step will end his career as a religious reformer. This is the end of every rebel against the authority of the Church of God. Cheered at first, flattered, upheld by non-Catholics, at length they become *stale*. The novelty, apparently, of the Reformer's position is what amuses the world, but as scandals will ever exist, so fresher novelties will forever succeed and eclipse each other.

But is it not sad that so many people look upon every new rebel against church authority as an apostle and dub him Reformer! Is a rebel by nature a reformer? If a private in the ranks of an army saw things going wrong among his superior officers, would he be called a reformer if he mutinied against their authority instead of representing the case at headquarters? Would he be justified in his reformatory career in joining the enemy's camp? Would such a man be *presumed* worthy of credit at all? Yet if a priest fall out with his bishop, or a bishop with Rome, and thereupon begin to abuse the Church roundly, the non-Catholic world clap their hands and shout "Well done, reformer." "May Luthet's spirit shield you!" The presumption of innocence (until guilt be proved) that the law throws about an accused individual, ought certainly to shield a corporation, an institution, a church. We may justly complain that non-Catholics, with rare exceptions, take the unsupported word of any rebel whom the Church cuts off, thus reversing the rational and legal axiom that guilt must be proved. These "Reformers" attack individuals and impute vices to the body from which they have been excluded—their assertions are believed. They travesty the doctrines and practices of the Church, and attribute the evil acts of men to the influence of her teaching to this cause. Their genius, profound and sagacious, is applauded. They pose as martyrs, whose zealous love for truth and justice has been outraged and oppressed, and ask for sympathy—generally in the shape of dollars and cents—their piety is revered and the shekels roll merrily in!

It is not so long since one of these *Reformers*, the Rev. Dr. Keating, with several *aliases*, duped the Bishops of the English and Irish Protestant Churches. His education, polish of manners, and silvery eloquence, as he detailed to excited audiences the circumstances—hair-lifting and otherwise horrible—of his escape from the claws of the Jesuits and the Pope of Rome, who, among other fearful things, were trying to keep him from running away with a nun, seduced the wildest, and for the thousandth time the Reformer was hailed welcome to the bosom of Protestantism. Previously he had been the idol of the late Henry Ward Beecher and of Dr. Fulton. Poor man, he is picking oakum now. The Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, though overwhelmed with shame at being *taken in* so easily, was obliged to prosecute Dr. Keating—the Reformer—for forgery and a few other little matters. If non-Catholics would but abandon for a time the credulity they are so apt to impute to Catholics, and investigate their true inwardness, they would speedily discover that in the case of Hyacinthe, as in that of De Camin and Chiniquy, and Luther himself, there is a woman in the plot. Erasmus who, no less than Luther, berated the monks and ecclesiastics of his time, called the Reformation a comedy always ending sooner or later in a marriage.

Catholics deplore the scandals that *individuals* here and there in the Church effect, but they know that true reform must come, if at all, to such, from within, not without the Church. And non-Catholics ought to see, moreover, that if the existence of scandals among some church members is an argument against the Church's divine origin and in favour of rebels, *alias* Reformers, the same arguments will prove fatal to their own institutions, and with doubly intensified force. The Church is of God, and therefore irreformable, or the Reformers are; but if the Reformers need reforming they are evidently not of

God. Then the Church which spurns rebellious children is of God or God had no Church on earth. There is no platform between the Catholic Church, the Church of yesterday, of a thousand years ago, of the Catacombs, of the Apostles, and NO Church. The career of the Reformers is finished as regards thoughtful men.

P. J. HAROLD.

## THE CLAIMS OF ANGLICANISM.

37TH ARTICLE, CONTINUED.

2ND PROPOSITION,—“ECCLESIASTICAL CAUSES PERTAIN TO THOSE WHO HOLD THE ROYAL POWER.”

V.

THE Catholic Apostolic Church, by its very constitution, being a perfect Spiritual Kingdom, must necessarily possess within herself all requisite power and authority to regulate all matters pertaining to her special jurisdiction. Whatever is purely spiritual, or has a spiritual end involved in it, comes within her jurisdiction, and no earthly tribunal can legitimately meddle with such things, in so far as they are spiritual. This power and authority being in the very essence of Christ's Church, they cannot possibly become the prerogatives of any mere Secular Rulers. To attempt to make them such, as does this 37th article, is to destroy, as much as in man's power, the Church Catholic, and to make of her a mere human institution,—the creature and the slave of the State. It is also to deny the constant belief of the old Anglo Saxon Church, which was always one in doctrine with the Roman See, from the time of Pope Gregory, A.D. 590, down to the Reformation in the 16th century.

That the Anglo-Saxon Church fully recognized the Supremacy of the Roman Pontiff in things spiritual is evident, among other very numerous testimonies, from the profession of faith made by all the Bishops, at the Council of Cloveshoe, held in the eighth century, under the Archbishop of Canterbury. That profession of faith was as follows:—"Know that the faith which we profess is the same as was taught by the Holy and Apostolic See, when Pope Gregory the Great sent Missionaries to our Fathers." (Wilk, page 162). Were this second proposition true, it would destroy, not only the Church in England, but the Catholic Church at large; for it strikes at what resides in the very essence of the Church's constitution.

The testimonies which I have already given on the truth of Catholic teaching, on the supreme spiritual jurisdiction of Peter and his lawful successors in the Roman See, are of such a nature as should convince every candid mind that when the Anglican Church denied the Primacy, she denied what was universally believed by the Church Catholic from her infancy. St. Optatus, St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyprian, St. Augustine and Theodoret form a phalanx of deep and acute minds, than which none superior have yet left their mark on the history of the world.

If we add to the testimony of Holy Scripture and of these learned Fathers, the testimonies of the numerous councils held, and it to these we add the fact that the Popes of Rome have always exercised the uncontrolled privilege of creating, restoring, and of suspending Bishops in all parts of the world; of passing judgment on matters involving persons of the highest earthly dignity, then, there can exist no reasonable doubt but that the Primacy of the Roman See was universally recognized and firmly established from the very first age of the Church. That Primacy, which the Anglican Church denied to Peter and his successors, the Popes of Rome, she sacrilegiously handed over to her mere temporal rulers, and by so doing reduced herself to the condition of abject slavery. True liberty consists of subjection to *legitimate* authority,—slavery, in subjection to usurped authority. Britons, whose constant refrain is,—“we never shall be slaves”—are, after all, subject to the worst kind of bondage,—spiritual bondage. As a specimen of the humiliating and