

bach, and the translation of Rabign, recently published in the "Foreign Theological Library," we do not at this moment remember any work that comes into competition with Mr. Cave's. The idea of it, like a great many other ideas, comes from our cousins, the Germans. The "Encyclopædia of Theology," or "Theological Encyclopædia," is, with them, a distinct branch of theological discipline. Mr. Cave's title, "Introduction to Theology," is one which will probably be more intelligible to English readers, even if it conveys a less complete idea of the contents of the book. Its aim, in fact, is to give a general idea of the various departments of theology, of the "science" of theology in general, and of the various sciences into which it may be sub-divided.

The Prolegomena contains some admirable remarks on the importance of the study of theology, we wish that this could be read by every clergyman and every layman in the country. It is hardly possible to eradicate from the minds of many of our people the false notion that a man may be as good a preacher and pastor without theological learning as with it. In the first part, Mr. Cave intends that theology has full right to the name of science, and he notices the various divisions of theology adopted by different writers on this subject.

Referring to a very common division into Biblical, Historical, Systematic (or Dogmatic), and Practical, to a certain extent he approves of it, but adopts one more extended, proposing the following divisions: (1) Natural Theology; (2) Ethical Theology; (3) Biblical Theology; (4) Ecclesiastical Theology; (5) Comparative Theology; (6) Pastoral Theology. We quite agree with Mr. Cave in prefixing the two divisions in Natural and Ethical Theology, as they certainly have a full right to a place under the general subject, and could not properly be discussed under any of the other divisions, unless, indeed, he had removed the "fundamental theology" from its place under "comparative theology," and comprehended the two branches under that, as might very well be done. Indeed, we cannot quite agree with Mr. Cave in the position which he assigns to "fundamental theology" or "apologetics," under "comparative theology." The very name which he adopts would refer to a first place in theological discipline, otherwise it might be included under "pastoral theology," or under the generally used and more comprehensive term of "practical theology."

We are not sure that anything is gained by giving "Ecclesiastical Theology," instead of "Historical Theology." It is quite true, as he says, that the word "historical" may be applied for the then Christian Theology. It is also true that all Christian Theology has had some relation to the church or bond of the churches: but the term would seem to exclude the speculations of individual Christian teachers, unless their opinions are either accepted or condemned by the Church. So with regard to "Comparative Theology," or even "Dogmatic Theology" would have been better. These are small matters, and may be considered by Mr. Cave before he brings out a second edition which will undoubtedly be called for.

As regards the book in general, we have nothing but commendation to bestow upon it, and to young theologians we give the advice to procure it at once, unless they possess Rabiger, Hagenback, or Rothe. A book like this will give definiteness to their reading, will save an immense deal of time, and will also guide them to the best sources of information on various departments of theology.

The "literature" is selected with good judgment, showing wide reading and knowledge on the part of the writer. We have missed a few favourites in various departments. The Abbe Hamon's *Traite de Predication* should certainly have been mentioned and perhaps also Coquerel's and some other works on the same subject. But we cannot have everything. As regards foreign works, it would be well, in a subsequent edition, to have a little more uniformity. Works untranslated should, of course, have their native title. In regard to translated works, we should have either the original and the English title, or the English alone. Here we sometimes have the one method, and sometimes the other.

## CATHOLIC VERSUS ROMAN.

REV. JOHN LANGTRY, M.A., REPLIES TO ARCHBISHOP LYNCH.

On Sunday evening, November 15th, Rev. John Langtry, M.A., rector of St. Luke's Church, Toronto, delivered the sixth of a series of sermons in reply to a lecture delivered recently by Archbishop Lynch, on "The difference between the Catholic and the Protestant religions." The rev. gentleman selected as his text a portion of the 3rd verse of the general Epistle of Jude:

"It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

The rev. gentleman said:

MARIOLATRY.—It is just the same with the history of the great crying crime of the practical system of the Roman Church—her obscuration, nay, overthrow, of faith in Jesus Christ as our only Mediator and Redeemer—the cultus, they call it, of the blessed Virgin. It has no place whatever in the faith or practice of the Catholic Church of the first ages. The first approaches to it are rejected with almost furious indignation by the great Church teachers. The vast majority of the Christian writers before the Council of Nicea, whose writings have come down to us, in all their historical, doctrinal, and devotional statements never mention the blessed Virgin in any way what ever. Of the few who do refer to her in an historical way not one directs any devotion to be paid to her, or assigns her any other place than that of being the honored instrument of the Saviour's incarnation. Two, Origen, and Tertullian, blame her for entertaining unbelieving doubts. Irenæus says that St. Mary's obedience counterbalances Eve's disobedience, so that she has become the advocate of Eve. We have only a barbarous Latin translation of what he wrote, and it is evident that he is not thinking of the blessed Virgin as the advocate of Eve in the active sense of pleading for her now, but only of the one act of her ready submission to the divine will, as furnishing a counterbalancing plea to the disobedience of Eve. And it is evident that he had no notion of the Roman doctrine concerning the Virgin mother, for in another place he speaks of Christ having checked the unreasonable haste of His mother at Cana. (Adv. Hæv. iii., xvi.) There is no change in the testimony of the greatest fathers even after Nicea. In their catechisms, prepared for the instruction of the people, there is absolute silence as to any religious homage due to her, and in their devotional utterances there is nothing that can be tortured into an address to her of any kind. St. Chrysostom does not hesitate to say that she was ignorant of the full mystery of the incarnation, and that she was moved by ambition and arrogance in sending that message to her son. (Hom. on St. Matt. xii., 48). St. Basil speaks of her as wavering in belief at the time of the Passion. (Epist. 260). St. Gregory Nyssen says nothing created is to be worshipped by man.

We who are taught by the scriptures to look to the true Godhead are instructed to regard every created being as foreign from the Divine nature and to serve and reverence the uncreated nature alone. (Contra Eunomium), St. Ephraïm (408), a Doctor, says, Mary's body was holy, indeed, but she was not a Deity. She was a virgin, too, and honored, but not given to us for worship. And he concludes, "Christ called her woman, as in prophecy, because of the heresies and schisms which were to come upon the earth, lest any one, through excessive adoration for that holy Virgin, should fall into the silly nonsense of that heresy (that of the Collyridæans). \* \* \* For if Christ willeth not that the angels should be worshipped, how much more is he unwilling that worship should be paid to her who is born of Anna? Let Mary be honored; but let the Father, Son and Holy Ghost alone be worshipped. Let no one worship Mary." He says that this idolatrous heresy has only for its promoters weak, fickle, narrow-minded women, prone to error, and that they must be put to silence. With these agree St. Jerome, Doctor, 478; St. Augustine, Doctor, 430; St. Cyril, of Alexandria, 440. And, finally, nothing whatever implying this cultus is to be found in the copious writings either of Pope Leo the Great, 461, or of Pope Gregory the Great, 604. And when we first find the cultus of the blessed Virgin, or of the angels, making its appearance, it is at once challenged and condemned as a novel heresy. Such was the doctrine, such the practice of the Catholic Church for over 600 years with regard to the cultus of the blessed Virgin. Like the worship of angels, images and relics, it was introduced to conciliate the heathen, and it found a soil ready prepared in the minds of those barbarous hordes who had been accustomed to worship the Queen of Heaven and her attendants or rivals. And so this custom which the fathers rejected with abhorrence as an idolatrous heresy grew apace in that soil till it reached at last its truly appalling proportions in the modern Roman Church. I have not time to trace its history, but invite your attention to a few

illustrations of the accredited Roman teachings on the subject now. One of their most learned writers Suarez, says it is a universal sentiment in the Roman Church that the intercession of Mary is not only useful, but in a certain manner necessary, because God has determined to give us no grace except through the hands of Mary. And so it is taught in authorized books that "it is morally impossible for those to be saved who neglect the devotion of the blessed Virgin;" that "it is the will of God that all graces should pass through her hands;" that "no creature obtained any grace from God save according to the dispensation of His holy mother" (quoted from Bemeridine by Liguori). That Jesus has in fact said "no one shall be partaker of My blood except through the intercession of My mother." That "our salvation is in her hands." That "it is impossible for any to be saved who turns away from her, or is disregarded by her." That "God Himself is subject to the command of Mary." That "God has resigned into her hands His omnipotence in the sphere of grace." That "it is safer to seek salvation through her than directly from Jesus. It was necessary that Christ should constitute His well-beloved mother a mediator between us and Him, that she would appease the wrath of her Son." (Iac de Valent on Epos Magni) Again, it is taught that "God retained justice unto Himself and granted mercy to her." "That she is the throne of grace whereof the Apostle speaketh to which we are to come;" "that she appeaseth the just anger of her Son." "She is the only refuge of those who have incurred the Divine indignation." (Blosius in Glories of Mary, p. 93.) And these are not the mere opinions of private teachers, but of Doctors whose teaching has been examined and approved of, authorized books of devotion and instruction, nay, of Popes themselves, e. g. "On this hope," says Pius IX., "we chiefly rely that the most blessed Virgin, \* \* \* who by the foot of virtue bruised the serpent's head, and who being constituted between Christ and His Church, hath ever delivered the Christian people from calamities of all sorts. For ye know very well, venerable brethren, that the whole of our confidence is placed in the most holy Virgin, since God has placed in Mary the fulness of all good, that, accordingly, we may know that if there is any hope in us, if any grace, if any salvation, it redounds to us from her, because such is His will who has willed that we should have everything through Mary." (Ep. Encycl., 1849) That is the way the last Pope interpreted and taught this doctrine. We have been told that the present occupant of the Papal throne is a liberal and enlightened man, who has no sympathy with the superstitions of his predecessors. And yet who of us has not been horrified at the pure and simple heathenism that pervades every line of that encyclical of his published about a month ago, calling the faithful to observe a novena to the blessed Virgin, and promising all sorts of indulgences for the mere mechanical recitation of prayers to her? Neither the name nor the doctrine of Christ has the faintest recognition. It is in fact an entire endorsement of Liguorian teaching about Mary. Again, de Salazar (pp. 621-629) hesitates not to say that "Mary loved the world, and gave her only begotten Son for it; for with priestly piety she offered Him as a sacrifice for the world. Many things are asked from God and are not granted; they are asked from Mary and are obtained." "At the command of the Virgin all things obey, even God." "The salvation of all depends upon their being favored and protected by Mary; he who is protected by Mary will be saved; he who is not will be lost. Mary has only to speak and her Son executes all." (Glories of Mary, Liguori.) This is what is taught the people in the popular manuals of devotion and instruction. Think of this prayer in the Recoleta, to be used during the celebration of the mass: "I acknowledge thee and I venerate thee, most holy Virgin, Queen of Heaven, Lady Mistress of the universe, as daughter of the eternal Father, mother of His well beloved Son, and most loving spouse of the Holy Spirit; kneeling at the feet of thy great majesty with all humility, I pray through thy divine charity wherewith thou wast so bounteously enriched on thine assumption into heaven, to vouchsafe me favor and pity, placing me under thy most safe and faithful protection and receiving me into the number of those happy and highly favored servants of thine whose names thou dost carry graven upon thy virgin heart." And think of this prayer, published at Rome with licence of Superiors in 1825: "I adore you, eternal Father; I adore you, eternal Son; I adore you, most holy Spirit; I adore you, most holy Virgin, Queen of the heavens, lady and mistress of the universe." She is thus put on a virtual level with God as an object of worship, and as far as language can do it is honored above Him. Salazar calls her "the complement of the whole Trinity, with body and soul under the sacred species." I shudder even to read what follows. Dr. Pusey (Eneicon) says there exists among the poor people of Rome a belief that in the Holy Eucharist not only our Lord but His mother is present. And the belief is defended by Oswald, one of their distinguished writers. (Dogmat.