

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

The Rev. Augustus Aylward, Incumbent of Featherstone, Leicestershire, to the Rectory of Brede, Sussex. Patron, Thomas Frewen, Esq. The Rev. G. Crabbe, to the Rectory of Merton, Norfolk. Patron Lord Walsingham. The Rev. E. W. Ingram, to be Chaplain to the Sheriff of Worcestershire. The Rev. D. C. Legard, Rector of Lea, to be Chaplain the Sheriff of Lincolnshire. The Rev. W. D. Macray, to the Chaplaincy of Christ Church, Oxford. The Rev. H. Niven, to the Vicarage of Bishampton, Worcestershire. Patron, the Bishop of Worcester. The Rev. J. Poole, to the temporary charge of Coleford, Gloucestershire. The Rev. T. Walters, to the Curacy of Kilvey, Glamorganshire. The Rev. R. Williams, M. A., Rector of Llanvyllyn, Montgomeryshire, to be a Surrogate. The Rev. Plumpton Wilson, L.L.B., Vicar of Thorpe, Arnold, Brentingby, Leicestershire, to a Deanery Rural in the Diocese of Peterborough. The Rev. F. Woolley, S.C.L., St. Mary Hall, Oxford, to the Curacy of Stoke-Mandeville, Bucks. The Rev. Cecil Daniel Wray, to the Rectory of Hulme-cum-Runcion, Norfolk. Patrons, the Rev. C. W. Ethelston and Anne Ethelston. The Rev. H. W. Burrows, Incumbent of Archbishop Tenison's Chapel in Regent-street, to the Perpetual Curacy of Christ Church, St. Pancras, vacant by the secession of the Rev. W. Dodsworth.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

The Rev. William Plues, M. A., Head Master of Ripon Grammar School, and Incumbent of North Stanley, aged 65. Gerrard Thomas Noel, M. A., Canon Winchester and Vicar of Romsey, aged 69. Joshua Greville, Vicar of Dunton, aged 81. G. Treweeke, Rector of Illogan, Cornwall, aged 72. K. Yerburgh, B.D., Vicar of New Sleaford, and Rector of Tothill, Lincoln, aged 76.

ROMAN UNITY.—The Rev. Henry Allen, Vicar of Patcham, Sussex, has recently addressed two letters to Dr. Wiseman, inquiring whether the Oriental Maronites were considered to be in strict and perfect communication with the Church of Rome, inasmuch as he had been informed that they received the Communion in both kinds, and that they had a married Priesthood, and that their public service was not conducted in the Latin tongue. Dr. Wiseman's reply is in the affirmative on all these points. He says that they differ in no doctrine from the Holy See; that their Ecclesiastical language is Syriac; and that the 'use of the cup,' and the marriage of Priests before Ordination, are permitted, as being merely matters of discipline, allowed to the Maronites in common with 'many Churches in communion with Rome.'

UNITED STATES.

SALARIES OF CLERGYMEN.—The following is the average rate of salaries per annum of the Clergy in different countries, as collected from an article in the Independent, and from other sources:

Table with 2 columns: Country, Salary. In Hungary \$250, In Sweden 309, In United States 375, In English Dissenting Churches 325, In English Established Churches 700, In Holland 500, In Norway 1,200, In Austria 1,200.

—Gospel Messenger.

From our English Files.

FATHER GAVAZZI'S ORATIONS.

(From the Daily News.)

"INFALLIBLE SUPREMACY OF THE ROMAN BISHOP."

The trumpet blast which has gathered an Italian congregation from every quarter of this metropolis is an event pregnant with vast ulterior results, and it is now evident that what was at first only a political sentiment is fast assuming the form of a religious persuasion, fully developed and organized under the apostleship of an able vigorous champion. The enthusiastic adhesion of his auditory, now swelled to the full dimensions of a Christian Church, and the ready adoption of his views by every intelligent Italian who takes the smallest interest in revealed faith, has concentrated here the hopes and prospects of a nation. When, at the close of yesterday's appeal, the father broke forth into a strain of highly devotional eloquence, the visible emotion in the crowd responsive to his efforts to evoke a deep and solemn recognition of belief in a Redeemer and the great atonement on Calvary gave convincing proof of the vivifying influence he can use over the minds and hearts of his countrymen.

"How did this ultramontane system originate? If you open the ponderous tomes of its official exponents, you will learn with awe and a suspicion of blasphemy that the Creator in the Book of Genesis foreshadowed the Vatican's supremacy when he made the sun an emblem of the Papal power and the moon a symbol of temporal authority, which is but the reflex of the former—kings being mere planets, who revolve in their orbits round the central luminary, and shine only with derivative light; the fact is that this papacy is but the ghost of the old Roman empire—a hobgoblin made up of a lantern and white sheet, squatting in the graveyard of the seven hills, a phantom formidable to ignorance alone. In the dust of paganism it picked up the words Pontifex Maximus, a fragment of imperial pretensions, and turned it to account as it did other shreds and patches of idolatry. To the system of centralization, of which the Roman empire was the mighty model, was traceable the notion of absorbing the whole Christian episcopacy in one bishop. A primacy of honor and simple precedence freely granted towards the decline and fall of the Cæsars was enlarged and expanded at their disappearance into the full inheritance of their autocracy, and the good will of the premises in which they carried on business passed into the hands of their successors with its concomitant monopoly. Away with the pretext of Peter and his transformation it to a rock to support a superstructure of delusion. Is Christ to be thus thrust aside? Can any man assert any other foundation than that which has been placed in Jesus? Is he not the corner stone whom the builders rejected? Did Isaiah and David prophesy in vain? Did Paul mislead the Ephesians and Corinthians on this very point on which he is so explicit as to the foundation-stone of the Christian edifice? To Christ is the Church espoused, not to Peter. Christ is the supreme head of the universal Church, not any of his twelve apostles."

The Father proceeded, on the assumption that a body can have but one head, to describe the monstrous chimera which Horace in his Art of Poetry ridicules, but Roman casuists have reproduced; the pretended headship of Peter combined with the admitted headship of Christ; a sort of bifurcated neck with the crown of thorns on one brow and the pompous tiara on a rival forehead, after the fashion of the Austrian eagle, an object equally abominable; he asserted the perfect equality as to jurisdiction and inspiration of Christ's twelve apostles, maintained that Christianity in its origin was much more a republic than a monarchy; all we read of its simple organization, its popular elections, its elders, overseers, and deacons, utterly demolishes the notion of a centralised despotism either at Antioch or Rome. The possibility of a quasi-presidential power entering into the scheme of its constitution was barely admissible; the idea of an all-absorbing authority in any of its bishops was totally irreconcilable with the tenor of the acts of the apostles and the early writers of Church history. The Christian episcopacy derives its functions and its rights directly from God, not through the intermedium of any brother bishop, he patriarch of the east or patriarch of the west. This latter title was accorded to the ordinary of Rome without murmur, and in defence to the importance of the city in which he resided, but the style of "œcumenical patriarch" was only first granted by the emperor Phocas to Boniface the IV., in 606. Phocas was the real founder of this fabric of fraud; though no monument proclaims it, save a column in the forum; but patriarchs, like bishops, often forget their maker. Phocas not only gave Boniface, whom he had known at Constantinople, his cast-off appellation of Pontifex Maximus—of no use to the original owner—but also banded him over the Pantheon, another Pagan property, unproductive to its imperial proprietor and symbolical of Rome's old assumption of universal supremacy over the idolatrous rites of the world. Many other historic details illustrative of the gradual encroachments of the Roman bishopric, first over the neighbouring sees of Italy, and next of France, were rapidly sketched by the speaker, who brought the annals of usurpation down to the present day, when Rome has succeeded in getting into its own management the exclusive appointment of bishops in Asia, Africa, and America. In Europe alone it encountered resistance, and had to higggle and bargain with conflicting autocrats for a share in the enslavement of the Church which had originally elected its own bishops throughout all Christendom, the papacy itself being elective in the people and clergy of Rome, not as now, an ignoble game of intrigue among bloated cardinals and corrupt diplomacy. The origin of concordats was described, and these negotiations denounced as the device of two rival despots, to rivet closer the chains of doubly-enslaved Christianity. True to their worldly and secular derivation, mitres tyrannised in the interest of kings and romanised in that of popes, so much so, that when the present unhappy occupant of the principal bishopric in Christendom showed a brief velleity of honest dealings and liberal tendencies, the whole episcopacy betrayed strange misgivings; and now that the dog has returned to his vomit, their uneasiness is changed into plaudits of congratulation. He has renewed the old league with the world's despots; and a new tariff of commercial interchange is struck between the Vatican and Vienna. The famous journey of Pope Braschi to the Austrian capital, in the vain hope of cajoling Joseph II. into complicity with the Roman court's manoeuvres, was graphically set forth, and the annual claim of a white palfrey in homage from Naples contrasted with the mendicant appeal for shelter at Gaeta, and the subsequent grovelling servility to the most brutal of the besotted Bourbons. Alternately a bully and a sneak, the Papacy dared to talk of infringement of agreements to Piedmont, when it was notorious that among the decisions of the rota, or high chancery of Rome, it was formally laid down as a papal principle that Rome might infringe any sort of concordat distasteful to its pretensions; a pleasant arrangement, much like going to law with a horned potentate in the infernal courts.

"But the tiara confers infallibility? To illustrate which the Gospel shows us Peter a recreant to Christ in the vestibule of Caiaphas, stumbling on the very threshold of a long career for his presumed successor. Is it not to the body of the episcopate that the promise of Christ belongs, that he will be with them to the consummation of ages? Has the gigantic mind of Bossuet laboured in vain to make this clear? Is it not laid down by the council of Constance, when rival Popes were at loggerheads, and in the council of Basle? Is it not the assumption of the Pope's individual liability to err the rationale of every church assembly from that of Jerusalem to that of Trent? If the 5th General Council condemned the doctrine of Pope Virgilius, and the 6th the monothelite vagaries of Honorius, it was apparently that those functionaries were in the wrong. If Formosus, Sergius and Stephen received similar rebukes, it is probable that they were bankrupt in the faith. Either Ganganelli must have been fallible in his bull of reprobation against jesuitism, or else Chiaramonte in again whitewashing the putrid sepulchre which his predecessor destroyed. We have a liturgical book of common prayer called a breviary which was found so full of absurdities that Pius V had to expurgate it, a Clement further eliminated rubbish, and Urban VIII finally cleared out its blunders, though heaven knows it teems with abundant lies in its present edition, stereotyped by infallibility. Was the blessed Pio Nono infallible in describing the matrons of Rome who bound up the wounds of our bleeding citizens as prostitutes—(immense cheering)—or Gregory in denouncing the bible with the "damnable liberty of the press." How many infallible soundbrels has history recorded in her annals?

In the book of Wisdom it is written, chap. 1, verse 4: "In malevolam animam non introibit sapientia nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis." (This book is apocryphal with us, but not in the Roman canon of scripture). Does not this text annihilate the claim of 30 or 40, at least of the more notorious transmitters of infallibility? Yet these men in their lifetime were dubbed "his holiness." Il santissimo, a word in Italy, either understood to mean the sacramental elements of Christ's body, or the care of a Borgia. Come to Rome. You gaudy chariot is the equipage of the santissimo? You flunky a santissimo attendant. You brutified Swiss mercenary a santissimo janissary. You cook in connecting a santissimo pranzo to pao-per the santissimo paramour of a sister in the case of Donna Olympia, or a daughter in that of Donna Lucretia.

It would be scarcely fair to claim infallibility for the late aggressive proceedings against England, because, though called a motu proprio, the brief is entirely the work of three confederates. Cullen, Ellathorne, and Wiseman, and may be justly deemed surreptitious, in addition to insolent and insidious. The farce of con-

plimentary addresses between Westminster and Armagh, the interchange of reciprocal laudations between the intrusive primate and the abrasive cardinal would be ludicrous, were it not a dismal and woful proof of the credulity of the Roman Catholic population of both islands. One tells the other how the rescript is "wonderfully calculated to advance the interests" of religion, he says, but we know what that means. In the simplicity of ignorance, the honorable legislator, Philip Howard, "knows nothing of the court of Rome in contradistinction to the church" of that name. He finds no mention of it in his creed, because the symbol of the apostles never contemplated a court, therefore the ambition of cardinals does not scandalise Christendom with all its profanities, intrigues, and traffickings, its chieri di anticamera, its busolanti, its prelati di mantelone, its knights of the golden spur, and the piano with the whole machinery and mockery of courtship.

The father went on to complain of the malignant whisperings which pious calumny had whispered about himself. That he was engaged in forming a wealthy alliance with some imaginary object of conjugal attraction, and that his London mission to the Italian exiles was to end, like all comedies, in matrimony. He recognised the sons of Escobar in the concoction of this venomous tale, but he would tell them he was wedded; aye, to the land he loved, and the hopes he cherished of its approaching deliverance from the canaglia of Croats, and the Jesuitaglia of the confessional. He had intended to increase his labors among his countrymen, by preaching on Wednesdays, and would do so next week, with God's blessing; but the coming Wednesday he was appointed for the holding of an Italian meeting, the protest against the papal sovereignty, and the late aggression on English rights by that foreign power; he would waive his claim, in the presence of such a laudable and loudly called for project, meant to shame the slaves who, at the bidding of Austrian underlings, misrepresented the feelings of Italy in Theobald's-road some time ago, and grovelled at the foot of a reactionary throne. The concluding portion of the father's discourse was purely of a devotional character, as indicated in the commencement of our report, and embodied feelings and thoughts which we respect too deeply for newspaper insertion. The impression was one of heartfelt sympathy with the enthusiastic preacher.

(From the Standard.)

Lord John Russell has just made a declaration, which must—if he act in the spirit of it, as we trust he will—reflect honour upon his name while he lives, and upon his memory hereafter. The following is the declaration to which we allude:—

"But the next point is, that the hon. member for Athlone, and the hon. member for Bucks, who takes a similar line in this respect, say that it is totally inconsistent on my part to propose the present bill, after the declarations which I have made upon former occasions. Now, sir, I am not about to say that it is not so; I am not about to say that these declarations did not amount to this, and I thought that it was puerile and childish to prevent the assumption by Roman Catholic bishops of titles held by the bishops of the Church. I am not about to say that the opinions I then expressed are consistent with the opinions I now hold. But I am justified in saying this, that whatever may have been my confidence in respect to the conduct of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastics—whatever may have been my confidence with respect to the conduct of the Pope, I have found since that time that that confidence was misplaced (loud and protracted cheering). Now, I have thought it better clearly and plainly to avow that I was mistaken in the opinions which I then held (renewed cheering)—that subsequent events have convinced me that I have trusted too much to the forbearance of the court of Rome with respect to the sovereign power of this country; and that, therefore, feeling my confidence was misplaced, I must take measures in accordance with the events which have occurred (hear, hear)."

All men are subject to error, and the most charitable and generous of errors is the reposing of confidence in those unworthy of it; all men are subject to err, but all have not the courage so frankly and unreservedly to acknowledge their mistake. Will Earl Grey make so honourable a confession—will Lord Clarendon—will any other of the ministers? If not, they are unworthy to sit in the same cabinet with their Premier, and we tell him plainly that he will be open to a suspicion of insincerity, and incur disgrace, if he do not cast them off.

Lord John Russell has thus plainly told that the ecclesiastics of the Romish Church are not to be trusted in their relations with the State; that their professions and pledges, and even their oaths, are not to be relied upon; are they, then, we ask, to be trusted in their relations with the people? Is their monstrous tyranny over millions of the Queen's subjects to be connived at as long as they forbear to assail the royal authority? Oh, but Mr. Hume and Mr. Roebuck and Mr. Oswald, and the rest who claim free scope for the most cruelly persecuting system that ever prevailed among men, will tell us that to control this tyranny were an "invasion of religious liberty." Whose religious liberty would be invaded by a law restraining by penalties the power of a perfidious body of ecclesiastics? Not, surely, the religious liberty of those Roman Catholics over whom these ecclesiastics wield the terrors of interdict, excommunication, infamy, following altar denunciations, and even corporal chastisement. Not the Protestants who are treated as noxious animals, where the slaves of the perfidious priesthood predominate in numbers, and are, like Major Mahon and hundreds of others, actually murdered upon the bidding of a perfidious priest. Is the support of such religious tyranny, indeed, to defend religious liberty? What is "religious liberty"? Is it not to believe and worship according to the dictates of conscience? But what individual born of Roman Catholic parents, and educated a Roman Catholic, dares to hold Protestant opinions or to attend Protestant worship, or even to send his children to a Protestant school, without incurring the persecution of his priests—persecution always savage and violent in exact proportion to the power of the priesthood to inflict; We suppose Messrs. Hume, Roebuck, Oswald, &c., will maintain that the suppression of the liberties of the Hungarian Protestants by Popish Austria was a glorious triumph of religious liberty! Strange ideal of "religious liberty," which consists in the despotism of the strong over the weak, of the many over the few, and an organization of perfidious ecclesiastics over all. Such was not the notion of religious liberty held by our ancestors even in Popish times. Magna Charta itself forbids such exercise of the power of the priesthood as may be hourly seen even within the limits of the United Kingdom at this day. Thus speaks the 29th chapter:—

"Nullus liber homo capiatur, vel imperisonetur, aut dissolviatur de libero tenemento suo vel libertatibus vel liberis consuetudinibus suis, aut utlagetur, aut exulet, aut aliquo modo destruat, nec super eum ibimus, nec super eum mittemus, nisi per legale iudicium parium suorum vel per legem terræ. Nulli vendemus, nulli negabimus, aut differemus, rectum vel justitiam."

Does the poor Romanist enjoy the benefit of this benign provision, which would protect him from punishment of every kind, except by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land? Does the Protestant neighbour of a numerous priest-ridden Romanist population enjoy any such protection?

We have said enough to show what "religious liberty" is; would we could believe enough said to prompt the members of the legislature to its vindication! In our number of Tuesday, however, we ventured to offer a sketch of an act by which religious liberty could be secured to all, without the slightest infringement upon any religious dogma, true or false. We lament, however, to see that no member of the House of Commons has yet touched upon the subject. All, like the barbarian pugilist spoken of by Demosthenes as a type of stupidity and folly, look to guard the single piece already stricken, but want sense and spirit to protect other points, or to return the blow. Nevertheless a great opportunity offers—an opportunity such as may never occur again. A silly Pope has laid bare of artifice the policy and designs of his church—policy and designs which would not be credited by many upon less sure authority, and which were, in fact, a thousand times contemptuously denied during the discussion of the last forty or fifty years, as often as they were asserted by really wise and far-seeing men. The Pope has thrown down his gage of battle; he has been supported by his subordinate ecclesiastics; and if it be true, as affirmed by an Irish Romanist journal (the Limerick Reporter), that he has promoted Cullen to the cardinalate, he is in no disposition to retract the challenge. Surely Lord John Russell will not think that challenge worthily met by a law against titles—a law as experience proves, to be laughed at before it shall have lumbered the statute book for a single year. No, the whole state of the Romish Church in the United Kingdom must come under consideration, and the tyranny and fraud exercised by the parochial priesthood—matters of much more serious import to the people than any mere names, which, indeed, are reported only as giving a sanction to tyranny and fraud in detail, must be put an end to. Let the Protestant members of the two houses take the broad ground we propose, and they will have the unanimous support of all the Protestants in the empire, and the good wishes (though it may be the silent good wishes) of a large portion of the Roman Catholics.

From Lord Stanley's frank, patriotic, and masterly address in the House of Lords, on Friday evening, we gather sufficient to know that the hostile division on Mr. D'Israeli's motion, and the friendly defeat on Mr. Locke King's for an extension of the franchise, were merely used by Lord John Russell, as a pretext for quitting office—a mere ruse to escape the responsibilities entailed by the Durham letter. It was the weakness of the ministry, and the division among its supporters, which was the sole cause of the Premier's resignation, and neither the vigorous assault which the Cabinet had suffered from without, nor the apparent treachery within, as was supposed, which induced him to abandon his post. Indeed the unpopularity of his measures had long prepared the country for a speedy downfall of his administration.—a crisis which he himself prematurely hastened, by thus resigning at a period of the Session when the unfinished and confused state of public business would preclude the possibility of his probable successor in office, Lord Stanley, availing himself of the only chance he had of establishing the existence of a government on a sure basis, namely, that of immediately dissolving the Free Trade Parliament, and appealing to the electoral constituencies of the country. Lord Stanley, in alluding to these facts, thus draws aside the flimsy veil with which it was attempted to conceal the real motives of the Whig Ministerial leaders:—

"I cannot divest my mind of the strong conviction that the Papal aggression question and the difficulties which attend it, were in a great degree the cause why the late Cabinet came to the conclusion that they were not able to carry on the Government of the country. That feeling, I think, upon their part must have been increased by the financial crotchets of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—(hear, hear)—although, undoubtedly the course which the late Government had taken was not such as to induce me to think that in ordinary circumstances so small a majority as 14 on a motion could be held by them a sufficient reason for resigning. (Hear, hear.) With those two serious difficulties staring them in the face—difficulties putting them in a position in which they must forego their own convictions or forfeit the support of their ordinary adherents, and arising from the universal dissatisfaction produced by the Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I was not surprised that the occasion should be welcomed for resigning which was presented when they were left in a minority, the majority consisting of persons of their own opinions. I took the liberty of doubting whether that defeat, with the small majority on Mr. D'Israeli's motion, were the sole cause for the resignation of the Cabinet. I ventured to state one or two facts to her Majesty in confirmation of that view. I hold in my hand a copy of a portion of a letter which, by her Majesty's express command, after the interview with which I was honoured, I wrote to her Majesty for the purpose of placing on record the advice it was my humble duty to tender; and, with her Majesty's permission, I will read from that letter so much of the passage in it as shall tend to explain the force of the statement I make to your Lordships:—'He, (Lord Stanley) adverted to the two occasions specified by your Majesty as the grounds of the resignation of your Majesty's servants, and observed with reference to the motion of Mr. D'Israeli, that it had been negatived, and, although by a small majority, the minority were reinforced by a number of votes hostile to the Government on other grounds, and on whose general support Lord Stanley and his friends could not reckon; and with reference to the majority on Mr. Locke King's motion, he observed—'And when it was stated that the Government had been defeated in consequence of the absence of opponents who, had they been present, would have voted against the measure as a dangerous and mischievous one, and on whose support the Government rested, it is right your Lordships and the country should know the fact. Mr. Locke King's motion for an extension of the Parliamentary franchise was carried by 100 to 54. The extract proceeds to say—'That of the minority of 54, 27 held office, only 10 unofficial supporters voted with the Government, and no less than 17 of the Protectionist party; who would have been more numerous but for an impression which undoubtedly prevailed that your Majesty's Ministers were not honestly exercising their influence to defeat the motion.' I believe that my friends in the House of Commons believe it; and if they had found a disposition on the part of the Government to act otherwise they would have given it their generous and disinterested support."