

take an intense interest, coming to the rehearsals and services eagerly, and without a cent of pay. But that does not imply that the boys have any thought of God in their minds, or any desire to 'worship Him for His great glory,' or that their lives are growing any purer or truer for all the words they sing. And if there is no deepening of reverence, no cleansing of life in the choir boy, then the result must inevitably be a hardening of the heart from the barren repetition of holy names, a drying up of the very springs of spirituality as the most solemn mysteries of the faith come to be regarded as mere musical performances, and the faith itself as 'a tale of little meaning, though the words are strong.'"

5. THE Deceased Wife's Sister Bill is a hardy perennial. It has made its appearance in the House of Lords again, under the chaperonage of Lord Dunraven. The persistency with which this measure is brought forward makes one wonder at the hardihood of the agitation. It is an agitation carried on in the interests of a wealthy and unscrupulous minority, backed most unfortunately by Court influence. The majority of the nation desire no change in the marriage laws, neither do they wish to contract incestuous unions with their deceased wives' sisters, nor, for the matter of that, with their deceased husbands' brothers. On religious grounds it is a matter which admits of no compromise, the teaching of Holy Writ and the universal law of the Holy Catholic Church are opposed to it, and, though it may become the law of the land, it can never become the law of the Church. Its passing would, indeed, mean bringing the State and the Church into direct conflict with one another. The clergy could not be forced to marry such people, neither could they be compelled to administer the Holy Communion to those who, by the Church's law, would be living in open and notorious sin. In fact such a measure would do more to bring about Disestablishment than anything else would do. Churchmen and Conservatives would do well to note this.—*Family Churchman.*

LETTER TO THE ROMAN ABLEGATE

BY THE RIGHT REV. A. CLEVELAND COXE, D. D.

[Concluded.]

Patiently, or I might say most stupidly rather, have American Christians permitted you without rebuke, at Chicago, and elsewhere, to assume, in the most arrogant manner, that all which Christianity has done for mankind is somehow to be credited to this religion of the Jesuits. Do you suppose we are ignorant of the superior antiquity of the Greek Churches? That they were the Mother Churches of Christendom; that for three centuries the Roman Church was Greek; used the Greek Liturgies; accepted the creed, the canons, and the canon of Scripture itself as set forth in the Greek language? That Alexandria was the schoolmistress of Catholicity, and sent annual decrees to Rome fixing the date of the Easter festival, which Roman bishops were obliged to observe? Do you suppose we forget that not for a day have the older Churches recognized your Papacy as anything but a schismatical usurpation, based on the forgeries which Nicholas I. (A.D. 856-67) presumed to authenticate? Or let me ask whether any of them has paid the slightest respect to the decree of Hildebrand (Gregory VII., A.D. 1073-85) claiming the title of Papa—a Greek name for all bishops, and even common to parish priests—for the Roman pontiff exclusively; You seem to be ignorant of your own history, and I have a mind to repay Father

Pustet for his catechism, by catechising you, with a truly American freedom, about some of your impudent assertions. Thus, please to tell us: (1) When did Christ say to the Roman Church that—"the gates of hell should not prevail against her"? Answer: That was said to the entire communion of Churches; least of all to the particular Church which is especially threatened with extinction in the words of St. Paul, as follows; "Be not high-minded but fear . . . lest He spare not thee . . . otherwise thou also shalt be cut off," i.e., as the Jews were *

(2) Were the ancient Bishops of Rome pontiffs or popes, in the modern sense? Answer: Just as much as Cincinnatus and Regulus were Roman Emperors. (3) Did "the Roman Catholic Church" exist before the Council of Trent? Answer: Just as much as the present German Empire existed in the time of Frederick, the father of Frederick called the Great. (4) What is this modern Church called "Roman Catholic"? Answer: A collection of ancient Latin Churches which have permitted the Roman See to impose upon them the Creed of Laynez, and so to involve them in the anathema of the [Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon, as schismatical and heretical, and in so far, no longer Catholic. (5) And what is the position of the modern Bishop of Rome? Answer: Gregory the Great pronounced any one who should claim the universal episcopate a "forerunner of Antichrist." (6) What then is the duty of godly Catholics, who have been subjugated by such a herald of Antichrist? Answer: "Come out of her my people." (7) What are the necessary steps to this restoration? Answer: Dr. Dollinger, the greatest of modern Roman Catholic theologians, has shown the way, declaring with his dying breath that the late Vatican Council had rendered it impossible for a Catholic to continue in the Papal communion. Follow the example of the "Old Catholics."

I might remind you that the illustrious Bossuet virtually occupied the same position, when he forced the Pope, in his day, to sanction his "Exposition," by which he endeavored to harmonize the novel Creed of Trent with the ancient Creed of the Church; stoutly denying at the same time, the Papal Supremacy, the Infallibility, and other dogmas recently set forth. But I content myself with advising you, as soon as possible, to pronounce that Exposition of Bossuet sufficient for the Roman Catholics of America. If you do not, they will find out their privileges, and may demand something more. Why should Maronites and Slaves and other Uniats, of your communion, be privileged to retain those ancient usages which are denied to Americans? They do not celebrate the Roman Mass. They worship not in Latin, but in their own tongues. Their priests are married men, as Holy Scripture permits, and seems to enjoin. Already 'Roman Catholics' of this sort have settled in these States, and you are forced by Papal treaties to recognize them as 'Catholics'; as much so as yourself, who come to us with the title of a Greek diocese, while, apparently, knowing nothing of the Greek liberties, if, indeed, you have any diocese, anywhere, or preside over any Christians as their acknowledged diocesan.

In short, then, what variety of your discordant and antagonistic usages and creeds do you design to enforce upon your American co-religionists? You can't deny to immigrant Maronites and Slaves the liberties you have so long guaranteed to them. Why, then, in one ward of Philadelphia, should a Roman priest be allowed to live as an honest married man, while in another he cannot be permitted, like St. Peter, to have a lawful wife, though he may be what Antonelli was, if he will only confess and be absolved as often as he sins? These inquiries will

*Romans xi. 20-22.

be sure to reach you, by and by, from your own people, and if you are not prepared to answer them you had better not talk of a permanent throne at our Capital. Perhaps if you will study De Marca and Launoi and Bossuet as faithfully as you should do, to say nothing of the primitive fathers, you will reach the same conclusions. Or, better, if you will hurry to Lepanto and consult the Church of Corinth, which had a bishop long before Rome received one, you may learn yet more of the Catholic religion than you are likely to pick up in Italy.

"Go teach all nations." We have heard much of this text recently, and it has been assumed to be the exclusive privilege of the Roman hierarchy. How dare you claim that text for your commission, at the very moment when you forbid anybody, in any tongue, to read the Four Gospels, translated by your own Henri Lasserre; approved by archbishops and bishops of France, and by the Pope himself, who blessed the translator and approved it from the bottom of his heart? What do you pretend to teach, when you condemn such a work as iniquity and heresy, and order all copies to be delivered up to Inquisitors?

"Go teach all nations." Why not begin at home, and set the Pope and cardinals to work teaching something to that illiterate populace which for centuries has groaned in ignorance and servitude about the walls of the Vatican. Poor hungry sheep—how long they have looked up in vain to your pontiffs and have not been fed. Look at all the nations you have pretended to teach, on this side of the Atlantic? Was there ever a worse specimen of work not done at all! And is it such a job that you have undertaken for these States? In this concluding letter I have merely touched upon the bristling points you must encounter; and you may be sure that my catechism will be forced upon you, very soon, by Americans, who have been baptized in your communion, but who will not die there unless you can give them practical answers, that will satisfy godly consciences and logical brains.

In all I have said to you, in this Octave of Letters, I have been speaking to my countrymen, chiefly, and without any personal animosity whatever. You have forced me, indeed, to become your antagonist, but only so far as you are an invader and an emissary. I have not failed to use all the conventional forms of respect, so far as I can apply them to one in your equivocal position. Instructed by our Holy Religion (the Catholic, not the Roman), I have regarded you as my Christian brother, and have taken pains to recognize your assumed titles. St. Paul addressed a very different personage from yourself, the wicked and cruel son-in-law of Herod Agrippa, as the "most noble Felix"; and to His betrayer and murderer, our blessed Master said—"Friend, wherefore art thou come?" Thus have I accosted you, and have spoken, in this last letter, not merely as a citizen, but as a Christian bishop, representing an older Catholicity than yours. "I dwell among my own people"—but you—unless your bishopric is a mere titular sham, why are you not in Lepanto? May the Lord judge between us, and forgive me if I have said anything amiss. May we both find mercy, in that day when we must give an account of our stewardship before the Great High Priest of our profession, the Church's only Head. He has spoken in the Apocalypse, and bids us give heed to "what the Spirit saith to the Churches." It comforts me to know that "even in Sardis" there are a few faithful names. May God bless you. So prays

Your friend and brother in Christ,

A. CLEVELAND COXE,
Bishop of Western New York.

Buffalo, Wednesday, (Festival of the Decoration of Soldiers' Graves, May 30th, 1893).

—N. Y. Churchman.