

No. 5466.63





2321

PAMPHLETS.

Roman Catholic
church.

5266.63

722



ACCESSION No.

375.588

ADDED

June 9,

1878

CATALOGUED BY

REVISED BY

MEMORANDA.

THE
"SEVEN CALUMNIES."

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN

FATHER THOS. McGOVERN,

ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST OF YORK, PA.,

AND

P. ANSTADT,

EDITOR OF THE TEACHERS' JOURNAL,

*On Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Salvation by
Works, Infallibility, Persecution, Political
Intrigues, Papal Bulls and Bible Burning.*

SECOND REVISED EDITION.

PRICE 15 CENTS.



YORK, PA. :
OFFICE OF THE TEACHERS' JOURNAL.

1879.

THE TEACHERS' JOURNAL.

A Sunday-school monthly best adapted to all classes of teachers for the study of the International Lessons.* * It is the only Journal that publishes a Paraphrase of the Text.* * It is the only Journal which gives an exhaustive and logical analysis of the lesson, translated from Starke's Synopsis.* * It is the only Journal that publishes homiletical skeletons on the lessons.* *. It contains larger and more appropriate Black-board Illustrations than any other Sunday-school Journal.* *. Its EXPLANATORY NOTES are compiled from the best expositors, Ancient and Modern, German and English.* *. Its questions are simple and adapted to the capacity of the average scholars.* *. It is published monthly, 32 pages, at 55 cts. a year. Sample copies sent free.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMENTS.

This is the Lesson Leaf of the Teachers' Journal; twice the size of the ordinary lesson leaf; contains copious Explanatory Notes for the use of the scholars, and costs but 12 cts. a year. Samples sent free.

SPRINKLING THE BIBLE MOSE OF BAPTISM.

A 4-pp. tract, 5 cts. per copy or \$3.00 per 100, post paid. Address, P. ANSTADT, York, Pa.

THE
"SEVEN CALUMNIES."

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN

FATHER THOS. McGOVERN,

ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST OF YORK, PA.,

AND

P. ANSTADT,

EDITOR OF THE TEACHERS' JOURNAL,

*On Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Salvation by
Works, Infallibility, Persecution, Political
Intrigues, Papal Bulls and Bible Burning.*

SECOND REVISED EDITION.



YORK, PA. :
OFFICE OF THE TEACHERS' JOURNAL.
1879.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

—:O:—

The circumstances that gave rise to the following discussion will be seen by reading the introductory "Conversation."

It is a reprint of an article of the Rev. Thomas McGovern in the *York Gazette*, in which he charges me with having perpetrated "Seven Calumnies" against his church, and my reply to that charge in the columns of the AMERICAN LUTHERAN. The discussion created considerable interest in York, and wherever the AMERICAN LUTHERAN circulated, both among Catholics and Protestants, and as all the spare numbers of the paper were soon exhausted, the writer was solicited to publish the whole controversy in pamphlet form. I have thrown in a few "Conversations in the Sanctum," bearing on the same subject, to add spice and variety to what might otherwise prove a dry and dull discussion. In one or two instances I have borrowed some interesting ideas from "Nevin's Practical Thoughts on Popery," a work which I most heartily recommend to my readers.

The Roman question is becoming every day a more important one in our country, both in Politics and Religion, and if these pages shall shed any light upon it, the object of the writer will be accomplished.

P. A.

NOTE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The first edition of this pamphlet has been exhausted for some time. As the subject of which it treats is still agitating the country, there is a continued demand for it, which makes a second edition necessary.

In this second edition there is no material change; some verbal alterations and corrections have been made, and a few paragraphs, not necessarily connected with the subject, have been omitted.

It must be a matter of some interest to Father Mac, that our controversy on the "Seven Calumnies" is attracting so much attention. It is, however, not fair or clever in Father Mac, that he leaves all the trouble and responsibility of this publication to us. When we published the first edition we asked how many copies he wanted; but he gave us no reply. We sent him two or three copies when they were printed, but he never acknowledged them nor thanked us for them. He seems not to be kindly disposed towards us. We will also send him a copy of this edition, and see whether this will not soften his heart.

P. A.

THE SEVEN CALUMNIES.

—:O:—

CONVERSATION IN THE SANCTUM BETWEEN PETER,
JAMES AND JOHN.

PETER—Where have you been this evening, boys, and why do you appear so much excited?

JOHN—We have been in the Romnn Catholic church, where we heard the Priest slandering Luther, and Protestants in general, and that provoked us to such a degree that we could scarcely keep silent in church while he was speaking.

PETER—In one sense it served you right ; what business have you in the Roman Catholic church?

JAMES—There are a number of priests here at present from Boston, who are holding what they call a “Mission,” and on this evening it was announced they were going to speak against Protestantism. So we felt a natural curiosity to hear what they had to say in favor of Popery and against Protestantism.

PETER—Well, tell us something of what you saw and heard.

JOHN—The walls of the church are covered with pictures, and crosses, and crucifixes, and on what they called their altar there was such a profusion of lighted candles that the place looked more like a theatre, or a heathen temple, than a Christian church. And then their many and senseless ceremonies appeared to me also as heathenish and idolatrous. First a priest came in by a back door dressed in a black gown ; when he was through another priest came out with a white gown over his other clothing, and a three-cornered hat on his head ; besides him there were three or four boys, dressed in white shirts, seated and walking about in the altar. One of these threw a kind of an oil-cloth over the priest's back with a flower-pot painted on it, and pretty soon another oil-cloth on the top of that yet. He looked very fantastic, and reminded me of ihe Pharisees whom the Saviour rebuked for their display of ecclesiastical vestments, and who made broad their phylacteries.

JAMES—One of the most curious of their ceremonies was the fumigation of the church ; one of the boys in a white shirt had something like a lantern in his hand in which they burned a substance that produced a great smoke. It had rather a pleasant smell, and must therefore have been used for the purpose of driving away any bad odors that may have been in the church, although I did not smell anything offensive at the time.

JOHN—Their prayers appeared to me especially heathenish. They repeated their Pater Nosters and Ave Marias a hundred times this evening, just as fast as they could rattle them off. The Savior said, “When ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do, for they think they shall be heard for their much speaking.” They certainly use vain repetitions (or as the German has it, “Plappern,”) and

therefore, according to the Savior's rule their prayers are heathenish.

PETER—Well, now tell us something of what was said.

JOHN—In the first place the priest labored hard to prove that the Pope is the vicar of Christ and head of the church on earth. He said while Christ was on earth he was the head of the church himself, but when he left the earth he appointed Peter to be his successor, vesting the supreme authority in him, and the other apostles were to be his assistants.

PETER—You might easily have answered him on that point. In the first place there is no Scripture proof, at all, that the other apostles were to be merely the assistants of the apostle Peter, and in the second place the apostle Paul flatly contradicts the assertion that Peter had any more authority than the other apostles. He says, "I am not a whit behind the chiefest of the apostles," and declares on one occasion that he withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed. This at once destroys the assumption of supreme authority of the Pope, as well as of his infallibility.

JAMES—What provoked me the most was the calumny and slander which he heaped upon Luther and the other Reformers. He said that Luther was a libertine and a drunkard, that Calvin committed a crime for which the letter S was branded on his back, (although he did not say what the crime was or what the letter S indicated), and that Henry VIII was the founder of the Protestant Episcopal Church in England. When I heard these lies and slanders I could hardly sit still, but felt as though I must rise and tell the priest plainly that he lied.

PETER—You may well say that the priest lied, and that he slandered the Reformers most shamefully. They were some of the purest and holiest men that ever lived on earth. Luther especially was a man of extraordinary faith, and prayer, and holiness of life. It ill becomes the Romish priests in York, or anywhere else, to impute libertinism and drunkenness to Luther. Is not the whole history of the popes, bishops, and priests of the Romish church polluted with lewdness and stained with the blood of the saints whom they have slain? I would not pollute our Sanctum by reciting the lewdness of the Romish council which burnt John Huss, about one hundred years before Luther. Now, as this Romish priest has come to York and publicly charged Luther with libertinism and drunkenness, and Calvin with a nameless crime, I will let an enlightened public decide, how the character of the priests compares with that of the ministers of our Protestant churches in these respects.

JAMES—I guess we could go farther and verify the proverb, "Like priest, like people." All travelers in Europe say they can tell when they get out of a Protestant into a Romish country by the demoralized condition of the people in the Romish countries. The Roman Catholic nations are sunken in ignorance and vice, and that is the reason why Protestant and enlightened Prussia has become the greatest power in Europe.

—————:O:—————

ROMAN CATHOLIC PROSELYTES IN YORK, PA.

We understand that the Romanists of York claim to have secured six or seven proselytes as the fruits of their so-called mission for the last week or two. We have no personal acquaintance with any of

these proselytes, and are not sure whether any of them were ever communing members in any Protestant church. We would not undertake to state the motives that influenced these persons, or the social influences that were brought to bear on them to induce them to take this step, but we venture the assertion that not one of them joined the Roman Catholic church from an intelligent conviction of the truth of the Romish doctrines, or can give a Scriptural reason for preferring the Romish to the Protestant faith. Any man who in this enlightened day and country connects himself with popery, is influenced either by pecuniary gain, or by political policy, or by social relations, or else there is something morally or mentally wrong with him.

ROMISH DOCTRINES.

A mere statement of some of the principal Romish doctrines is enough to convince an intelligent Bible Christian of their falsity and absurdity.

Their doctrine of Transubstantiation is, that the priest by muttering a few words over the wafer and the wine, changes them into the real body and blood of Christ, so that they are no longer bread and wine, but the actual flesh and blood of Christ.

Their doctrine of Purgatory is, that the souls even of the best Christians must go to Purgatory to suffer a while for their sins, and that masses said by the priests and paid for by the relatives will deliver them out of the tortures of purgatory and take them up to heaven, against the express declaration of Scripture, that the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin and makes meet for heaven, and not the mass that is said by the Romish priest.

They teach that by good works the sinner can merit salvation, whereas Scripture declares that by faith we are saved and not by works.

They teach that men must confess to a priest and that he can forgive their sins, whereas the Bible assures us that every sinner has access so the throne of grace, can confess his sins to God and obtain forgiveness from Him.

By the doctrine of Infallibility they teach that the poor, imbecile old man, Pope Pius IX, in Rome, cannot err, whereas history, science and reason teach that the popes have contradicted themselves and each other a thousand times.

The popish church is doubtless that woman spoken of in the Revelations as clothed in scarlet, and drunken with the blood of the saints. The so-called Christian Rome has put to death more Christians by fire, and sword, and torture, and the inquisition, than ever pagan Rome did during the persecutions of the early Christians.

This corrupt, persecuting church is the same in all times and in all lands where she has the power, whilst losing power and influence in Europe, she is making a desperate effort to establish herself in this country. She is always grasping for political power. The Jesuits already boast that they have the control in New York City, and that it is only a question of time how soon they shall control the State, and the whole country. One of the greatest dangers that threaten the safety of our government at this time is to be apprehended from the interference of the Romish church with our political institutions, and our people should be kept wide awake to a sense of this danger.

To give our readers an idea of the bitter persecuting spirit that

pervades the Roman church toward all other Christian denominations, we will here transcribe the popish anathema, which is read in every Romish church on Thursday before Easter:

“In the name of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by the authority of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, and by our own, we excommunicate and anathematize all Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and other apostates from the faith; and all heretics, of whatsoever name they may be. And also their adherents, receivers, favorers, and generally any of them—as also schismatics, and those who withdraw themselves, or recede obstinately from their obedience to us, or the existing Roman Pontiff.”—*BULLA IN CENA DOMINI.*

This profane anathema dooms to eternal perdition all who are not found within the pale of the Romish church. But, thank God, the thunderbolts thus hurled, fall harmless at the feet of His dear children whom He shields as the apple of His eye, and protects in the hollow of His hand. The key which Rome turns with so much bitter hate, fails to lock the gate of heaven against those whose names are written in the book of life. Amid the angry and impotent thunders of the Vatican, cheering words of the great Shepherd are heard, “Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.”

—————:o:—————

FATHER MCGOVERN’S REPLY.

EDITORS YORK GAZETTE:—I do not wish to make your paper the channel of religious controversy, but the medium of self-defence. In the remarks I am about to make I disclaim every intention to use your columns to publish Catholic teaching; and at the same time, I wish it to be perfectly understood that my remarks apply only to the Rev. P. Anstadt, editor of the *AMERICAN LUTHERAN*, and to him only in his editorial capacity, whom we hold responsible for every editorial that appears in his paper.

The *AMERICAN LUTHERAN* of May 6th, a so-called religious paper published in our town, having for its accredited editor the Rev. P. Anstadt, regales its readers with a stupid article titled “The Roman Catholic Proselytes in York, Pa.” which is intended to do a great injury to a very unobtrusive little Christian congregation in your midst, as well as to outrage the feelings of a few who concluded to serve their God according to their honest convictions.

The pastor of this little congregation thought, and still thinks, he has a right, under the auspices of a government that professes to protect the conscience of men, to assemble the members of his flock in their church for religious purposes; he also thought, and still thinks, he has a right through himself, or through others, to teach them the truths of their holy religion, and to warn them from the danger of false doctrine “even taught by an angel from heaven;” he also thought and still thinks, that persons who come to his church, through other baser motives, inasmuch as they are not compelled thereto, have no reason to be offended at what is said or done, since the exercises are not for them, but for his own flock; he also thought, and still thinks, that as long as he commits no overt act against law or order, he has the unquestionable right in this town to practice, without let or hin-

drance, the honest dictates of his conscience. The Rev. Editor thinks the contrary, though at the same time he professes a great abhorrence of persecution. The few persons he sneeringly calls proselytes, came not through curiosity, but for the sake of light and truth; and to all such we extend a cordial welcome, and promise never to hurt their feelings by any word or expression not warranted in the pursuit of truth. If, therefore, these proselytes, whose ears are wounded and bruised by the uproar of contending voices which fill the air with ceaseless clamor and discord, as they emerge from the dark chinks in the temple of chaos that reigns outside of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic church; or whose hearts are sick from being tossed about on countless waves of error and schism, and infidelity, by "every wind of doctrine," if these, I say, return to the mother church, the rock of ages, built upon a rock, the pillar and ground of truth, and rest their fevered brow on her maternal bosom wherein truth, peace, and comfort resides, on what principle of honor, justice, charity, or Christian morality, does the Rev. Editor justify himself for maligning their characters, traducing their motives, and endeavoring by means unjust and unmanly to direct the scorn of public opinion against them? I am confident that the moral status of this community will not be improved by the annexation of the Rev. Editor's loose theology; and with equal confidence do I trust that the honorable spirit of fair play, so characteristic of this community, will repudiate the cruel slanders of the Rev. divine.

From slandering converts to the Catholic faith, he turns, as is natural for him, to slander the doctrines of the Catholic church, and foolishly talks of "Bible Christians." This at best is only childish twaddle. The Bible is a book comprising the old and new testaments, and purports to be a portion of the revealed word of God. A bible Christian then must be one who derives his Christianity from the Bible comprising the old and new testaments. Now, a follower of Christ, taught by the words that flowed from his sacred lips, did not derive his christianity from the Bible, therefore, a follower of Christ was not a bible christian. A follower of Christ could not derive his christianity from the Bible, as the new testament was not written during the time of Christ. St. Matthew and St. Mark wrote their gospels, the first contributions to the new testament, about the year A. D. 42, nine years after the death of Christ. There are no epistles of St. Paul extant prior to the year A. D. 52, nineteen years after the death of Christ; and St. John did not write his gospel till the year A. D. 96, sixty-three years after the death of Christ. Where were the bible christians in those days? The writings of the Apostles and Evangelists were addressed to certain persons, or churches, or nations, speaking divers tongues, and living in places often remote from each other. This fact left them unauthenticated till in the Council of Carthage, A. D. 397, when they were collected, as we now have them, and stamped genuine. Where were the bible Christians before this time? Bible christianity, therefore, is only a spurious annexation to the church.

He assumes to himself the office of explaining to his readers, "the absurdities" (as he calls them) of some Catholic doctrines. To take this role it is required of him, in all fairness, that he has an adequate knowledge of the subject: otherwise he perpetrates a fraud on

the public, and if what he states is false he is guilty of a slander and calumny. On this principle of sound morality I shall test his statements of our doctrines.

With all the confidence of a learned scholar, he tells his readers "That their (Catholic) doctrine of transubstantiation is that a priest by 'muttering' a few words over a wafer and wine changes them," &c. Now the word muttering when applied to vocal language signifies to utter words, with sullenness of complaint, in an indistinct manner, which is effected with compressed lips. The Catholic church on the contrary teaches that the priest must, under pain of grievous sin, pronounce the words of consecration over the bread and wine distinctly and reverently. (See the Rubrics of any *Missale Romanum*.) His statement, therefore, of our doctrine is a stupid falsehood, which for brevity's sake I title calumny No. 1.

He goes on and says: "That their (the Catholic) doctrine of Purgatory is that even the souls of the best christians must go to Purgatory to suffer for their sins," &c. Now if the best, which includes the most perfect christians, are doomed to Purgatory, then our doctrine, as he states it, must be universal, and admitting of no exception; whereas the Catholic teaching is that Purgatory is a place in the other life, where some souls suffer for a time, &c. (See Butler's Catechism taught in our Sunday-schools, or any Catholic treatise on this doctrine.) The term "some souls" does not include all universally as inferred by the Rev. Editor. He therefore perpetrates another falsehood, which is calumny No. 2.

"They," (the Catholics) he states, "teach that by good works the sinner can merit salvation," &c. Now the Catholic church teaches with St. Paul, "That without faith it is impossible to please God," Heb. xi. 6. "That if I had faith so as to remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing," 1 Cor. xiii. 2. "That as the body without the soul is dead, so also faith without works is dead," James ii. 26. In a word, the Catholic church teaches that faith and good works are the mutual compliments of each other, and must be united, not separated. Here again the Rev. Editor mistakes our teaching, utters a contemptible falsehood, which is directly opposed to reason and revelation. I mark it calumny No. 3. By the way, there is on my mind an impression which no act of charity that I have been yet able to elicit can remove; it is, that the Rev. Editor feels in his heart a lurking suspicion that, if good works must accompany faith, he has so few set to his credit in the book of life, that there is no chance or hope of heaven for him unless faith seizes him by the heels as he sinks for the last time in the gulf of moral depravity, and "nolens volens" drags him thereunto.

He continues: "By their (the Catholic) doctrine of infallibility they teach that that poor imbecile old man, Pope Pius IX, in Rome, cannot err," &c. This is a negative proposition, and according to the rules of logic, distributes both the subject and the predicate, so that no error, of any kind whatsoever, can be predicated to the Pope—that is to say he cannot err in eating, drinking, killing fleas, snuffing, blowing his nose, sleeping, dreaming, waking, walking, or that he cannot err in teaching geography, grammar, mathematics, botany, geology, painting, sculpture, literature, history, philosophy, chemistry, civil jurisprudence; that he cannot err when passing his opinion on the

weather, or on the secrets of hearts, or the final solutions, in the future, of present political combinations, &c., &c.—in fine, that the Pope enjoys a perfect immunity from all error, present, past or future. This is no part of the Catholic teaching. The following, taken from the 4th chapter of the Dogmatic Decree of the Vatican Council, as proclaimed July the 18th, 1870, is our teaching: “That when the Roman Pontiff speaks *EX CATHEDRA*, that is, when in the exercise of his office of Pastor and teacher of all christians, and in virtue of his supreme apostolical authority, he defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the universal church, he possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed His church to be endowed in defining a doctrine of faith or morals.” Here we teach that the Pope is infallible only when, as universal teacher of all christians, he defines “*ex cathedra*” cases of faith or morals. We claim, therefore, for him no more infallibility than the Rev. divine arrogates to himself, and that without any show of reason, when before a congregation he presumes to preach without being sent, Rom. xi. 15; we claim for the Pope no more infallibility than any consistent Protestant should assume to himself when he stakes his eternal salvation on his own deductions of faith and morals from the Scriptures in which he knows “are contained some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction,” 2 Pet. iii. 16. The Rev. divine has for the fourth time misrepresented our teaching and, in this instance, his crime partakes of an aggravated guilt. It is not twelve months since this dogma was so generally published and discussed in all its bearings, in the public press, that no intelligent editor could have forgotten it. His position in the premises can only be solved on the principle of cumulative ignorance, or willful and deliberate malice. In charity and truth I designate it calumny No. 4.

From a feast of falsehood he turns to prophecy, and informs his readers that “the popish church is doubtless the woman spoken of in Revelations,” &c. Be not deceived, kind reader, examine the case for yourself, for he is doubtless a false prophet—one of those of whom our Lord cautioned us to beware of; if therefore they say to you: Behold he is in the desert, go ye not out; Behold he is in the closet, believe it not, Matt. xxiv. 26.

He further states: “That the so-called christian Rome has put to death more christians by fire, and the sword, and torture, in the Inquisition, than ever did Pagan Rome,” &c. The American Cyclopædia, published by Appleton & Co., New York, (a Protestant work) says, Article, Inquisition, page 540, “The Roman Inquisition was the mildest of all tribunals of this nature, no instance having occurred of the punishment of death being inflicted through its agency,” and thus brands calumny No. 5. He seems in the next place to rejoice in the church losing ground in Europe, but this to my eye is not a well-founded joy. Our Lord, who founded His church on the rock, and promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, under whose providence for over 1800 years she has passed through more trying calamities than now beset her, will not, for mere personal gratification of the Rev. divine, break His promise, and let “His word pass away,” but as is more likely, He will guide His church on her mission of truth, faith, hope and charity, till the devouring element

shall announce the consummation of ages. Wherever the church loses "power or influence" over the minds of men, either in Europe or this country, the ground that is lost is lost to christianity, and gained by infidelity, as is now witnessed in the streets of Paris. This observation is not only true at this present time, but was also true in the days of Macaulay: "During the former period (18th century) whatsoever was lost to Catholicism, was lost also to christianity; during the later period (19th century) whatsoever was regained in Catholic countries to christianity, was regained also to Catholicism," (Review of Rank's History of Popes).

He charges us that we are "grasping for political power" in this country, &c. If this is true, which however is not, it would be nothing more or less than what two-thirds of the people of this country are doing—from the cobbler who sells his vote, to the President who sells his oath. The Rev. divine offers no proof for this charge but his own word, which is a sufficient guarantee that the charge is false, we therefore pronounce it calumny No. 6.

He "transcribes" for his readers what he calls a "popish anathema," and says it is read in "every Romish church on Thursday before Easter." I have been Catholic all my life; thirteen years of which I have been a theological student, ten years of these thirteen I have been a priest, and can say without contradiction that I never knew, never heard, never read; nor never heard of one that did hear that anathema read in the service which the church prescribes for the Thursday before Easter, or for any other day in the year. I can safely pronounce this an unmitigated falsehood, and stamp it the base and malicious calumny No. 7.

So far I have reviewed the article of the Rev. Editor, or published under his sanction, fairly and honestly, and, in my animadversions on it I have made no effort to magnify the author's want of veracity. He may proclaim in his congregation any calumnies he pleases against the Catholic church, though far from admitting the morality of the act, still I will not complain, but when he prostitutes the press, and as far as in him lies debauches public opinion, I will hold him to a strict account for every word he utters, and for every statement he makes. I have full confidence in the honest public opinion of this community, and before its tribunal I arraign the author of the article reviewed on the charge of maligning his neighbors' characters, traducing their motives, and holding them up unjustly to public scorn for performing an act on which God alone has a right to judge. I charge him for being a deceiver of the people, a falsifier of public documents, and a man who bears false witness against the Catholic church, the spiritual kingdom of God upon earth. Under this indictment I hold he is not entitled to any right of an honest man except defense.

THOS. MCGOVERN.

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION.

Father Mac begins by calling our editorial "a stupid article," speaks of the great injury done to his very unobtrusive little congregation, and then proceeds as follows:

"The pastor of this little congregation thought, and still thinks, he has a right, under the auspices of a government that professes to

protect the conscience of men, to assemble the members of his flock in their church for religious purposes; he also thought, and still thinks, he has a right through himself, or through others, to teach them the truths of their holy religion, and to warn them from the danger of false doctrine "even taught by an angel from heaven;" he also thought and still thinks, that persons who come to his church, through other baser motives, inasmuch as they are not compelled thereto, have no reason to be offended at what is said or done, since the exercises are not for them, but for his own flock; he also thought, and still thinks, that as long as he commits no overt act against law or order, he has the unquestionable right in this town to practice, without let or hindrance, the honest dictates of his conscience. The Rev. Editor thinks the contrary, though at the same time he professes a great abhorrence of persecution."

Now all this is mere buncombe by Father Mac. Neither we, nor any other Protestant in York ever thought of interfering with the consciences of the Roman Catholics, or their liberty of assembling in their churches and teaching their doctrines, absurd and unscriptural though they be. The case stands thus:

A few weeks ago two Romish priests came here from Boston and held one of their so-called missions. During this time they invited, yea, urged Protestants to come to their church and hear them preach. Many accepted the invitation. But they were rewarded by hearing the most slanderous statements in regard to the moral character of the Protestant Reformers, and shameful misrepresentations of our Evangelical Christianity. *They*, therefore, commenced the attack and provoked a reply. Now, as our Catholic neighbors claim and take the right of publicly proclaiming these slanders after inviting us to come and hear them, we also shall claim and practice the right of refuting these slanders, and exposing the errors of Romanism, both from the pulpit and by the press.

It ill becomes the Romanists to extol the liberty of religious worship. It is only in Protestant countries, where they are in the minority, that they advocate religious toleration, but where they themselves have supreme control, there they tolerate no other religion than the Roman Catholic. It is not long since Protestant Bible readers were persecuted in Spain, and only since the Pope has been deprived of his temporal power have the Protestants been allowed to build churches and hold public worship in the city of Rome. To be consistent, the Roman Catholics should not claim religious toleration in Protestant lands while they deny it to Protestants in Romish countries.

BIBLE CHRISTIANS.

Father Mac proceeds in the following manner to speak of the Bible and Bible Christians:

"From slandering converts to the Catholic faith, he turns, as is natural for him, to slander the doctrines of the Catholic church, and foolishly talks of "Bible Christians." This at best is only childish twaddle. The Bible is a book comprising the old and new testaments, and purports to be a portion of the revealed word of God. A bible Christian then must be one who derives his Christianity from the Bible comprising the old and new testaments. Now, a follower

of Christ, taught by the words that flowed from his sacred lips, did not derive his christianity from the Bible, therefore, a follower of Christ was not a bible christian."

Here it will be observed that the holy Father Mac calls our remarks about the Bible Christians "foolish talk" and "childish twaddle," but in trying to illustrate this elegant assertion he makes use of a very transparent Jesuitical sophistry. He says the Bible *purports* to be a *portion* of the revealed word of God. My dear Father Mac, the Bible not only *purports* to be, but really *is* the revealed word of God, and it is not only a "*portion*," but it is the whole of the revealed Word of God. Or if the Bible contains only a portion of the revealed Word of God, will you please to tell us where the other portion of the Word of God is to be found outside of the Bible? Then you say, "A follower of Christ, taught by the words that flowed from his sacred lips did not derive his christianity from the Bible, therefore a follower of Christ was not a Bible christian." But, I say, a follower of Christ who was taught by the words that flowed from his sacred lips, heard the same words that were afterwards recorded by the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, and, therefore, must have been a Bible Christian. The same Bible doctrines that are recorded in the Gospels and Epistles, were also taught by Christ and his inspired apostles, and hence all the early Christians were Bible Christians in their doctrinal views and practices.

Besides, the Savior insists on Bible Christianity when he says, John v. 36. "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." But, according to Father Mac, this is "foolish talk" and "childish twaddle." And from St. Paul's account of Timothy he must have been a Bible Christian even from his childhood; for he says of him, 2 Tim. iii. 16, "And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Yet Father Mac would say it is "foolish talk" and "childish twaddle" to call Timothy a Bible Christian.

Moreover, St. Luke regards Bible Christians as the noblest kind of Christians. Speaking of the Bereans, Acts xvii. 11, he says, "These were more noble than those of Thessalonica in that they received the word with readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily to see whether these things were so." But Father Mac would say it was "foolish talk" and "childish twaddle" to call these Bereans Bible Christians.

Now, in the face of the command of Christ to search the Scriptures, the testimony of St. Paul to Timothy's knowledge of the Scriptures from his childhood, the eulogy of the Bereans by St. Luke for searching the Scriptures daily, how can you write it down in black and white, and get it printed yet, that to speak of Bible Christians is "foolish talk" and "childish twaddle?" Oh, Father Mac! Father Mac! It is blasphemy!

Here I would like to ask you a question, Father Mac. Do you ever exhort your people to search the Scriptures, as Christ commanded us to do, and as the Apostle commended the Bereans for doing? I fear you do not; for I have heard it said that your so-called Holy Father, the Pope, has put the Bible on the list of forbidden books, and within the memory of many of our citizens, a Roman Catholic priest

of York, one of your predecessors, burnt a copy of the holy Scriptures.

After this introduction Father Mac proceeds to convict us of seven calumnies, which he says we have perpetrated. We will take up these seven calumnies in their order and try to defend ourselves as best we can.

CALUMNY No. 1.—TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

We had stated that the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation is, that a priest by muttering a few words over a wafer and wine, changes them into the real body and blood of Christ. Now let the reader mark the Jesuitical manner in which Father Mac undertakes to construe this into calumny No. 1. He does not deny the doctrine of Transubstantiation ascribed to the Romish church, but by amusing the reader with a mere play on an incidental word in the sentence, draws the attention away from the real point at issue. Here is what he says :

“With all the confidence of a learned scholar, he tells his readers ‘That their (Catholic) doctrine of transubstantiation is that a priest by ‘muttering’ a few words over a wafer and wine changes them,’ &c. Now the word muttering when applied to vocal language signifies to utter words, with sullenness of complaint, in an indistinct manner, which is effected with compressed lips. The Catholic church on the contrary teaches that the priest must, under pain of grievous sin, pronounce the words of consecration over the bread and wine distinctly and reverently. (See the Rubrics of any *Missale Romanum*.) His statement, therefore, of our doctrine is a stupid falsehood, which for brevity’s sake I title calumny No. 1.”

It is sufficient to reply to this that the words of consecration are spoken in Latin, a language which the audience does not understand. What difference does it make, therefore, as far as the hearer is concerned, whether the priest speaks the words plainly or mutters them? The one is as unintelligible to him as the other. But the real point at issue is the absurdity of the doctrine that the priest, by the Latin words of consecration, whether he mutters them or speaks them plainly, changes the wafer into the real body, and the wine into the real blood of Christ. This Father Mac has not denied, and he dares not deny it. Therefore his No. 1 is no calumny, but the truth.

Before we close this subject I would like to ask you, Father Mac, do you really believe the doctrine of transubstantiation yourself, as taught in your church? I should like to see this put to a practical test. It might be tested in this way: Let a physician, or druggist put a few drops of strong emetic into the wine cup. Then after you have solemnly, reverently, and distinctly pronounced the words of consecration over it from the *Missale Romanum*, you drink it all down. If you shall have really changed it, as you profess to do every time you say mass, so that it will be no longer wine, then it cannot hurt you; but if there has been no change, and consequently your doctrine untrue, then it will make you deathly sick. If you really have any faith in your doctrine, it would be worth while to confirm it by such a miracle. And as we are speaking of the sacraments, permit me to make one more remark in conclusion.

You claim to have seven sacraments, don’t you? But it appears to me you have only 6½, and five of them are no sacraments at all. The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper you have divided, and give the

people only the one-half of it. Namely, you give them only the wafer, and drink the wine yourself. This has been done ever since the council of Constance, where they determined that the people must put up with the wafer alone, but that they want the cup for themselves. John Huss and Jerome made considerable opposition to it, because Christ expressly says, "Drink ye *all* of it," and not the priest alone, but they just burned them, and that stopped their opposition. Ever since that time, about 450 years ago, the people in the Roman Catholic church have but half a sacrament. Now, it may be said that half a loaf is better than no bread, but we contend that half a sacrament is no sacrament at all.

CONVERSATION IN THE SANCTUM.

JOHN—(Reading in Luther's Table Talk.) I am interested in this book, and with your permission I will read a few extracts from it. (Reads) "In a Monastery at Luneburg, there stands to this day a great altar, whereon are represented the life and miracles of Christ; his birth, his entry into Jerusalem, his passion, death, descent into hell, resurrection and ascension. Just by is set forth in a like manner, the birth of St. Francis, his miracles, sufferings, death and ascent into heaven, so that they esteemed the works of St. Francis of equal value with those of our blessed Savior Christ Jesus; a great and abominable blasphemy."

JAMES—When we were in the Romish church here in York, the other evening, where we heard the priest slandering Luther and the Reformers, I observed that there also were two altars, one to Christ and the other to the Virgin Mary, and the priest exhorted the people to bring flowers with them to adorn the altar of "Our Lady," by which I suppose he meant the Virgin Mary; I suppose, therefore, they esteem her worthy of equal honor with Christ.

PETER—O yes, they worship her and pray to her as to God. They teach that she was born without sin, or natural depravity. This doctrine was lately decreed by the present Pope, and they call it the "Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary." Then they also teach that, just like Christ, she ascended into heaven and was crowned there. And then you may have observed that just as many Pater Nosters as they said, so many Ava Marias they also said, that is, they prayed just as much to the Virgin Mary as they prayed to God. This is worshipping the creature as much as the Creator, and is, therefore, pure Idolatry.

JAMES—From what passages of Scripture do they prove that the Virgin Mary was born without sin, and ascended to heaven, and was crowned there.

PETER—They have no Scripture for any of these teachings about the Virgin Mary, but they are purely human inventions.

JOHN—Here is a sentence, just in point, from the Table Talk. Luther says: "Mary, the humble Virgin of Nazareth, strikes these potentates and popes fiercely, when she sings: 'I will put down the mighty from their seats.'" Doubtless she had a sweet voice.

JAMES—That song has a pungent significance just now, when the Pope is "put down" from the seat of his worldly power.

JOHN—The monks must have lived well in the time of Luther, as is evident from this extract from his Table Talk. (Reads.) "The

fasting of the friars is more easy to them than our eating is to us. For one day of fasting there are three days of feasting. Every friar, for his supper, has two quarts of beer, a quart of wine and spice-cake, or bread prepared with spice and salt, the better to relish their drink. Thus go on these poor fasting brethren; getting so pale and wan, they are like the fiery angels."

JAMES—That must have been intended for sarcasm by Luther, when he spoke of those poor fasting brethren, growing pale and wan, on two quarts of beer and one quart of wine, with spice-cake for supper. It seems to me, an ordinary man would get very much befuddled on that much beer and wine. I wonder if they can drink so much in our day.

PETER—Some men can stand more than others, but I don't think it was wholesome for them, even, and therefore Luther said ironically they looked "like fiery angels." Read us another extract from the Table Talk.

JOHN—(Reads.) "Christ had neither money or riches, nor earthly kingdoms, for he gave the same to kings and princes. But he reserved one thing peculiar to himself, which no human creature or angel could do—namely, to conquer sin and death, the devil and hell, and in the midst of death, to deliver and save those that through his Word believe on him."

JAMES—I should think that strikes the Pope pretty hard too; for he pretends to be the vice-gerent of Christ on earth. Yet he is the very opposite of Christ in every essential respect; for the Pope has money and riches, and until lately also an earthly kingdom.

CALUMNY No. 2.—PURGATORY.

The second "calumny" with which he charges us relates to the doctrine of Purgatory. We had stated the Romish doctrine to be, that the souls of even the best Christians must go to Purgatory to suffer for their sins. Now see how Father Mac construes this into a "falseness" and "calumny No. 2." The following are his indignant words:

"He goes on and says: 'That their (the Catholic) doctrine of Purgatory is that even the souls of the best christians must go to Purgatory to suffer for their sins,' &c. Now if the best, which includes the most perfect christians, are doomed to Purgatory, then our doctrine, as he states it, must be universal, and admitting of no exception; whereas the Catholic teaching is that Purgatory is a place in the other life, where some souls suffer for a time, &c. (See Butler's Catechism taught in our Sunday-schools, or any Catholic treatise on this doctrine.) The term "some souls" does not include all universally as inferred by the Rev. Editor. He therefore perpetrates another falsehood, which is calumny No. 2."

In this statement of "Catholic Teaching" Father Mac leaves us very much in the dark, as to what class of people really go to Purgatory. Whether it is the good or bad, he does not say, he merely says that *some souls* suffer there for a time. Fortunately we have other means of determining, from "Catholic Teachings" what class of persons do not, and what class do go to Purgatory. We find by reference to some of their catechisms (Doctrinal and Scriptural Catechism by Collot, p. 388) that the wicked suffer eternally in hell. Consequently they could not have been in Purgatory, for there they suffer

only "for a *time*." Hence only good Catholics go to Purgatory, yea, as we stated, even the best Christians must suffer there for their sins. We find this abundantly illustrated in Romish books and practices. In the above-named catechism (Collot's, p. 386) occurs the following: "St. Monica, being at the point of death, said to her children: 'Give yourselves no trouble about this poor body, bury it wherever you choose; the only thing that I ask of you is, to remember me at the altar of the Lord, wherever you may be.'"

Here then we have an eminent saint asking her children to pray for her after she was dead, to deliver her soul from the pains of Purgatory.

The following extract from a Baltimore newspaper, published many years ago, also shows that, according to the Romish view, the best Christians must go to Purgatory.

"OBSEQUIES.—This day the Prelates and Theologians of the Catholic Provincial Council, now in session in this city, together with several other priests celebrated the solemn office for the repose of the souls of the Right Rev. Dr. Fenwick of Cincinnati, and De Necker, of New Orleans. The Right Rev. Dr. Rosati celebrated the High Mass, attended by the proper officers. After the Gospel, the Right Rev. Dr. Purcell, Bishop of Cincinnati, ascended the pulpit and preached a funeral oration, in which he ably portrayed, in accurate and pathetic language, the virtues and services of the deceased Prelates, the former of whom fell a victim to the cholera, after years of laborious and successful exertions; the latter was taken away in the bloom of youth, and in the midst of his labors, by the yellow fever. After the Mass, Dr. Rosati performed the usual obsequies."

Now here we have two prelates of the Roman Catholic church, eminent for their "virtues and services," dead a year or more, and yet their souls are not at rest, a whole Provincial Council celebrating mass for the repose of their souls. They could not have been in heaven, for then their souls would have been at rest. Where else could they therefore be, but in Purgatory, "suffering the rigor of fire." "And let us remember that all the fires of this world, are neither so strong nor so piercing as that of Purgatory." (see Collott's Catechism, p. 385, 386). What a horrible place to send such holy men to, as those prelates were, to burn in for a whole year! And who knows but they are there yet, at least we have never seen it announced that they have been delivered. We had stated that according to the Romish doctrines even the souls of the best Christians must go to Purgatory to suffer for their sins. Does not Father Mac count St. Monica and those prelates, so eminent for their "virtues and services" among their best Christians? And yet he calls our statement a "falsehood" and "calumny No. 2." Now, if the very best of your bishops are tossing and burning in Purgatory a year after their death, and need to have solemn offices said for the repose of their souls, what will become of the less virtuous ones in your church? Oh, Father Mac, you must take that back. It is neither a falsehood nor a calumny, that you teach that the best Christians must go to Purgatory.

We wish to state a few objections to your doctrine of Purgatory.

1. In the first place it is unscriptural. The Bible speaks plainly enough of *two* places beyond the grave, but it says nothing about a *third* place. It tells of a *heaven* and a *hell*, but never a word of *Purgatory*. Those passages of Scripture which they adduce to prove

this doctrine do not prove it at all. If Purgatory is full of souls, who are helped by masses and the prayers of the faithful on earth, as the Romanists teach, why, in the multitude of their exhortations, do the Savior and his apostles never so much as give us a hint about praying for those poor suffering souls? What a great oversight it was in them.

2. The doctrine of Purgatory is derogatory to the atonement of Christ. The Scriptures represent Christ as an all-sufficient Savior, whose blood cleanses from sin. But the Romish doctrine represents him as an insufficient Savior whose blood does not cleanse from all sins, but that the Christian must have his sins purged away by the fires of Purgatory. What low and degrading thoughts the Romanists must have of the work of Christ, and the efficacy of his blood, that they should believe, after he has done all he can for a soul, and his blood has exhausted its virtue on it, it has still to be subjected to the action of the fires of Purgatory for no one knows how long, in order that the expiation of its sins may be complete, and its salvation perfected. What a doctrine! Why according to this, Christ was premature in proclaiming on the cross, "It is finished." It was not finished. The expiation of sin was only begun on Calvary. It is to be completed in Purgatory. God save the world from a dreadful delusion so derogatory to the Son of God, the Savior of the world.

3. We read of no one in the Scriptures who went to Purgatory. If there was a Purgatory in the time of Christ it must have been a place of little *note* and of little *use*—of little note, for they say nothing about it; and of little use, because we read of no one going there. Lazarus did not go there, he was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom; the penitent and believing thief on the cross did not go to Purgatory, he was with the Savior that same day in Paradise; Dives did not go there, nor did Judas Iscariot. Paul speaks of those Christians who are *absent from the body, as present with the Lord*. Is Christ in Purgatory? Is it there that believers go to be ever with him? But hark! a voice from heaven! now we shall know what it is: "I heard a voice from heaven," says St. John, "saying unto me write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth, yea saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labors." They that die in the Lord, *rest*. Then certainly they are not in purgatory. Now here is a dilemma. Will Father Mac say that those two bishops for the repose of whose souls the council in Baltimore said mass, did not die in the Lord? I suppose not. Then he must believe that they were at rest. And if so, why celebrate mass for their repose?

4. It is a horrible doctrine to believe on a deathbed. I have somewhere read that Roman Catholics are never happy in the prospect of death. I do not wonder at this. The devout Papist believes that immediately after death he goes to Purgatory, which is a place of torment so dreadful, that "all the fires of this world are neither so strong nor so piercing as that of Purgatory." (Collot's Catechism p. 380). We have witnessed conflagrations where the heat was so great that one could not come up to them within several hundred feet; we have seen furnaces heated to such a degree, as to melt the hardest metals, but all this comes far short of the fire of Purgatory; that exceeds "all the fires of the world." Into such a horrible fiery furnace you are doomed to go immediately after death, my Catholic friends. It is no wonder, therefore, that Catholics are never happy in the pros-

pect of death, for all have to go there with the following exceptions, which he transcribed from Collot's Catechism, p. 384 and 385:

"1. Those who die in a state of baptismal innocence, such as baptized children who die before the age of reason, or even adults who die immediately after baptism. 2. Those who suffer martyrdom; refer to the martyrdom of St. Stephen, who saw the heavens opened to receive him. 3. Those who die after the perfect penance. Such as St. Paul, the hermit, whose soul was seen by St. Anthony ascending into heaven, as white as snow, amongst troops of angels, and amid the choirs of prophets and apostles. The same is related of St. Scholastica, and several others."

It will be seen from the above, that, with the exception of baptized children, there is no escape from Purgatory; according to the Romish doctrine, only St. Stephen, St. Paul the hermit, St. Scholastica and "several others," did not go there. But all the rest, millions upon millions in number, have gone there, and still go there to endure those horrible burnings. But thanks be to God, this doctrine has no support in Scripture, reason, or common sense.

5. Lastly, we remark that this is pecuniarily a very profitable doctrine to the Romish church. It is a trafic in the souls of men and women. There is no doctrine which pays so well. It is a capital speculation. St. Peter's church, in Rome, the largest church in the world, was built by the sale of indulgences, and one of the largest sources of revenue to the Romish church at this day, no doubt flows from the masses said for the repose of the souls in Purgatory.

CALUMNY No. 3.—SALVATION BY WORKS.

We have gone through two of the so-called calumnies, which Father Mac accuses us of having perpetrated against his church, and now come to the third one. The following is his language:

"'They,' (the Catholics) he states, 'teach that by good works the sinner can merit salvation,' &c. Now the Catholic church teaches with St. Paul, 'That without faith it is impossible to please God,' Heb. xi. 6. 'That if I had faith so as to remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing,' 1 Cor. xiii. 2. 'That as the body without the soul is dead, so also faith without works is dead,' James ii. 26. In a word, the Catholic church teaches that faith and good works are the mutual compliments of each other, and must be united, not separated. Here again the Rev. Editor mistakes our teaching, utters a contemptible falsehood, which is directly opposed to reason and revelation. I mark it calumny No. 3."

In reading this statement of Father Mac without knowing who he is, one would almost take him to be a Protestant. For we also believe all those passages which he quotes from the Scriptures, perhaps more firmly than he does. We believe that faith without works is dead, but we believe in addition that good works are the necessary fruits of a living, saving faith. But Father Mac does not state the doctrine of his church correctly on this subject; he merely quotes a few passages of Scripture, whereas when we examine their catechisms and confessions we find it to be quite different. Let us see now, whether what we said under No. 3 was really a calumny, or the truth.

We said "The Romanists teach that by good works the sinner can merit salvation." Now we can prove from Collot's catechism

(which we suppose Father Mac will acknowledge to be good authority, for it purports to be published with the approbation of the ecclesiastical authorities of Montreal,) that the sinner can obtain the forgiveness of his sins, and consequently merit salvation, by good works in this life, and after death by suffering the rigors of fire in purgatory, and also that Romanists can assist their friends in purgatory by their prayers and masses. On page 240 of Collot's catechism occur the following questions and answers:

Q. What is an indulgence? A. It is a remission of the temporal punishment due to sin. Q. Where is this temporal punishment undergone? A. Either in this life or in the other.

On pages 250 and 251 occur the following questions and answers:

Q. What is the first thing necessary for gaining indulgences. A. It is to be truly penitent. Q. What is the second thing necessary for gaining indulgences? A. It is to fulfill the conditions prescribed by the church. Every one is to read with attention, or hear read, the *Bull* of each indulgence, and the *mandamus* of the bishops and conform thereto in every particular. In the Bulls of the Jubilee there are usually confessions, stations, alms, fastings, and holy communion.

Here, the reader will observe, there is not a word said about faith; it is all works by which the sinner merits the pardon of his sins, and of course also the salvation of his soul. And not only do they teach that by such good works as confession, stations, alms, fasting, and holy communion, the sinner can gain an indulgence, and thus merit the remission of the punishment for his sins; but they also teach that the sinner expiates for his sins in Purgatory, and that his friends can assist him there by their good works. On page 385 of Collot's catechism the following questions and answers occur:

Q. What is the state of those who have not cleared off the punishment due to their sins? A. They finish the expiation of their sins by the pains of purgatory. Q. In what do these pains consist. A. In suffering the rigors of fire.

Here, the reader will observe, there is not a word said about the merits of Christ, or faith in his atoning blood, which the Bible says, cleanses from all sin; but the poor sinner must expiate his own sins by the pains of Purgatory. Think of this, my Catholic friends, unless you die a martyr's death, or have done "perfect penance," you must expiate your sins in the pains of Purgatory, suffering the rigors of fire. You have no all-sufficient Savior in the Romish church. But is there no relief from the pains of Purgatory? Yes, according to the following questions and answers on pages 385 and 386:

Q. Can we relieve the suffering souls in purgatory? A. Yes, we can relieve them by our prayers, fasting, and alms, and especially by the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ. (By the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ is here meant the mass.)

Here again faith is left entirely out of the question, and all is ascribed to the merits of good works.

Now I would like to ask you, Father Mac, do you acknowledge the authority of Collot's catechism, and do those questions and answers give a true statement of the teaching of your church on this subject? If you do, then it is no calumny to say that your church teaches that the sinner can merit salvation by his good works, because I have proved from one of your own catechisms that indulgences are

gained by such good works as confession, stations, alms, fasting, and the holy communion, without one word of faith or the merits of Christ, and that unless the souls in Purgatory are relieved by the same kind of good works, they must expiate their own sins by the rigors of fire.

O Father Mac, though you seemed to be so much displeas'd with me when I made the assertion the first time, and you call'd it a "contemptible falsehood," and mark'd it as "calumny No. 3." yet I am compell'd by force of evidence from your own doctrinal standards to repeat it, and say for the second time, you teach in your church that the sinner can merit salvation by his own good works.

I could prove this Romish doctrine from some of their doctrinal standards, if it were necessary, but the above is already abundantly satisfactory. I will therefore merely cite one more extract from the decree of the Council of Trent. (Sess. 6, Can. 21.) "If any one shall say that men are justified either by the mere imputation of the righteousness of Christ * * * or shall say that the grace by which we are justified is only the favor of God, let him be accurs'd."

Will the reader please mark this language. In Collot's catechism it is taught that the sinner can gain indulgences from the punishment of sin by good works, independent of the merits of Christ, and in the decrees of the council of Trent those are curs'd who hope to be justify'd by mere imputation of Christ's righteousness!

Father Mac now proceeds in the following grandiloquent style, which he no doubt regard'd as a most lofty flight of eloquence:

"By the way, there is on my mind an impression which no act of charity that I have been yet able to elicit can remove; it is, that the Rev. Editor feels in his heart a lurking suspicion that, if good works must accompany faith, he has so few set to his credit in the book of life, that there is no chance or hope of heaven for him unless faith seizes him by the heels as he sinks for the last time in the gulf of moral depravity, and *volens volens* drags him thereunto."

The sentiment expressed in this paragraph is so characteristic of popery, that Father Mac has certainly prov'd himself true to his church. He truly says, he has not been able to elicit an act of charity from his heart. A good reason why, there is none there. Who would look for charity in the heart of a Roman priest towards a Protestant heretic? The charity of the Romish church toward Protestants has indeed been cruel. If any one wishes to see the quality of popish charity let him read Fox's Book of Martyrs. When he therefore speaks of us as "sinking for the last time into the gulf," &c., no doubt the wish was futher to the thought. If it depend'd on the tender mercies of Rome our chances of heaven would be slim indeed. But thank God, neither the Pope nor his priests have the control of the keys of heaven.

Father Mac no doubt is naturally a kind-hearted man, as most Irishmen are, but as a priest he has to be true to the spirit of his church, which would hurl all Protestant heretics head-foremost into the gulf. The Lord save us from the tender mercies of Rome.

P. S.—Just as we had finish'd writing the above reply the *York Gazette* came to hand containing another article from Father Mac in reply to our first. We do not wish to be turn'd from our couers by anything he may say or write against us, but will keep on in the even tenor of our way till we get through with those seven calumnies. There is one sentence in this reply which

we do not fully understand. Speaking of our article, he says of us: "He annoys, teases, disturbs, tantalizes, torments—just escaping the letter of the law—makess our life a continued martyrdom, by depriving us of peace and happiness while living, as well as the honor of shedding our blood in testimony of our faith when dying."

We certainly did not intend that our humble efforts at vindicating ourselves against his accusations of "falsehood and calumny," should have such an effect on him as to deprive him of peace and happiness while he is living, and make his life a perpetual martyrdom. We beg of him to keep as cool as possible during the warm weather. As to shedding his blood in testimony of his faith, we really think there is no necessity for it, in this luminous nineteenth century.

CALUMNY No. 4.—THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

We come now to discuss the fourth calumny which Father Mac accuses us of having perpetrated against his church. This relates to the infallibility of the Pope, a subject that has attracted a great deal of attention of late. Before proceeding with the discnssion we remark that we are sorry to see the Reverend Father so much excited; he is evidently angry, when he applies such epithets to us as "cumulative ignorance," "willful and deliberate malice," "his crime partakes of aggravated guilt," "falsehood," "slander," "calumny," &c., &c. Such language will not convince your readers that you are right and have truth on your side. Let us keep our tempers and treat each other like gentlemen, and the community will have much more respect for us. In order that our readers may have as much as possible of both sides of the question, we will quote the principal part of what he sets down as the proof of our fourth calumny. The following are Father Mac's words:

"He continues: 'By their (the Catholic) doctrine of infallibility they teach that that poor imbecile old man, Pope Pius IX, in Rome, cannot err,' &c. This is a negative proposition, and according to the rules of logic, distributes both the subject and the predicate, so that no error, of any kind whatsoever, can be predicated to the Pope—that is to say he cannot err in eating, drinking, killing fleas, snuffing, blowing his nose, sleeping, dreaming, waking, walking, or that he cannot err in teaching geography, grammar, mathematics, botany, geology, painting, sculpture, literature, history, philosophy, chemistry, civil jurisprudence; that he cannot err when passing his opinion on the weather, or on the secrets of hearts, or the final solutions, in the future, of present political combinations, &c., &c.—in fine, that the Pope enjoys a perfect immunity from all error, present, past or future. This is no part of the Catholic teaching. * We teach that the Pope is infallible only when, as universal teacher of all christians, he defines *ex cathedra* cases of *faith or morals*. * The Rev. divine has for the fourth time misrepresented our teaching and, in this instance, his crime partakes of aggravated guilt. * His position in the premises can only be solved on the principle of cumulative ignorance, or willful and deliberate malice. In charity and truth I designate it calumny No. 4."

If the reader will carefully examine the above extract from Father Mac, he will observe that his statement of the Romish doctrine of infallibility does not differ essentially from ours. We simply stated

the fact that they regard the imbecile old pope infallible, without stopping to explain on what subjects or under what circumstances they regard him infallible. He also says that they teach that the pope is infallible, and then goes on to explain on what subjects and under what circumstances he cannot err; namely, when he sits in the chair of St. Peter, and speaks *ex cathedra* to the whole Christian world, on some subject of faith or morals. But under all other circumstances and on all subjects not involving faith or morals he is liable to err. The only difference between us is, that his statement is more elaborate than ours. He cannot, therefore, reasonably or justly accuse us of perpetrating a calumny against his church for simply stating that they teach that the pope cannot err, because he states the same thing, only designating the subjects on which he is infallible.

We are right glad Father Mac took the trouble of specifying all the particulars in which he does not regard the pope infallible, because it gives us an insight into the domestic arrangements of the old man, and shows how Holy Father, the pope, spends his precious time. Father Mac says, in eating drinking, killing fleas, &c., &c. Now we have read that Italy is infested with fleas and other vermin, especially among the Lazaroni, but we had no idea that these pests had also invaded the Vatican in Rome, and even penetrated into the bed-chamber of his Holiness, so that a part of his time has to be taken up in catching and killing them. The reason of this, no doubt is, that he is a confirmed old bachelor, and "lives by himself." If he were a married man, as he ought to be, and had a tidy wife, she would keep his bed clean and he would not now, in his old age, have to exhaust his time and patience in catching and killing fleas. It must be very interesting sport to see the old man engaged in this exciting employment. Sometimes, like the Irishman, he puts his finger on a flea, but when he comes to look, the flea is not there. In that case the pope is fallible, he has made a mistake. And again, sometimes he puts his finger on a flea, and it really is there, he catches him in triumph and kills him; in this case he is infallible, he has made no mistake. I should think it quite likely that all the Romish priests and bishops, living as they do, in single blessedness, are annoyed in like manner. Perhaps Father Mac has experienced the same inconvenience, and hence his allusion to the trouble of his Holiness the pope. But be of good cheer, Father Mac, there is a good time coming. Since Victor Emanuel has become king in Rome, the priests are allowed to marry, and their wives will banish all the fleas from their houses, just as sure as St. Patrick drove the snakes and toads from Ireland.

We wish to make some remarks on the doctrine of papal infallibility itself.

1. Look at its absurdity. The doctrine, as Father Mac states it, is that under ordinary circumstances the pope is a fallible man, just like all others. But as soon as he sits down in the chair of St. Peter, and assumes to speak to the whole Christian world on a question of faith or morals, then he is infallible! Can anything be more contemptibly absurd? What is there in that old wooden chair that should inspire him with infallibility the moment he sits down upon it?

2. It is totally unscriptural. The word *ex cathedra* means "From the Chair," but there is not a word in the Bible about the chair of St. Peter. There is only one passage that speaks particularly of St. Peter

as sitting, namely, when he sat by the fire in the court of the high priest, among the servants, and warmed himself; and from that chair, or bench, or whatever he was sitting on, he denied his Savior three times. And then the cock crew. The Romanists claim that St. Peter was the first pope; did he speak *ex cathedra* when he denied his Lord?

3. If Peter had been infallible he could have settled any dispute that might have arisen among the early Christians, without submitting the decision to the deliberations of his brethren. But in that first council of the early Christians in Jerusalem, Peter does not claim more authority than the other apostles, nor was there any particular deference paid him by the council. He related his experience precisely as did Paul and Barnabas. The apostle James appears to have occupied the chair on that occasion. He appears to sum up the result of the deliberations of that meeting, when he says, "Wherefore my sentence is," &c., Acts xv. The bishop of Jerusalem, and not the bishop of Rome occupied the chair. One of the priests who were here in York holding the so-called Catholic mission, said that Christ had appointed Peter to be the head of the church and the other apostles were to be his assistants. But the other apostles and the early Christians do not appear to have known anything of this arrangement.

4. Paul does not recognize the superiority or infallibility of Peter. He declared on one occasion that he considered himself not a whit behind the chief of the apostles, and on another occasion he says that he "withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed." But how differently the present pope acted from St. Peter. When Dr. Dollinger and others refused to accept the doctrine of infallibility, they were excommunicated. But Peter did not excommunicate Paul for charging him with error, and denying his infallibility, but he speaks of him in his second epistle as "our beloved brother Paul." Perhaps Father Mac will say, Peter did not know he was infallible. Men do not always know themselves.

5. Is it not singular that when a dispute arose among the disciples as to who should be the greatest, Christ did not settle this question at once, and tell them Peter is the greatest, he is infallible, you must go to him for the final decision of every question. But instead of that he took a little child and set him in the midst of them, indicating that even the little child in his estimation was as great as any one of them.

6. I would just like to ask Father Mac, merely for information, how was it when there were *three* contemporary popes, each claiming infallibility? Had they it between them, or which of them had it? What was the name of the one there was no mistake about? How were the common people to ascertain the infallible one? For you know their salvation depended on their being in communion with the true and infallible head of the church, the rightful successor of St. Peter.

7. Some of the popes differed in doctrines very much from each other, and some held the most unscriptural views. Thus pope Liberius was an Arian, denying the Trinity; Zosimus was a Pelagian, denying natural depravity; pope John XXIII, was deposed by the council of Constance in 1415 on account of his infidelity; and against pope John XXII, W. Ocum wrote a whole compendium of errors. See Herzog's Encyclopedia, page 614, on the article of infallibility. Where

one pope contradicts another they cannot both be infallible, or it would be infallibility against infallibility.

8. It is well that the pope does not claim infallibility in *practice*, for if he did he would have some difficulty in reconciling this doctrine with the history of the popes. It is very true that a man may have the right faith and yet sometimes err in practice, yet when I see a man very crooked in practice I cannot believe that he is always straight in doctrine. I cannot believe that all I hear from him is good and true, when what I see is false and bad. Take for example pope Alexander the sixth. He was the father of that promising youth, *Cæsar Borgia*, and yet as infallible pope he taught that it is a shockingly wicked thing for an ecclesiastic to get married. If this pope was infallible in doctrine, he was most lamentably fallible in practice.

CALUMNY No. 5.—PERSECUTION.

We have now gone over four of the so-called calumnies, and we think we have shown conclusively that what he designates as calumnies, are really incontrovertible truths—truths which Father Mac has not yet been able to disprove, and the exposure of which, before an intelligent Protestant community, has doubtless caused him the “continued martyrdom” of which he complains in his last article. We now come to the fifth calumny, which relates to the cruel persecutions which the papists have practiced, and the horrors of the inquisition. This is indeed a dark spot on the character of the papal church. We will let Father Mac make out this calumny in his own words: this is his language:

“He further states: ‘That the so-called christian Rome has put to death more christians by fire, and the sword, and torture, in the Inquisition, than ever did Pagan Rome,’ &c. The American Cyclopædia, published by Appleton & Co., New York, (a Protestant work) says, Article, Inquisition, page 540, ‘The Roman Inquisition was the mildest of all tribunals of this nature, no instance having occurred of the punishment of death being inflicted through its agency,’ and thus brands calumny No. 5.”

In reading these words, a person who knows nothing about popery would suppose that the Romish church had never put a martyr to death nor the inquisition ever burnt a saint; whereas the martyrs slain by popery are not counted by hundreds or by thousands, but by millions. It was evidently the design of Father Mac to produce this impression on the community, that no one had ever suffered death through the agency of the inquisition. To make this impression he quotes a single sentence from Appleton’s Cyclopædia, ignoring all that is said in the rest of that same article about the horrible cruelties inflicted on hundreds of God’s children.

Now, as he has quoted one sentence from the article in Appleton’s Cyclopædia, and based the whole of his fifth calumny upon it, he is bound to receive that same article, which proves that it is no calumny, but an awful truth that the so-called Christian Rome put to death more Christians than ever pagan Rome did.

The sentence which Father Mac quotes from Appleton’s Cyclopædia is indeed found in the article on the inquisition,; but it is a detached sentence, and relates to a single inquisition, namely, the one established in the city of Rome. But Father Mac took good care

to say nothing about the inquisition in other countries, as related in this same article from which he quotes. On the principle of Father Mac we could prove from the Bible that there is no God. For in the 14th Psalm I can find the words, "There is no God," but immediately preceding these words I read, "The fool hath said." So Father Mac quotes from the Cyclopædia, "The Roman inquisition was the mildest of all tribunals of this nature, no instance having occurred of the punishment of death being inflicted through its agency," but he omits to quote what precedes it, about the thousands who were publicly burned through the agency of the inquisition. We will therefore try to fill the deficiency from the same source which he employs, and if he regards this good authority on his side, he will have to admit the other part of the article as equally good authority on our side.

On p. 539 of Appleton's Cyclopædia, article Inquisition, we read as follows: "In 1483, Torquemada became grand inquisitor general of all Spain." * * * * * The following is the result of his grand inquisitor generalship: "The number of those burned alive under Torquemada, from 1483 to 1498, amounted to 8,800; those burned under Deza, from 1499 to 1506, amounted to 1,664; those burned under Cardinal Ximenes, from 1507 to 1517, amounted to 2,536. The general result of this statement for the time, from 1483 to 1808, is as follows: Burned alive, 31,912; burned in effigy, 17,659; subjected to rigorous pains and penances, 292,450. From the beginning of the 17th century, when it had succeeded in completely exterminating Protestantism in Spain, the inquisition became more lenient, and directed its efforts mostly to the suppression of heretical books."

We might go on quoting from the same article to show what the inquisition did in Portugal, the Netherlands and France, but the report from Spain will suffice to show our readers what horrors the inquisition perpetrated, and what reliance is to be placed on Father Mac's statements, when he tries to make the impression that the inquisition never put any one to death. O Father Mac! how can you walk the streets of York, and look an honest man in the face, after writing such a prevarication of the truth, and getting it published in an intelligent Protestant community? Did you think nobody else had Appleton's Cyclopædia, and that therefore nobody would refer to that article on the inquisition, and discover your trick?

But our remark which Father Mac designates as calumny No. 5, embraces not only the cruelties inflicted on Christians by the inquisition, but persecutions by the papal church in general. The limits of these pages will not admit of our going into any detail, we will therefore briefly state some of those persecutions as we find them recorded in the Cyclopædia of Religious Knowledge, article Persecution.

Persecutions have been carried on in the Romish church, ever since popery really existed, soon after the time of the Emperor Constantine. In the 13th century the pope instituted a crusade against the Waldenses, and they were pursued with a fury perfectly diabolical. In the 17th century persecutions were renewed against them by the cruel Louis XI, and about 15,000 of them perished in the prisons of Pignorol, besides great numbers who perished among the mountains. By the council of Trent, which continued nearly eighteen years, the friends of the Reformation were anathematized and excommunicated. Luther's life was often in danger, though at last he died peacefully on

his bed. Wars were set on foot to exterminate Protestantism. As such we may instance the thirty years' war in Germany, and the so-called Invincible Armada, sent from Spain to suppress Protestantism in England. In Holland persecutions were carried on for many years. Father Paul observes that the Belgic martyrs were fifty thousand, but Grotius and others observed that there were one hundred thousand who suffered by the hand of the executioner. In England during the reign of Queen Mary, commonly called "Bloody Mary," the persecutions of Protestants were sanguinary indeed. Ireland, too was drenched with the blood of Protestants, forty or fifty thousand of them were cruelly murdered in a few days during the reign of Charles I. No country perhaps has produced more martyrs than France. The most noted persecution of the Protestants in that country occurred on the night of the 2d of August, 1572. Many of the principal Protestants were invited to Paris under a solemn oath of safety, upon the occasion of the marriage of the king of Navarre with the French king's sister. Coligni, admiral of France, was murdered in his own house. After this the murderers ravaged the whole city of Paris and butchered in three days about ten thousand people of all ranks. A horrible scene, says Thuanus. * * * *. The groans of those that were dying and the shrieks of such as were just going to be butchered were everywhere heard; the bodies of the slain thrown from the windows, the dead bodies of others dragged through the streets, their blood running through the channels; the torrents seemed to empty themselves into the neighboring river; in a word, an innumerable multitude of men, women and children were all involved in one common destruction, and the gates and entrances of the king's palace all besmeared with their blood. From the city of Paris the massacre spread through the whole kingdom. According to Thuanus about thirty thousand Protestants were destroyed in this massacre, others computed it to have been a hundred thousand. When the news of this was brought to Rome, the pope and his cardinals marched to the church of St. Mark to give thanks to God. On the Monday following solemn mass was celebrated in the church of St. Minerva, pope Gregory XIII and his cardinals themselves participating, a jubilee was published throughout the whole Christian world to return thanks to God for the extirpation of the enemies of Rome in France, and the cannon of St. Angelo were fired to testify the general joy.

It has been computed that fifty millions of Protestants have at different times been the victims of persecutions of the papists and put to death for their religious opinions. But it is supposed only about three millions of Christians suffered martyrdom under heathen persecutions.

Now we had said that papal Rome put to death more Christians by persecutions and the inquisition, than did pagan Rome. Father Mac stigmatizes this statement as calumny No. 5. We leave our readers to judge whether what we there said was a calumny or an awful truth. But in truth and honesty Father Mac should publicly recall that accusation. Well, therefore, may the inspired penman say that at mystic Babylon's fall "was found in her the blood of prophets, of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth!" Rev. xviii. 21.

CALUMNY No. 6.—POLITICAL POWER.

We now come to discuss what Father Mac calls calumny No. 6,

which relates to the grasping for political power. Father Mac puts this in the following way:

"He charges us that we are 'grasping for political power' in this country, &c. If this is true, which however is not, it would be nothing more or less than what two-thirds of the people of this country are doing—from the cobbler who sells his vote, to the President who sells his oath. The Rev. divine offers no proof for this charge but his own word, which is a sufficient guarantee that the charge is false, we therefore pronounce it calumny No. 6."

I am sorry to hear Father Mac speak so disrespectfully, yea slanderously, of cobblers and Presidents. He says the "cobbler sells his vote." Sad enough that this is done. We fear it occurs most frequently among his own countrymen who come to America from the "Emerald Isle." He does not say what they get for their votes, but we suppose in many cases it is not more than a glass of whiskey. But to charge the President with "selling his oath" is a more serious matter. Which one of the Presidents of the United States, from Washington down to Grant, sold his oath and thereby perjured himself? Will Father Mac give his name, and take the consequences? If not, he is liable to be regarded as a coward and a slanderer.

He states further that two-thirds of the people of this country are grasping for political power. We will not stop to discuss the numerical accuracy of this assertion, but if it is correct, it has nothing to do with the question under discussion. As citizens of a republican government, the competition for the greatest political influence and the highest offices, is open to every one. Every one has a right to strive, if not grasp, for political influence. But no religious denomination, as such, has a right to grasp for political power, in our country, where church and state are happily separated, and where, we hope and pray, they may never be united.

Now, it is this grasping for political power, as a religious denomination, and not as individual citizens, that we condemn in the Roman Catholic church. And though Father Mac sneeringly says, "The Rev. Divine offers no proof for this charge but his own word, which is a sufficient guarantee that the charge is false," yet we will not have to go very far to obtain proof to substantiate the charge.

Popery has always claimed to be not only a spiritual, but also a political power. It is but a few months ago since the pope has been deprived of his political power, and we have seen what a wonderful ado the Romanists everywhere make about this, and what efforts they are putting forth, even to the extent of proposing a Roman Catholic crusade, to restore the pope to his political power. Every reader of history knows how frequently the ambitious projects of the popes have come in conflict with the governments of Europe; how the pope—the infallible pope!!—has claimed the right to crown and to depose kings, how whole kingdoms have been placed under the ban, and the subjects released from allegiance to their governments, because their rulers had incurred the displeasure of the Holy Father; there is scarcely a country in Europe from which the Jesuits, those wily agents of the pope, have not been at one time or another banished for their political intrigues.

In this country popery is manifesting the same politico-religious character, and grasping for power, as in Europe. This is not a mere surmise, it is a matter of observation, yea it is openly professed and

boasted of by the papists themselves. Father Hecker, one of the most noted champions of Romanism in this country, lately expressed himself in a public meeting as follows: "We (the Roman Catholics) are now ruling the city of New York, and it is a question of time only when we shall rule the State and the whole country."

The most influential Roman Catholic paper, in this country, is the *New York Tablet*. It lately contained the following boastful declaration: "We can only say that if the republic is to be saved, it will be through the spread and salutary influence of Catholicity. The only city in the union in which Catholics approach a majority, or in which they have any marked political influence, is this city of New York; and this city, considering it is a great commercial city, and one of the great marts of the world, with a polyglot population, is upon the whole, *the most moral, orderly, and economically governed city in the Union.*"

We leave our readers to form their own judgment about New York being the "most moral, orderly, and economically governed city in the Union."

This political power they cause to be felt in individual cases when occasions present themselves. For instance, in the city of New York, the Romanists also control the school board. Recently they caused all the school books published by the Harpers to be excluded from the public schools. And why? Not because those were not the best school books of their kind, but because the Harpers had incurred the displeasure of the Romanists, by publishing a caricature of the pope in their pictorial weekly. O Father Mac, how can you unblushingly deny that your church is grasping for political power in this country, and charge me with perpetrating calumny No. 6, for saying so?

Gen. Lafayette once made the remark: "If ever the liberties of this country are destroyed, it will be by the Jesuits of the Roman Catholic church." And we believe the greatest danger that threatens our country at the present time, is from the political intrigues of the popish priests and bishops. Our political parties are often so equally divided that the Roman Catholics have the balance of power in their hands, and they will invariably throw that balance in favor of the party that makes the highest bid. We know that many of our politicians, alas, are so unprincipled as to make any concessions to the Romanists, in order to gain their votes.

If ever the papists gain that ascendancy in this country for which they strive, then we may bid farewell to liberty of conscience and freedom to worship God according to the dictates of our consciences, enlightened by the word of God. God in mercy grant that the papists may never gain such an ascendancy.

CALUMNY No. 7.—POPISH ANATHEMA.

We come now to the seventh, or last of the "seven calumnies," which Father Mac accuses us of having perpetrated against the Romish church. In the *AMERICAN LUTHERAN* of May 6th, we transcribed the popish anathema, which is prescribed to be read in every Romish church on Thursday before Easter. It reads as follows:

"In the name of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by the authority of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, and by our own, we excommunicate and anathematize all Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians,

and other apostates from the faith; and all heretics, of whatsoever name they may be. And also their adherents, receivers, favorers, and generally any of them—as also schismatics, and those who withdraw themselves, or recede obstinately from their obedience to us, or the existing Roman Pontiff.”

This is the import of the “*Bulla in Cæna Domini*,” which is a particular bull, read on the day of the Lord’s Supper, or Maundy Thursday, in the pope’s presence; containing excommunications and anathemas against heretics, and all who disturb or oppose the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the holy see. After the reading of the bull, the pope throws a burning torch into the public place to denote the thunder of his anathema. The council of Tours, in 1579, declared the “*Bulla in Cæna Domini* void in regard to France.” See Cyclopædia of Religious Knowledge, p. 282.

The origin of this bull dates back as far as the 12th and 13th centuries. It was originally directed against usury, but in the progress of time other subjects were also included. This was the case especially after the Reformation. In the year 1521 Luther and his adherents were included in it. It is known to most of our readers how Luther regarded and how he treated this papal bull. He called it “*Die Bulle vom Abendfressen des allerheiligsten Herrn Papstes*.” He also marched at the head of the students before the gates of Wittenberg, and burned one of the pope’s bulls.

It will not appear strange that the secular governments occasionally forbade the reading of this bull in their dominions, by which a part of their subjects were once a year or oftener anathematized. Even one of the popes, Clement XIV, omitted the customary public reading of it in the year 1770. But this was no permanent abolition of the practice, for we find accounts of the ceremony by eye-witnesses. Thus we find it described by Elisa von der Recke, in a diary of a journey through Italy, vol. 4, p. 95, Berlin, 1817. “After the pope had pronounced the blessing from the balcony of St. Peter’s church, something was read from a paper, then the paper was torn to pieces, and the fragments thrown down among the crowd; every one strove to get a piece of this paper, for what purpose I do not know, as I was told the paper contained only the words of the anathema which is hurled annually on this day against the non-Catholics.” A similar account is given by Councillor Gœtting, in a diary of his journey in 1828. No pope has ever annulled this bull; it is, therefore, yet in full force, to be read not only in Rome by the pope, but also in all Roman Catholic churches, once or oftener a year, on the specified days. If it is omitted in any country, it is because the government has prohibited the public reading of it, or the Romanists find it bad policy to do so. Now let us hear what Father Mac says about this bull. The following are his words:

“He ‘transcribes’ for his readers what he calls a ‘popish anathema,’ and says it is read in ‘every Romish church on Thursday before Easter.’ I have been Catholic all my life; thirteen years of which I have been a theological student, ten years of these thirteen I have been a priest, and can say without contradiction that I never knew, never heard, never read; nor never heard of one that did hear that anathema read in the service which the church prescribes for the Thursday before Easter, or for any other day in the year. I can

safely pronounce this an unmitigated falsehood, and stamp it the base and malicious calumny No. 7."

We must infer one of two things after reading the above extract from Father Mac's article: either he has written a willful falsehood, or he is deplorably ignorant of the doctrines and practices of his own church. He may take either horn of this bull, or dilemma, which he chooses. In charity we will suppose he knows no better. But really he must have been a student of theology for thirteen years to very little purpose, if he "never knew, never heard, never read," &c., the *Bulla in Cena Domini*. If he will come to school into our Sanctum for a few days, Peter, James and John will teach him a little Roman Catholic theology.

BIBLE BURNING.

We have now gone over the "seven calumnies," so called by Father Mac, but which we have proved, as we think, to every intelligent mind, were no calumnies, but incontrovertible truths. In our discussion we had alluded to the hostility of the Roman church to the Bible, and to the fact that in the town of York, within the recollection of many of the people, a Catholic priest, a predecessor of Father Mac, had burned a copy of the holy Scriptures. Father Mac replies to this in the following words: "No pope ever put on the index a faithful version of the Bible. No priest of York ever burned what he thought a faithful version of the sacred Scriptures, and no predecessor of mine ever burned any version of the Bible, as far as I can learn."

Now, we have documentary proof, that a Roman Catholic priest by the name of Francis Joseph Wachter, did burn a Bible, and threatened to burn all the copies of the Scriptures he could find in Catholic families. The circumstances under which this blasphemous outrage occurred are the following:

Rev. Solomon Oswald had given a Bible to Mr. Gregory Berger, a poor Roman Catholic, who was confined to his house by sickness, and who expressed a desire to read the Bible. The Priest coming to see him one day, observed the Bible, and threw it into the fire, saying that it was not fit for them to read. The wife of the poor man came to Mr. Oswald and told him what the priest had done. Whereupon Mr. Oswald gave her another Bible with these words inscribed: "*Loaned to Gregory Berger, by the Pennsylvania Bible Society.*" When the priest saw this, at his next visit, he was afraid to burn it, for fear of prosecution, as it was the property of the Society. He therefore sent it back with the following letter, which we give *verbatim et literatim*:

YORK, March 19th, 1854.

SIR:—I send you the Bible you loaned to Gregory Berger. The reason I do so is, because that Book is against christianity itself. I pray you shall not judge me as opposed to the reading of the Bible, supposed that, what pretends to be the Bible, really is the Bible. But that book which I send to you is partly adulterated, partly interpolated, partly mutilated, in those parts of it, which you and your fellows and masters can not and could not understand or which are opposed to that, what you call faith.

I ask you therefore that you would spare Yourself the trouble of loaning books of that kind to people of my congregation. If I should

find more such bibles I would them not send back, but I would burn them for they are worth it. Respectfully.

FRANCIS JOSEPH WACHTER,
Pastor of St. Mary's Rom. Catholic Church.

Hereupon the Executive Committee of the York County Bible Society passed the following resolutions:

WHEREAS, The Bible has been twice burned in this place, within the last two years, by the Papists, and WHEREAS, This recent act of sacrilege was perpetrated by a Roman priest, of Austrian birth, and recent immigration, we feel as Christians and friends of the Word of God, that it is our imperative duty, respectfully, to express our views of such outrages committed against the religious feelings of this community; therefore,

Resolved, That we do not only consider the act of burning the *Word of God* and the priest's avowal to repeat the act, as blasphemous, but hereby declare that as Christians and American citizens, we will no longer passively submit to such outrages against Christian morality, and the fundamental principles of our free American Institutions.

Resolved, That the above statement of facts calls upon the friends of the Bible, for increased devotion to, and greater diligence in the noble work of circulating the Holy Scriptures without note or comment, and therefore we will endeavor to furnish to every man, woman and child, in this town and county, a copy of God's Word, in the language in which it can be read, notwithstanding the opposition and threats of a Bible-burning Papal Priesthood. SAMUEL SMALL,
SOLOMON OSWALD, *Sec'y, pro tem.* President.

OSWALD'S REPLY TO WACHTER.

FRANCIS JOSEPH WACHTER—*Sir*: I received the Bible which you have, with a strong hand, taken from Gregory Berger—that book which was the source of great comfort to him in the hours of his affliction, but which you have ruthlessly snatched from him and by this very act brought sorrow upon him which never would have been his portion, if you had left him to the free exercise of his mental faculties which God has bestowed upon him. Your letter has likewise been received, and so extraordinary a document deserves more than ordinary attention. It is extraordinary in more than one sense; it is so both as respects the letter itself, and the spirit it breathes in almost every line. You start out by saying that the Bible which I loaned to Gregory Berger, in the name of the Pennsylvania Bible Society, is opposed to Christianity itself. Now, I want to ask you what you know about this book? for you certainly never have examined it; indeed, according to the spirit of your letter, which manifests the spirit of the teachings of your church, you dare not read and examine that book; for you are just as rigidly bound to the teachings of the *higher powers* as the poor, ignorant, deluded subjects that you domineer over are bound to live up to your dictates; and for a man in this enlightened age, and in this free land, to be bound hand and foot, soul, body and spirit, in such a manner that he dare not think and act for himself, is a species of bondage which might have been tolerated in the dark ages, but will not be submitted to now. You may for a while thus lord it over the consciences of those whom you have trained to your liking in foreign lands, under despotic rule, but it will

never do in a land of civil and religious liberty. Your church membership now consists mostly of the very scum and off-scourings of foreign lands. They are the beggars on our streets, and the majority of the men, women and children who fill our prisons and almshouses. We speak that we do know, and testify to that which we daily see. Now, sir, is it not the height of presumption for any one so ignorant as you seem to be, judging from your letter, both as to its matter and exhibit of scholarship, to undertake to tell a free and enlightened American that he is not competent to judge what is truth and what is not?

You tell me that neither those who are my fellows or masters, nor myself, *can* understand what is the sense of the Bible, for thus I understand you; and what right has a slave like you, who dare not have a mind of his own among his *fellows* and *masters*, to set himself up as my judge, or the judge of any other free man? God has given us His Word, and one who is *our* Judge and Master, even Jesus Christ, tells me to "search the Scriptures;" but here comes up a stupid gawk of a German priest, who has been trained to dance as others fiddle, and he says, "your scriptures are partly *adulterated*, *interpolated* and *mutilated*, and you cannot understand them." Poor, ignorant man. I pity you!

You say my Bible is not your Bible. This I deny. My Bible, as handed down in the original, is the same as your Bible, and if you had the ability and independence to compare that unequalled translation of the Bible into the German language by the illustrious Luther (of which you robbed Berger) with the original, you would find very little difference between them except this: that the *adulterations*, *mutilations*, and *interpolations*, are on your side.

But, further you wish to make the impression on my mind that you are not opposed to the reading of the Scriptures. I know what your corrupt church teachers say on that subject. In this land of civil and religious liberty, you cannot prevent the people from reading the Scriptures if they wish to do so; but to what vile subterfuge do you resort to keep them from reading the Bible, and consequently keep them in ignorance? Do you not tell them they dare not think for themselves when they read, for by so doing they may think wrong and thus commit a great sin? Verily, the apostle Paul knew not a little about your religious system in his day, when he pointed to those who would in after times "speak lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared as with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats," &c., &c.

But you do not wish me to put myself to the trouble of loaning any more Bibles to your people. It is no trouble at all, sir, and I shall embrace every opportunity that offers itself to spread light and truth among the people, and there is no book that will do it so well as the Bible, and you say the next one you find among your people, you will not return, but that you will *burn it*. It is well that you have thus freely spoken out the true spirit of your church, and the higher powers in it will be very apt to exclaim you to account for your stupidity in thus letting "the cat out of the bag." I should not be surprised to hear that you had been sent back to Jericho to give your beard time to grow. You will *burn the Bible*, you say; you have done that vile thing before; but you had better keep hands off from

any Bibles I may see fit to loan out. If you do not, I shall make it my business to inquire whether you have any more right to burn my Bible than you have to burn anything else I may hold in my possession. Remember where you are, sir, that you are not among the ignorant, deluded slaves of a Popish country, but that you are in a free, enlightened, Protestant America, and that you cannot burn Bibles with impunity. You may burn a poor, priest-ridden foreigner's Bible, but you will never commit an enlightened American's Bible to the flames. Your letter is a text on which volumes might be written. I might say much more, but forbear at present, and close by subscribing myself,

Yours, &c.,

S. OSWALD,

Treasurer York Co. Bible Society.

The following, which we clip from their respective sources, shows the hostility of the Romish church to the Bible:

"No Bible shall be held or read except by priests. No Bible shall be sold without a license, except upon the pains and penalties of that mortal sin that is neither to be forgiven in this world or the next."—*Council of Trent.*

"Moreover, we confirm and renew the decrees recited above, delivered in former times by apostolic authority, against the publication, distribution, reading and possession of books of the Holy Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue."—*Pope Gregory XVI.*

"It is utterly wrong to circulate the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue."—*Archbishop Ximenes.*

"To give the Bible to the laity is to cast pearls before swine."—*Cardinal Hosius.*

"Accursed be those very crafty and deceitful societies called Bible-societies, which thrust the Bible into the hands of inexperienced youth."—*Pope Pius IX.*

CONVERSATION IN THE SANCTUM.

JAMES—What a rainy, gloomy day this is! We have had fair weather all along, and just this afternoon, when we want to have a pleasant talk in our sanctum, it must be dark and gloomy.

PETER—You must never complain of the weather, nor expect that it shall accommodate itself to your individual wishes and feelings. This very rain has been greatly needed, and will do much good; the farmers have been praying for it long ago.

JOHN—Hark! I hear music in the distance.

JAMES—(Looking out of the window.) I see a procession moving down street, headed by a band of music, with banners and flags flapping in the rain, and the men and boys look very sad and dejected as they tramp through the mud. There is no enthusiasm visible in their faces. I wonder what they are celebrating and where they are going?

JOHN—Why this is the Roman Catholic celebration of the 25th anniversary of the pope's reign. It is no wonder they look sad as they trudge along through the mud and rain, for they all believe they are marching to Purgatory, there to endure the rigors of the fire for perhaps a thousand years. Who could march joyfully forward with such a horrible prospect before him? Let us all get close up to the window and see them pass by. I suppose they come past our sanctum, just out of respect for us, because we have taken so much interest in Father Mac of late. It was kind in him to honor our sanctum so highly. And the

band, too, is doing its very best just as it passes our sanctum.

JAMES—Here comes a carriage with Fathey Mac in it. See, he has a bouquet in his hand, no doubt presented to him by some fair lady, for though a bachelor, his heart is still susceptible of some tender emotions. He, too, looks dejected, like his people. Poor fellow! He says he has been “annoyed, disturbed, tantalized, tormented—just within the letter of the law—his life has been made a continued martyrdom, he has been deprived of peace and happiness while living, and the honor of shedding his blood in testimony of his faith when dying.” How could a man with such gloomy feelings look happy?

JOHN—O see, there goes a wagon with a white cross on it, and six little girls dressed in white, and flowers in their hands. That is really beautiful! Only I pity the innocent children that have to sit there in the rain, during this tedious procession. Somebody down on the pavement says it represents the purity and holiness of the Roman Catholic church.

JAMES—If it had been intended as a burlesque, it would be most appropriate; for the Roman Catholic is the most corrupt church on the face of the earth, the lives of the popes is a history of crimes, debaucheries and abominations, her garments are stained with the blood of the martyrs whom she has slain, and that blood, like the blood of Abel, cries up to heaven for vengeance.

JOHN—I suppose that yellow thing there which they carry alongside of the American flag, is intended for the papal flag.

JAMES—I regard that flag as very much out of place along side of the American flag. What congeniality can there be between the papal flag and the flag of the United States? The one represents despotism, the other Democracy; the one represents tyranny, the other liberty. It is an insult to American citizens, to flaunt such a rag into their faces.

PETER—Never mind, that flag is now played out, it represents no existing government, and, therefore, it only reminds us of something that was, but is no more, and, I hope, never shall be.

JOHN—They say this celebration was gotten up in honor of the 25th anniversary of the pope's reign; is it considered unusual for a pope to reign that long?

PETER—Yes, the popes have generally reigned but a short time. Some, no doubt, have shortened their lives through their debauchery, others have been removed by intrigues of opposing factions, and many of them have ascended the papal throne in their old age, and then their reign must of course be short. It was the policy of the Cardinals to elect one of the oldest men of their number, so that his reign might be short, and more of them might have a chance to become popes. Since the days of St. Peter, whom they claim to have been the first pope, that is for more than eighteen hundred years, they say, no pope has reigned 25 years, until the present one.

JOHN—Is it certain that St. Peter was ever in Rome?

PETER—There is no authentic history that he ever visited Rome, it is generally supposed he suffered martyrdom there, but we have nothing but vague tradition on the subject. It is more likely that St. Paul founded the first Christian church in Rome, consequently he was its first bishop. Certain it is, that St. Peter, whom they call their first pope, never proclaimed himself infallible, as this pope has done, he never laid claim to temporal power, and he was a married man, whereas the Romish popes declare it to be a mortal sin, for a priest or bishop to marry.

SERMON ON DANCING.

Text. "A Time to Dance." Eccl. iii. 4.
Second Edition. Published in the office of
THE TEACHERS' JOURNAL, York, Pa. Six-
teen closely printed pages. Sent by mail for
10 cents.

Balls, or dances are frequently an annoyance to Christian parents and ministers. A French dancing master comes to town and opens a dancing-school. Some of the "First Families" in town, occasionally also church members, send their daughters to acquire this "graceful accomplishment," to "learn good manners," and get into "genteel society." At the end of the quarter's teaching there is a grand ball to wind up with. Many church members would like to know "what harm there can be in this innocent amusement," and "why Christian people can not be allowed to attend a respectable ball?"

This sermon, we think, will answer this question satisfactorily to every one that honestly desires to know what God's word teaches on this subject.

The author very correctly remarks, "It is not the simple act of dancing that is sinful; persons may dance without committing sin thereby; but it is the manner of dancing, the kind of music danced after, the spirit in which you dance, and the object you have in view."

176

Pages of the choicest Music for Sunday Schools, Prayer and Praise Meetings, and a fine selection of Metre Tunes for Church Choirs.

Get the best.

CLERGY-
MEN, SU-
PERINTEN-
DENTS & SUN-
DAY SCHOOL

WORKERS will find this to be decidedly the best MUSIC BOOK ever published.

Contains 176 pages of the choicest music, including an elementary department on "Theory of Music" by J. H. Kurzenknabe, besides contributions from over 60 of the best Hymn and Music writers in the land. Single copy 35c.—\$3.60 per dozen—\$30. per 100. CRIDER & BROTHER, Publishers, YORK, PA.

"Song Treasury."

SUNDAY SCHOOL
REWARD CARDS,
SUNDAY SCHOOL
CERTIFICATES,
SUNDAY SCHOOL
LIBRARIES,
SUNDAY SCHOOL

Supplies

A Specialty. *Send for prices at once.*

ADDRESS

CRIDER & BRO.,

Publishers of Photo. Marriage Certificates, etc.,

YORK, PA.

APR 8 1929

