

allowed by the Church. However, I would gladly listen to you on the subject.

I am, sir, yours, &c.,

EDMOND POWER.

We congratulate Mr. Power that, after so many ineffectual attempts to make us out in the wrong by harping on imaginary inconsistencies in our statements, he has at last got hold of a real error of ours. In referring to the words of the Council of Trent which approve of our having recourse to the prayers of the saints, we substituted the word "intercession" for "prayers" ("opem auxilium et intercessionem," instead of "orationes opem auxiliumque"). Our only excuse is, that our answer to Mr. Power having been written in haste, and necessarily but a short time before our paper went to press, the quotation was made from memory. As we are sorry to have committed any inaccuracy at all, we shall take no notice of Mr. Power's attempt to magnify the amount of our error by putting into our mouths a quotation that we never made at all—"orationes opem auxilium et intercessionem." Having thus made acknowledgment of our carelessness—for we are lovers of accuracy whether the matter in question be trifling or important—we must proceed to ask is it pretended that the substitution of the one word for the other makes the slightest possible difference in our argument. We own that we gave the word "intercessionem" instead of "orationes," and we gave the word "et" instead of "que;" and, as far as we can see, one change was just as important as the other.

Mr. Power makes as great a flourish about the discrepancies, as a criminal who hopes that he has made his escape by discovering a wrongly spelt word in his indictment; but as we are anxious that substantial justice should be done, we shall take the liberty of repeating our argument, and our readers will see whether the right word, "orationes," does not answer our purpose the best of the two.

The question was, whether Mr. Power accurately describes the practice of the Church of Rome when he says, "Beyond asking the saints to pray for us we do not invoke them." We say, that besides requests to the saints to pray for us, we also find in Roman Catholic prayer-books direct petitions to them for protection, help, and assistance. We gave the following example: "Oh, most sweet Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, refuge of sinners and mother of mercy, I commit myself this day and evermore to thy peculiar protection with most humble devotion; place me near unto thee, and protect me from all my enemies, visible and invisible. Say unto my soul, I am thy salvation. Direct me, thy servant, in all my ways and actions. Console me in all my griefs and afflictions. Defend and preserve me from all lusts and dangers. Turn thy face unto me when the end of my life shall come, and may thy consolation in that tremendous hour rejoice my spirit." Now, we beg to ask Mr. Power whether he approves of this prayer, and whether he thinks it in conformity with the teaching of the Church of Rome. And we should be obliged if he would give us his answer in the present tense, instead of either promising us his reply at some future time, when we shall have shown sufficient proficiency in Roman Catholic doctrine to be deemed worthy of the favour, or instead of giving us a cento of references to back numbers of this paper, by putting which together we may be enabled to make out his past sentiments on the subject. If Mr. Power approves of this prayer he cannot expect Protestants to put much confidence in his statement that Roman Catholics never proceed further in their addresses to the saints than to ask the saints to "pray for them."

We repeat it as our own belief that such direct prayers to the saints for protection and assistance are not opposed to the teaching of the Council of Trent. That Council does not merely approve our having recourse to the "Orations" of the saints, by which it sanctions the use of the "Ora pro nobis," but after "Orationes," it goes on to add "Opem auxiliumque," by which additional words we think it reasonable to believe that some additional idea was meant to be conveyed.

If, however, Mr. Power asserts that we are mistaken, and that the prayer we have cited is not in conformity with the canons of the Council of Trent, we shall bow to his superior authority, but then we shall find for him a number of other prayers composed by distinguished Roman Catholics equally worthy of condemnation.

Again we repeat that we have never meant to convey that the protection and assistance asked from the saints was supposed to be given by them in virtue of any independent, self-derived power of their own. We readily believe that the author of the prayer we have copied was aware that neither Virgin nor saints have any power to help save what was given them by God. But the prayer itself shows how this point (being one with which we are not practically concerned) is lost sight of in practice. Just as poor people who are visited by the almoner of some great nobleman, or the agent of some religious society, may ask him to help them, and if they find him always possessing means sufficient for their relief, may care but little to ask whether or not it is from his own resources he supplies their wants: so Roman Catholics are, in the books of devotion we have referred to, led to look to the saints as the immediate dispensers of blessings to them. It matters not how the saints get the blessings to give, it is from them we receive them.

Mr. Power assails an article inserted in the January number in which it was asserted that the saints do not yet

reign with Christ. On referring back to this article we were surprised to find how completely Mr. Power's arguments had been met by anticipation. And we think that any of our readers who will take the trouble to turn back to the number for January, will find that the writer of the article alluded to has given good reason to think that though the faithful departed are in a state of happiness and are rightly described as being "with Christ," still the time is yet future when it will be said to them, "Come, ye blessed of My Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the formation of the world." And it was the primitive doctrine that the completeness of the happiness of the blessed does not take place until the union of their souls and bodies. Scripture, indeed, gives us but little information as to the condition of the faithful during the interval between their death and resurrection, nor is it a matter of much importance to us, who may be content with knowing in general that they are happy; but the omission is of vital importance to Roman Catholics, whose system requires that it should be established that during this interval the saints, or some of them, reign with Christ, in such a manner as to be capable of receiving and answering the mental addresses of thousands of suppliants in a thousand different places at once.

With regard to the word $\theta\epsilon\omicron\rho\omicron\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, we do not think it necessary to add anything to the exposition of our views given in the June number, and which we hope was sufficiently intelligible. We hold fast to the truth that He who was brought forth by the Virgin was God, and we accept the word $\theta\epsilon\omicron\rho\omicron\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ as declaring this truth; but we feel that the very invention of this new word proves that the early Fathers shrunk from the use of the words $\theta\epsilon\omicron\nu\ \mu\eta\tau\eta\rho$, and we have pointed out what ideas are suggested in the latter phrase which are not involved in the former.

We have to apologize to our correspondent who signed himself a "Reader of St. Augustine" for an important misprint that occurred in the passage of St. Augustine cited by him in our last number. The passage should have run as follows:—"Et mater quidem spiritu, non capitis nostri, quod est ipse salvator, ex quo magis illa spiritaliter nata est, quia omnes qui in eum crediderunt, in quibus et ipsa est recte filii sponsi appellantur." In our last number the word *nata*, which we have marked in italics, was printed *mater*, thus exactly reversing the statement of St. Augustine—that spiritually the Blessed Virgin was not our Lord's mother, but was rather to be counted among his children. While we regret that our correspondent's letter should have been disfigured by a misprint in so important a place, we must be permitted to remark that the mistake would not have occurred if his manuscript had been a little more legible.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

JOHN HUSS, CALVIN, SERVETUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I have read with interest your account of the death of John Huss, recorded in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN for July. I am myself opposed to all persecution on account of religious opinions; I have also a great respect and admiration for earnestness in religion. I think it shocking that men should profess to believe that a certain system of religion is revealed by God, and should yet be ready at any moment to deny or suppress it, when it seems to require any worldly sacrifice. If there be any truth in religion and its promises, it must be worth any sacrifice. I think the great want of the present time, and, perhaps, of all times, is to be thoroughly in earnest in seeking for God's truth, and professing it when we find it. I have, therefore, a great sympathy and admiration for those who have been ready to sacrifice life itself for that which they believed to be the truth; and I feel this sympathy and admiration for John Huss, as well as for others.

But I much question whether it be suitable for such a paper as yours to introduce the subject of religious persecution. You support the Protestant religion with ability and candour. You bring forward the persecution and death of John Huss; that is, of course, to be condemned. But do you not know that Catholics retort the charge of persecution? To say nothing of other cases, are you ignorant that Roman Catholic controversialists retort the case of Servetus burned by Calvin? Thus, Bishop Milner writes—"But the great champion of persecution every one knows, was the founder of the second branch of Protestantism, John Calvin. Not content with burning Servetus, &c."—Milner's End of Controversy, part iii., letter 49. And, perhaps, you are aware that many Protestant writers have admitted the charge. Why, then, stir up a subject which only leads to recrimination? Why seek to advance your own cause by an argument which can be turned against you by the mere mention of the names of CALVIN and SERVETUS?

I remain, your obedient,

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

[We receive with pleasure our correspondent's admission of the great principle of religious freedom, and his reprobation of religious persecution.]

We do not admit the justice of our correspondent's censure on our introducing the question of religious persecution in our article on John Huss.

This journal was established to promote religious discussion. We are not arguing, right or wrong, for a cause.

Our object is to promote an earnest search after truth. FACTS must, therefore, always be suitable to our object, on whatever side those facts are produced. We have opinions of our own, but open to conviction. We do not shrink from opening our pages to the discussion of facts which are thought to be at variance with our opinions: we court it rather. Let the facts about John Huss on one side, and Calvin and Servetus on the other, be fairly discussed.

But let the bearings of the facts on either side be carefully observed.

On the bearings of the facts, we know no better statement than that made by Bishop Milner in his "End of Controversy," in the very letter to which our correspondent has referred:—"If Catholic states and princes have enforced submission to their Church by persecution, they were fully persuaded that there is a Divine Authority in this Church to decide in all controversies of religion, and that those Christians who refuse to hear her voice when she pronounces upon them are obstinate heretics. But on what grounds can Protestants persecute Christians of any description whatsoever?"—Milner's End of Controversy, part iii., letter 49. The italics are Bishop Milner's own. There is really a good deal of truth and reason in this. There is much extenuation or excuse for Roman Catholics who persecute, because their religion teaches them to look on all opponents as "obstinate heretics" against "a Divine authority for deciding controversies;" and those who believe this religion may naturally come to think that in persecuting "heretics" they are only executing a vengeance which is pleasing to God; they may naturally come to think what our Saviour said, "Whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service."—John xvi., 2. We think there is much force in Bishop Milner's observation, and that there is some excuse for Roman Catholics, in the fact that their religion does naturally lead to this idea. And, Bishop Milner speaks with equal force and truth, when he asks, "But on what ground can Protestants persecute Christians of any description whatsoever?" We answer, on no grounds whatsoever; for there is nothing in the religion of Protestants that affords any ground whatsoever for persecuting others for religion. Admitting, therefore, as we do most distinctly, that individual Protestants who persecute are much more inexcusable than individual Roman Catholics who persecute, we say that this distinction is greatly against the Roman Catholic religion, and greatly in favour of the religion of Protestants; because the excuse which Bishop Milner makes for Roman Catholics, and which we admit, is, that their religion contains what naturally leads to persecution; whereas Protestants, as Bishop Milner asserts, and as we affirm, can find nothing in their religion that leads to any persecution.

Thus, Roman Catholics who persecute are in some degree excusable, because their religion is to blame; but Protestants who persecute are inexcusable, because their religion is blameless in that respect. We heartily agree with Bishop Milner in this.

This, we think, is a sufficient answer, as showing the bearing of acts of persecution committed on either side, as respects the comparative merits of the two religions.

But besides this, the accuracy of the statement of the facts has always to be examined. It often happens in history that facts are mis-stated from passion or prejudice, and succeeding writers repeat the mis-statement, merely from want of sufficient inquiry. We believe this to have been the case in respect of Calvin and Servetus. We ask our correspondent's candid attention to the article on Calvin and Servetus in this number.

BUYING A PIG IN A BAG.

MR. EDITOR,—The next night Andy met the Reader he says to him, "As I find that the arguments from reason didn't convince you, I'll now prove from Scripture that private judgment is a most dangerous error; and the texts I'll bring forward are so plain that, as a reasonable man, you must be convinced by them." "Well," says the Reader, "that beats all ever I heard. You appeal to my own judgment against my own judgment. Why," says he, "that beats the man that was hanged for his friend saying that he'd do as much for him another time. If you had any decency, you'd put an end to private judgment by some other means than making it kill itself; for," says he, "it's bad enough to condemn a man to death, but it's too bad to make him hang himself; but 't would be a pity not to hear he texts, so out with them." "Well," says Andy, "St. Peter says, 'No prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation.'" Now," says he, "how can you stand up for private judgment with such a text as that against you?" "Why," says the Reader, "even supposing that text was against private judgment, 't would go but a very short way for you. It speaks only of prophecy; and as that doesn't form one-tenth part of Scripture, we might use our judgment on the other nine-tenths. But tell me," says he, "what Bible did you read it out of?" "Out of your Bible," says Andy. "And why did you leave the Douay," says the Reader, "that we've been quoting from all along?" "Why," says Andy, "I'm no way particular; I take whatever Bible comes to hand." "It's queer, then," says the Reader, "that whenever any of your writers are quoting that text, it's the Protestant Bible that seems to be the handiest." "But," says Jerry,

^a 2 Peter i. 20.

^b Milner, Lett. x., sec. 2. Keenan, chap. 1., question 20.